Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/1479/16 Recommendation – APPROVE

Site: 22 Penstone Park, Lancing, BN15 9AJ

Proposal: Single storey rear extension to south elevation

Date of site visit: 15.11.2016

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Site and Surroundings

The application relates to a semi-detached bungalow, located fairly close to the main shopping area of Lancing. The neighbouring property to the east is two-storey. The property is render finish, and has a small glazed roof covered area rear extension.

The neighbouring part of the semi, (no. 24) also has a small glazed covered area. The other neighbour, no. 20 a two storey property has a long single storey rear extension appears a habitable room, going back into their garden approx. 9m long and close to the boundary with the application site. The street scene comprises a mix of terrace, semi-detached and detached properties. Some single storey, and others two, two and a half, and three storey.

Proposal

Permission is sought for a single storey rear extension with a part flat part pitched roof. The extension will measure some 3.8m deep x 7.8m wide x 3.8m high. The extension would be stepped off the boundary with no. 24 by approx. 400mm and no windows will be on that elevation to no. 24.

Consultations: None

Representations: Lancing Parish Council : No objections

Relevant Planning History:

AWDM/1047/16 HOUSEHOLDER APPLICATION FOR PERMITTED DEVELOPMENT FOR PRIOR APPROVAL FOR SINGLE STOREY EXTENSION TO REAR OF PROPERTY MEASURING 4M FROM REAR WALL OF THE ORIGINAL DWELLING, MAXIMUM HEIGHT 3.75M AND HEIGHT OF EAVES OF THE EXTENSION 2.776M **APPROVED 17.08.2016**

Relevant Planning Policies

Saved Local Plan policies (ADC 1996): AG1, AH7

Development Control Standard No.3 ‘Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings’
Submission Adur Local Plan 2016 : Policies 2, 15
National Planning Policy Framework (CLG 2012)
National Planning Practice Guidance

Planning Assessment

There is no objection in principle to the proposed extension which would upgrade an existing property within an established residential area. The key concerns are the effects on the residential and visual amenities of the locality.

Visual Amenity

The property benefits from a reasonably generous rear garden and the proposed 3.8m deep extension would not appear out of scale in this context. It would be located wholly at the rear with only limited potential for public views through the gap between No.20 and 22.

Residential Amenity

The most affected by the proposal would be the immediate neighbours no. ‘s 20 and 24.

The proposed extension at 3.8m deep exceeds that which is accepted for rear extensions within 1m of a boundary. Development Control Standard No. 3 is clear that in this instance, the single storey rear extension should be no more than 3.5m; this is in order not to put the rear rooms of the adjoining property in shade.

The neighbouring half of the semi, no. 24, has submitted plans to show a larger home extension to the rear of their property for a 4m deep rear extension for which it has been determined that Prior Approval was not required. However, this development has not commenced. Currently to the rear of No.24 there is a shallow, part-glazed lean-to which mirrors that existing at No.22. The proposed rear extension would not extend more than 3.5m beyond the rear of the neighbouring lean-to at No.24. Consequently despite its depth exceeding the Council’s minimum standard, it is considered there would be no adverse impact on the neighbouring property in terms of overbearing effect or loss of sunlight/daylight – particularly bearing in mind the orientation of these properties which have a southerly rear aspect.

No. 20 has a long single-storey addition onto the boundary with the application site (formerly a garage which record show was converted into habitable accommodation in the 1990s) and therefore will not readily view the proposal.

The properties at the rear are over 25m distant and thereby will not be affected by the single storey extension

Recommendation

APPROVE subject to the following conditions

1. Plans
2. Standard time limit
3. Materials to match existing
4. No windows in the west elevation

Informative

1. . Approved without amendment

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

Case Officer: Eve Hearsey Date: 23.12.2016

Authorised by: Jo Morin Date: 04.01.2016