Expiry Date – 7/5/15

Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/0240/15 Recommendation – Approve

Site: 6 Western Close, Lancing

Proposal: **Single storey rear extension with raised decking.**

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Date of Site Visit: 30.4.15

Site and Surroundings

This application relates to a semi detached bungalow on the south west side of Western Close. The property until recently had a rear conservatory. It also has a detached garage on the boundary with No. 5.

The property has a notably higher internal floor level than rear garden level necessitating the need for a stepped rear deck area.

The property is not in a conservation area, is not a listed building and there are no protected trees on the site.

Proposal

Permission is sought to erect a 6 metre deep rear extension 300mm off the shared boundary with No. 7. The extension has an eaves height of 2.9 metres and a maximum mock pitch height of 3.9 metres. It is 6.1 metres wide but does not extend in front of the kitchen door and steps at the rear.

Relevant Planning History

1991 – Detached garage . Granted 27.9.91

Consultations

Lancing Parish – No objection.

Representations

The neighbour at No. 7 makes the following comment:

'The application must include means for building boundary wall from existing building that marries up with existing boundary wall. Also drainage from roof that doesn't flow into neighbour's land/property. '

Relevant Planning Policies and Guidance

Adur District Local Plan 1993-2006 (ADC 1996) (saved policies): AG1, AH7 and Appendix 11 'Supplementary Planning Guidance' comprising: Development Control Standard No.3 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings'
National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012)

Planning Assessment

Principle

The principle of development can be supported as it upgrades an existing house on a brownfield site subject to no unacceptable impact on neighbour amenity and good design.

Residential amenity

No. 7 to the north has a rear extension close to the boundary to a depth of 4.25 metres with a mock pitched roof. The extension has a solid outside wall facing the site and No. 7 also has an area of decking to the rear. The boundary is defined by a dwarf wall with brick piers and inset fence panels. Part of this wall has come down.

The proposed extension will extend 1.75 metres beyond the extension at No. 7 and will have similar eaves and ridge lines. The extension will not be harmful to the amenity of residents at no. 7. It sits 5.3 metres off the boundary with No. 5, which has a driveway adjacent. It will not be harmful to their amenity either.

Also proposed is an area of decking which extends 2.7 metres beyond the extension and has three steps. Decking areas of 300mm or less do not require planning permission. Only the first step is greater in height than 300mm. It is not considered that overlooking from this step will be significant. Any perceived increase could be ameliorated by either neighbour with the introduction of an extra fence panel or area of trellis.

The existing boundary wall alongside the rear extension at No. 7 is down. The owner of No. 7 would like it to be a condition of this approval that it be rebuilt. The extension is shown to be built off the boundary. This recommendation does not rely on a fence being in this position as the solid walls of each neighbouring extension will run alongside this area. The rebuilding of this part of the fencing is therefore a private civil matter between the two parties. Room for guttering is available given the set in from the boundary. Encroachment otherwise would also be a private civil matter.

Visual amenity

The extension is of an acceptable design for this rear elevation.

Recommendation APPROVE

1. 3 years
2. Approved Plans
3. Materials to Match
4. No addit.side windows

Informative

The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by assessing the proposal against all material considerations, including planning policies and any representations that may have been received and subsequently determining to grant planning permission in accordance with the presumption in favour of sustainable development, as set out within the National Planning Policy Framework.

Is recommendation contrary to any representations? N

Case Officer signed: MOK Date: 1.5.15

Authorised and signed by: Jo Morin Date: 01.05.2015