Development Management – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/0830/18 Recommendation – APPROVE

Site: 6 Ring Road Lancing, West Sussex

Proposal: Two storey rear extension with balcony to south elevation. (amendments to AWDM/1271/16 to increase area of lower ground floor and widening of external balcony area.)

Date of site visit: 18.10.16 and 18.09.18

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Site, Surroundings and Proposals

The application relates to a semi-detached chalet style property. There is off street parking to the front of the dwelling. The street is characterised by dwellings of various types, design and styles. Some dwellings have been remodelled in recent years with the use of contemporary render finish and slate coloured roof tiles. The street represents an attractive, eclectic mix.

Due to the siting of this dwelling in north Lancing ground levels drop significantly to the south allowing for pleasant views to the south towards the sea. This dwelling, along with neighbouring properties on the southern side of Ring Road have long gardens which are heavily screened by vegetation at the southern end.

As existing the application site is two storeys to the front onto Ring Road and to the rear due to the level change there was originally a raised balcony platform leading off to the rear from the ground floor. This spanned the full width of the property with stairs leading down to the rear garden, which continued to slope to the rear. Below the balcony was an enclosed storage area.

Consent was originally granted in 2016 under AWDM/1271/16 to extend the dwelling to the rear. This included the excavation and utilisation of the existing lower ground floor space to the rear to create a guest/garden room with shower room. This was shown to have patio doors with direct access onto the rear garden, an internal staircase connects this to what will be an extension to the ground floor with bifold doors and ancillary balcony. An external staircase was shown to the eastern side of the dwelling leading from ground floor level to the rear garden. Balcony screens were shown and conditions attached to the original approved to safeguard the residential amenities of the adjacent occupiers.

The current scheme is an amendment to the previously approved development. Work has currently started on site and due to issues with the existing foundations and the costs involved with the potential to need to under pin the building the lower floor section of the development has been set forward. The result is that the space

under the balcony which was to be open with pillars is to be infilled with the lower ground floor living space. The projection will be no greater than existing where the line of the approved balcony was. In addition to this change the balcony is shown as being slightly wider than as approved. The extra width is to both ends, over all increased from 4.1 metres wide to 5.4 metres wide.

Representations: Comments received from the owner/occupier of No. 8 Ring Road

- The current plans do not specify height of screen/fence or materials of the privacy screen.
- The length of the balcony has been increased which could also impact upon privacy.
- Although we have spoken to the applicant who assures there will be no overlooking we would like clear plans to show this to ensure this is the case.

The Case Officer has emailed the neighbour to clarify the details of the proposals and to advise that the previous safeguarding conditions will be attached to this new consent to protect their amenities as previously was the case.

Relevant Planning Policies

Adur Local Plan 2017 Policy 15
Development Control Standard No.3 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings'
National Planning Policy Framework (CLG 2018)
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. The original consent is a material consideration here, the impact of the amendments are for determination here not the original scheme which was deemed acceptable on granting of the previous consent.

Visual Amenity

The assessment of the original consent is set out below. It is not considered that the increased depth of the lower ground floor space or the modest widening of the proposed balcony will result in any adverse impact in terms of visual amenity. Overall the scheme will not be significantly visually different.

The extension is to the rear of the site, it will therefore not be visible within the street scene, there will be no alterations which will impact upon the street scene. The extension to the rear represents a variation to the original form and character of the existing chalet style semi-detached dwelling. The flat roof design, additional lower ground floor level, contemporary balcony design with columns and grey finish represents a striking addition. Yet this is deemed to be acceptable when considered in the context of the existing street which is that of various style dwellings which have been altered over time. For example no. 2 to the west is another example of

contemporary design in a similar vein to that shown here with the use of the flat roof design, white render and grey detailing, this also has a large rear balcony. This scheme proposes to provide development which utilises and takes advantage of this raised and south facing position providing living accommodation at lower ground floor and benefitting from the aspect and views and ample length of the plot.

The proposed addition as show with contemporary design features and finishes is considered to be acceptable in this case in the light of its relationship to the existing scale of the dwelling and within the surrounding context of the character of this street. Consideration must be given to the depth of the overall extension being limited to 3.8 metres, increasing to 4.8 metres including the balcony projection. Also of note here is that the principle of the ground floor balcony is already accepted with the existing balcony being the full width of the dwelling. Other balconies exist within the location this would not be an alien feature.

Residential Amenity

The main properties to be affected in this case are, no. 4 Ring Road attached to the west and no. 8 the detached dwelling to the east. The increase in lower ground floor area is not considered to impact upon the properties either side. The building will not project to the rear any further at ground floor than the proposed balcony. The lower ground floor increase is an infill of the recessed area under the proposed balcony. The slight widening of the balcony, although bringing it closer to the neighbours either side will not result in any unacceptable loss of privacy, overlooking or unneighbourly impact. As discussed when the original consent was granted the original balcony area at the site had an existing impact. The proposals will not worsen the previous impact. The privacy screens are shown on the sides of the balcony on the proposed drawings these will be conditioned along with the side boundary fence height. Safeguarding conditions as attached to the previous consent will be attached to the new decision here to ensure there is no adverse impact.

Recommendation

APPROVE

1. time limit
2. approved plan
3. balcony screens
4. The extension hereby permitted shall be finished in white render to match the existing building, the windows in the extension will be graphite grey powder coated aluminium with the door frames and balcony columns to match. The external staircase shall be galvanised steel and painted to match the frames.
5. The fencing on the eastern boundary shall be erected at a minimum height of 1.8 metres and maximum height of 2 metres above finished ground level at the application site, and the same heights above stair pitch line (at tread nosings.) The fence shall be erected prior to use of the extension hereby permitted and shall remain in place at all times.

Informative

1. proactive no amendments

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

Case Officer: Hannah Barker Date: 25th September 2018

Authorised by: Peter Barnett Date: 26 September 2018