DELEGATED APPLICATIONS ASSESSMENT SHEET

APPLICATION NO./ADDRESS: 9 Upper Boundstone Lane AWDM/0651/11

DATE OF SITE VISIT: 22.09.2011

NEIGHBOURS CHECKED: Y

ADDITIONAL NEIGHBOUR NOTIFICATIONS: N

PROPOSAL, SITE AND SURROUNDINGS:

The application property comprises an older-style, semi-detached, hipped roof bungalow on the east side of Upper Boundstone Lane. It has previously been enlarged by a modest side extension on the south side.

Permission is sought for a rear extension 4m deep and 3.9m wide, with a flat roof 3.1m high, to provide a dining room. It would be 4.8m from the boundary with the attached bungalow to the north (No.10), and 2.2m from the boundary with the neighbouring bungalow to the south, No.8. It would be constructed with a brickwork plinth and rough rendered walls to match the existing bungalow. There would be a pair of French doors in the north elevation providing access to the garden. No windows or other openings are proposed in the south side.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY None.

RELEVANT PLANNING POLICIES

Saved Local Plan policies: AG1, AH7
Development Control Standard 3 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings' '
South East Plan: CC1, CC6, BE1

RELEVANT CONSULTATION RESPONSES AND REPRESENTATIONS:

Lancing Parish Council: No objection.

PLANNING ASSESSMENT:

The proposal comprises up-grading of the existing housing stock located within the built-up area and can be supported in principle. The relevant issues are the effects on the amenities of neighbouring residential occupiers, and the design of the extension and effect on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

The impact on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers
The proposed extension is located sufficiently distant from the boundaries on either side such that it would not be physically overbearing or result in unacceptable overshadowing of neighbouring properties. The party boundary to the north consists of a timber panel fence approximately 1.7m high. It is considered the French doors are sufficiently distant from the boundary as

would not result in an unacceptable degree of overlooking as to warrant the opening being re-positioned, or the glazing obscured.

Design and the effect on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

The size and external finishes of the proposed rear extension are in-keeping with modest scale of the existing bungalow, and its simple flat-roofed design is considered an appropriate form of rear development.

The flat roof will project above the existing eaves to enable the floor and ceiling levels within the extension to match those within the existing bungalow. As a result, a small element of the flat roof where it cuts into the main roof pitch will be visible in public view through the gap between the buildings (and above the side extension). Although this results in a rather uncomfortable detail in visual terms, it is a common feature of other rear extensions to the modest bungalows in this road. In streetscene terms, this awkward roof detail is not so prominent or the effect sufficiently severe as to warrant compromising the internal layout of the extension through seeking an amendment.

RECOMMENDATION APPROVE SUBJECT TO:-

1. Standard time limit (3 yrs)
2. Approved drawings
3. Matching materials
4. No windows in south side elevation

REASON FOR APPROVAL

The proposed development would not detract from the local environment and can take place without resulting in unacceptable detriment to the amenities of neighbouring properties. It would consequently not conflict with the 'saved' policies of the Adur District Local Plan (AG1, AH7) the South East Plan policies (CC1, CC6, BE1) and the Council's Development Control Standard No.3 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings'.

HUMAN RIGHTS:

Article 8 (Right to Respect of a Private and Family Life) and Article 1 of the First Protocol (Protection of Property) of the Human Rights Act 1998 are relevant to this application. It is accepted that the proposal, if approved, would have some impact on the neighbouring properties. However, it is considered that on balance, existing residential quality of life would not be significantly adversely affected as a result of the proposal. Accordingly it is considered that it is acceptable with regard to Article 8 and Article 1.

IS RECOMMENDATION CONTRARY TO LETTER (S) OF REPRESENTATION?

No

Delegated Decision

Case Officer
Sign……J Morin……..Date…….21.10.2011 ……..

Authorising Officer
Sign……P Barnett….. .Date…….21.10.2011……