Development Management - Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: **AWDM/0669/15**

Recommendation – Approve

Site: 22 Ring Road, Lancing

Proposal: First floor extensions to front (west) elevation to increase existing first floor accommodation. New open porch canopy to front (west) elevation

Date of site visit: 1 June 2015

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

The application site relates to a detached bungalow located on the east side of Ring Road. The bungalow is set back from the street frontage with a large driveway occupying most of the frontage. At the front of the bungalow there is an eyebrow dormer window and a pair of modest hipped roofs over the bay window and garage that project slightly forward of the front wall of the house. A glazed porch has been added in front of the entrance door. At the rear there is a large rear dormer extension and single storey rear extension. No.22 is positioned on the bend in the road where there is a staggered building line. No's 26 to 20 are all sited so to stagger forward of the northern building, generally following the bend in the road. No. 22 is sited approximately 7 metres forward of the neighbouring two storey house at No.24 to the north. There is a change in ground level that is followed in the differing floor levels of these houses with No.24 being sited between 1 and 1.5 metres higher than the application site. This is a predominantly residential area with a mix of bungalows and two storey houses of varying styles including a recent contemporary two storey house at No.42.

Planning permission is sought for first floor extensions to the front elevation to include two gabled additions, a raised eaves level and a porch canopy set between the two gables. The extensions would be rendered and with a small area of timber cladding and a new timber front door. The existing roof would be adjusted to reduce the height of the side gable walls. The proposals involve a minor adjustment to the building footprint to square off the corner next to the garage.

Relevant site history

L/11/91/TP/6704 - SINGLE-STOREY REAR EXTENSION & GARAGE ON NORTH SIDE Approved 08.03.1991

L/62/91/TP/6849 - OBSCURED-GLAZED WINDOW IN SOUTH SIDE OF PROPOSED EXTENSION (VARIATION OF CONDITIONS 3 & 4 OF L/11/91/TP) Approved 21.06.1991

L/96/95/TP/16052 - ROOMS IN ROOF (WITH ADDITION OF PART-HIPPED GABLES AT SIDE AND FRONT & REAR Approved 30.10.1995
DORMERS)

Consultations
Lancing Parish Council: *No Objections*

Representations
None

Relevant Planning Policies
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 2012)

Planning Assessment

Visual amenity
The streetscene comprises of a mix of dwelling types with many houses having extended or altered the front elevations giving a contrasting mix of styles and designs in the locality. The proposed gabled extensions and roof alterations to the front elevation of No.22 would be prominent additions to the building and alter the overall character of the house to give an overtly 2 storey contemporary appearance. The overall size and proportions of the two gabled extensions would be matching giving a general symmetry to the form of the house, although details within each bay would differ. Having regard to the variety of design and form in the vicinity of the site, the contemporary design solution and the two storey scale is not considered harmful and the front elevation would appear as a striking modern addition in the streetscene.

As originally proposed the extensions resulted in a contrasting mix of contemporary two storey design to the front elevation and the remaining traditional bungalow to the side elevation being visible in the streetscene. As proposed these two elements were not designed to blend successfully, neither appearing as a modern two storey house or as a sympathetic extension to the bungalow. Revised plans have been received to address these concerns and now the side eaves level of the part gable walls on each side (where there is an existing barn hip) has been lowered so that there would be a consistent eaves line following along the side elevations and the side wall would be entirely rendered to match the finish of the new front elevation. Through the use of matching materials and a consistent eaves level, the design has become more coherent and, although no longer appearing as an extended bungalow, its appearance as a modern two storey house would not be harmful to the character of the street.

Residential amenity

The houses at this section of Ring Road, where the road bends, have a staggered building line. No. 20 is a two storey house to the south, set forward of the application dwelling and has a two storey side projection with rear windows facing south but in front of the front elevation of No.22. There is a converted garage at the side of No.20 which abuts the common boundary with

the application site. No.22 is set approximately 1.5 metres from the side boundary with No.20 and given the position of the converted garage at No.20, the site orientation, and that there would be no changes to the footprint of the building on this side, there would be no significant impact arising from the proposed extension on the occupiers of No.20 in terms of loss of light or outlook. In relation to the window in the side projection of No.20 that has the ability to look back towards the front windows of the application dwelling, this relationship would not be altered significantly from the existing relationship with views only possible at an acute angle and so is not considered to result in a significant loss of privacy.

No. 24 to the north is set back behind the application dwelling and is a two storey house set at a higher ground level (approximately 1.5 metres). No. 24 has a side garage adjacent to the common boundary and wide ground floor bay window and first floor glazed patio doors and balcony nearest to the application site. The full extent of the side elevation would be visible from this neighbour's front windows. The main impact would be at ground floor level. Although the extensions would result in additional bulk along the boundary with No.24, there would be no increase in the footprint of the building here and so the additional bulk is at roof level. The amendments have resulted in a slight reduction in bulk from the original proposals due to the lowering of the eaves level of the existing barn hip where it is closest to the front of No. 24. The staggering of the frontages is a common feature in the street and so the relationship between the two properties would not be uncommon. In this case there is a garage immediately adjacent to the application site and the affected ground floor window is set away from the boundary and at the higher ground level. Having regard to this relationship, and in the absence of any objection from the neighbouring occupier it is considered that a refusal on amenity grounds would not be justified on the basis of the revised plans.

Recommendation

Approve
Subject to Conditions:-

1. Standard time limit 3 years
2. Painted render, timber cladding as per drawings and matching roof tiles
3. No further side windows
4. Permission relates to approved plans:
   Drawing number L-100 entitled 'Site Location Plan' deposited 13 May 2015
   Drawing number L-102 entitled 'Existing Drawings' deposited 13 May 2015
   Drawing number L-103 revision B entitled 'Proposed Drawings' deposited 6 July 2015

Informative:
The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by identifying matters of concern within the application (as originally submitted) and negotiating, with the Applicant, acceptable amendments to the proposal to address those concerns. As a result, the Local Planning Authority has been able to grant planning

permission for an acceptable proposal, in accordance with the presumption in favour of sustainable development, as set out within the National Planning Policy Framework.

Is recommendation contrary to letter(s) of representation? Y

Case Officer: Rebekah Smith Date: 6 July 2015

Authorised by: Peter Barnett Date: 7 July 2015