Expiry Date - 26/05/2014

Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/0379/14 Recommendation – APPROVE

Site: 6 Lewis Road Lancing West Sussex BN15 0NT

Proposal: Single storey rear extension

Date of Site visit: 8/4/14

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

The site is located within the built up area of Lancing on the west side of the road. The street comprises semi-detached bungalows and the land slopes down to the south. The dwelling has a part width single-storey extension at present. There is a large outbuilding in the rear garden at the southern boundary. The adjoining dwelling to the north at no. 8 has a single-storey rear extension with a blank wall defining the boundary with no. 6. The dwelling to the south at no. 4 is set lower.

The proposal seeks permission for a single-storey full-width rear extension rear extension 6m wide x 3.3m deep x 3.5m high under a flat roof. It would have one high level south facing window, a roof light and rear facing glazed bi-fold doors. Materials would match the host dwelling.

Consultations

Lancing Parish Council: No objection. Comments that there are a number of similar extensions in the area.

Representations

Third Parties*:* - One response received from a neighbouring address raising no objection but querying the accuracy of the drawings.

Relevant Planning Policies and Guidance

Adopted 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 – CLG March 2012

Expiry Date - 26/05/2014

Relevant Planning History

AWDM/0245/14 - Retrospective application for shed in rear garden
Permitted

Planning Assessment

Principle

Policy AH7 of the Local Plan states that extensions and alterations to dwellings should be designed so as not to result in an unacceptable degree of overlooking, a loss of natural light or an overbearing effect on neighbouring dwellings. They should be of sympathetic design and materials to the original dwelling and the area in general.

Residential amenity

The rear addition would be of similar height and scale to that attached to no. 8 to the north. Therefore it would lead to no loss of light, privacy or outlook for the purposes of this neighbouring dwelling's occupiers. The shallowness of the extension would mean that there would result no loss of outlook or light for the purposes of the occupiers of the neighbouring dwelling to the south at no. 4. Whilst described as 'high level' the lowest edge of the window in the south side is less than 1.7m above the floor of the room and a condition is recommended requiring this to be obscurely-glazed to safeguard the privacy of the occupiers of No.4.

No other property would be close enough to be affected by the proposal.

Visual amenity

Being proposed to the rear of the dwelling, the addition would be out of general street view and therefore would not be visually disruptive to the visual amenities of the area from public viewpoints. The extension's design, form, scale and external finishes would also harmonise acceptably with the dwelling.

With regard to the comments submitted by a neighbouring occupier, the application drawings are considered sufficient for the purposes of assessing the proposal.

Recommendation

APPROVE for the reason:

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) or the NPPF.

Expiry Date - 26/05/2014

Subject to Conditions:

1. Time Limit
2. Materials to match
3. No additional south side windows
4. Obscure glazing
5. Approved plans: Nos. 01, 02 and 03 received 31/03/14.

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: Lawrence Simmons Date: 1 May 2014

Authorised and signed by: Jo Morin Date: 2 May 2014