Expiry: 16/7

Development Management - Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/0618/26 Recommendation – Refuse

Site: 7 St James Avenue, Lancing

Proposal: Raising of roof eaves and ridge to include front and rear gables and a dormer to south roofslope; two storey rear extension; single storey extension to north side.

Date of site visit: 17/7

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

This application relates to a fully pitched roof bungalow on the east side of the road. This interwar bungalow has not been altered since it was built and the site has been unoccupied for the last 5 or so years. It has an unusual front chimney feature with its 'front' door in its north side wall.

St James Avenue climbs up from the south. It is a road predominantly made up of detached and semi detached bungalows of a similar age, of which some have been upwardly extended. No. 5, to the south is a bungalow of a similar age, No. 9 is untypical, a chalet bungalow with a steeply pitched and gabled roof built in the late 1970's. It sits much deeper into its plot. The site backs on to North Lancing Primary school.

The site is not in a conservation area and is not a listed building. There are no TPO's on the site and it is not at any known flood risk**.**

Permission is sought to add a 5.5 metre deep rear extension and to add a new roof with front and rear gables over the entirety with a 1400mm increase in ridge height and a lifting of the eaves by 700mm. The new roof would extend beyond the rear wall by a further 700mm. A south side dormer is proposed with rooflights on the north slope. Large gable windows are proposed front and rear. A single storey north side extension is also proposed to the maximum extended depth.

Following submission of a light study the applicant revised the application by lowering the new roof but adding an additional south side dormer. A further light study was subsequently submitted. Consequently, the applicant decided to revert to the original submission.

Relevant Planning History

None.

Expiry: 16/7

Consultations

Southern Water: Formal connection application required. B Regs should comment on adequacy of soakaways, they should not connect to the public surface water sewer. No tree plating adjacent to SW sewers etc. Landscaping condition required.

Lancing Parish Council: supports the application.

Representations

Neighbours at Nos 5 and 9 object. Summarised as follows:

1. Increased roof height over dominant and overbearing from No. 9.
2. Loss of light to entrance way , bathroom and bedroom at 9 contrary to BRE guidance.
3. Overlooking from side rooflights and rear gable window of side windows, gardens, sun room.
4. Single storey side extension within 900mm of shared boundary. Further sese of enclosure, loss of light.
5. Use of render out of keeping with predominant palette, harmful to streetscene.
6. Loss of light to No. 5's north side rooms, raised height, higher ground
7. Likely loss of rear garden tree reducing privacy further
8. Sharing manhole proposed, can drains cope?
9. Wood burner chimney, fumes will be polluting.

Councillor Mrs Albury objects:
Overdevelopment of site in particular raised gables and south side dormer. would like to voice my concerns on this development as the ward Councillor and knowing this road and property extremely well. Overbearing to No. 5. Other upward extensions are further up the hill on wider plots.

Relevant Planning Policies

Adur Local Plan 2017 Policies 1, 2 and 15
'Supplementary Planning Guidance' comprising: Development Management Standard No.2 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings''
National Planning Policy Framework (August 2026)

Planning Assessment

Principle

The proposal involves upgrading the existing housing stock located within the built up area and can be supported in principle. The relevant issues are the effects on the amenities of neighbouring residential occupiers and the effect on the character and appearance of the dwelling and its surroundings.

Expiry: 16/7

Visual amenity

The proposal results in a significant change to the appearance of this modest bungalow. Front gables are not a typical addition to this street with most bungalows hipped or half hipped at the front. However, No 9 is a detached chalet bungalow with a steeply pitched gabled roof and south side dormer. Consequently, the roof form will not be entirely alien in its context.

The streescene drawing shows that the new roof would have a similar eaves height to No. 9 with a slightly lower ridge line. The south side dormer proposed is also a similar size to that at No. 9.

The single storey extension is set off the side boundary by 1100mm, excluding roof overhang. It will not result in a cramped over development of the plot. A similarly positioned side extension could be added to the original bungalow under permitted development.

