Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/0124/16 Recommendation – APPROVE

Site: 25 Brighton Road, Lancing, West Sussex BN15 8RJ

Proposal: Proposed one and two storey rear extensions. Proposed porch and first floor balcony to front elevation.

Date of site visit: 03.03.2016

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Site and Surroundings

The application relates to a detached, two storey dwelling house next to the busy main Worthing to Brighton Road, A259. Opposite the site, beyond the housing on that side, lies the beach and sea.

The detached dwelling has been much altered with conflicting extensions to the rear, and has low eaves to the main dwelling, with them abutting the front two storey bay window approx. two thirds up the window. The two storey bays (one either side of the frontage), terminate above the eaves by way of a flat roof.

Nearby there is a 3 storey block of flats to the east (Ariel Court) and a 10 storey high rise block of flats to the west (Milford Court), on raised land. However, other properties in the locality are generally two storey. Residential use predominates in the locality

Double yellow lines exist on the main road, on both the north and south side of the road. New development is taking place on the southern side of the road, i.e. the beach side.

The application dwelling lies forward of its neighbours, thereby making it visually prominent within the street scene. Approaching the site from the east, the single storey rear extension can be viewed, although the whole of the rear area of the site is screened by its neighbouring properties no.'s 27 and 29 which itself sits forward of Ariel Court, but not as forward as the application site. Although the property sits forward of its other neighbour, no. 23, it is not as visually dominant as viewed when travelling from the west.

Proposal

The proposal seeks planning permission for a two storey and a single storey rear extension together with a porch and balcony extension to the front of the property.

The two storey element will total approx. 7m wide x 5.2 m deep on the ground floor (this will incorporate the removal of part of the existing ground floor

extensions); with the first floor section being partially on top of the new extension and partly on top of an existing single storey extension, i.e. on top of Bedroom 3 to the east corner of the dwelling. The section of the rear extension that will only be single storey is shown to have a pyramidal glazed lantern over the flat roof.

The height of the rear two storey element will be some 5.3m to the eaves and 7m to the ridge.

The front single storey porch extension will be positioned between, and slightly in front of, the existing east and west two storey bays, with the roof of the porch becoming the base of a first floor balcony with glazed screen. Access to the balcony will be from the first floor living room.

Consultations: None undertaken.

Representations: None received.

Relevant Planning Policies

Saved Local Plan policies (ADC 1996): AG1, AH7
Development Control Standard No.3 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings'
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 proposed front porch extension would help balance up the current widely positioned two storey bays, along with the new glazed screening and French doors, it will offer an improved design solution to the external appearance of the dwelling.

As the dwelling is forward of its neighbours, the rear two storey rear extension will be visible from outside of the site across the frontage of No.27. It will have an awkward appearance in relation to the host dwelling owing to its raised eaves compared to the existing building. Discussions with the applicant have taken place with a view to seeking an amended design with lowered eaves and dormers 'breaking through' which would achieve a more subservient visual relationship. Having explored this option the applicant is concerned that the resulting accommodation would be unacceptably compromised and wishes the application to be determined as originally submitted. On balance, given that the proposed 2-storey rear element would be set-in from the east side wall of the existing house by 1 metre, and views of it from the street would be from an oblique angle, it is considered the effect on streetscene would not be so intrusively dominant as to withhold permission for the development.

Residential amenity of neighbours

The neighbour, no. 27 has windows in its west side elevation, which appear to be landing; a secondary window; and a high level window, it is not considered that the first floor extension, which will be no deeper into the garden than the ground floor extension, will have a negative visual impact onto that property.

With regard to the neighbour to the west, no. 23, that too is set back from the application site, and the fence line between the application site is not high enough to fully screen the proposal from that property either. No. 23 has 2no. windows on its side (east) elevation. The separation distance between no. 23 and the new single storey extension will be some 3m, and the distance to the new two storey extension will be some 7m. These distances are considered an acceptable separation distance between the two residential properties. No windows will be in the side elevation (west) of the new two storey extension, and a condition precluding future windows would be appropriate.

Recommendation

APPROVE

1. Standard time limit
2. Approved plans
3. Materials to match existing
4. West side window obscured and fixed shup below 1.7m
5. No windows in east or west elevation of the two storey extension

Informative

1. 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 letter(s) of representation? N

Case Officer: Eve Hearsey Date: 21.04.2016

Authorised by: Jo Morin Date: 21.04.2016