Residential amenity

The main impact is on the neighbouring properties on either side.

No. 5 is on lower ground. It is set off the shared boundary, behind its garage, by approximately 2.5 metres. It has two dining room windows in its side wall closest to the back of the garage. It also has a kitchen door and secondary kitchen window closest to the back garden.

The extension proposed is 8.5 metres beyond the rear of No. 5's garage. It is no closer to the common boundary than the existing bungalow and will not extend beyond the rear wall of No. 5.

However, the increased height and depth on higher ground will be overbearing to occupiers of No. 5 and will unacceptably harm light to their dining room. The applicant's own Daylight Study confirms that the extension will reduce the Vertical Sky Component (VSC) to this room by a factor of 0.56. Sunlight in this north facing room is naturally unaffected.

The same study indicates that two windows in the side of No. 9 will have their VSC reduced to 0.65 and 0.62 respectively. W3 is the dining room window to a larger, longer kitchen diner and this room has a large front window. It is a deep room though. W2 is one of two south facing windows in a living room. This room also has a larger north facing window and leads on to a single storey addition with considerable glazing.

No. 9 is also on higher ground. The effect on light to No. 9 is not considered to be as great as the impact for No. 5 though the proposal would represent a significant change to No. 9's outlook.

The proposed gable windows are very large and will certainly increase the perception of overlooking in neighbour's rear gardens. The rear one, is particularly insensitively considered.

Expiry: 16/7

The applicant was asked to reduce the height of the new roof and to curtail the depth of the first floor to the original back wall only. The Council considered such a revision was likely to result in an acceptable proposal. The applicant declined.

Side rooflights proposed are not to habitable rooms and the south side dormer has two bathroom windows. These rooflights can be conditioned to be obscurely glazed and non opening below 1.7 metres, with the cill height of rooflights set at this height too. This will avoid overlooking of neighbours houses.

Policy 15 of the Adur Local Plan states:

Development should be of a high architectural quality and respect and enhance the character of the site, and the prevailing character of the area, in terms of proportion, form, context, massing, siting, layout, density, height, size, scale, materials, detailed design features and landscaping. Development should:

Make a positive contribution to the sense of place, local character and distinctiveness of an area; and not have an unacceptable impact on adjacent properties, particularly residential dwellings, including unacceptable loss of privacy, daylight/sunlight, outlook or open amenity space;

When considering applications for extensions or alterations to dwellings, proposals will be expected to comply with the criteria contained in the Council's adopted Development Management Standard No.2 "Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings" (as amended or superseded by other Council guidance in force at the time an application is considered) or any other appropriate national standard.

Development Management Standard No.2 "Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings" expands on this point:

The effect on neighbouring properties

2.2 Proposals will not be granted planning permission if they have an unacceptably adverse effect on neighbouring properties. The main detrimental effects could be related to:

• Privacy - the proposal should not result in direct overlooking of rooms in neighbouring properties, nor excessive amounts of overlooking of garden areas.

• Daylight - any proposal should not reduce the daylight to neighbouring properties to an unacceptable extent.

• Outlook – the fact that a neighbour may be able to see an extension would not in itself make a proposal unacceptable, the outlook of neighbouring properties should not be dominated by the extension since this could be

Expiry: 16/7

overbearing and oppressive. However, the loss of a distant view would not normally be considered a valid reason for refusing an application
• Privacy - the proposal should not result in direct overlooking of rooms in neighbouring properties, nor excessive amounts of overlooking of garden areas.

Recommendation

REFUSE

The height, depth and design of the proposed extension would have an unacceptable impact for neighbours in terms of a loss of light, outlook, overbearing impact and overlooking. It is therefore contrary to policy 15 of the Adur Local Plan, adopted Development Management Standard No. 2 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings' and policies DP3 and P3 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

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

1. The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by identifying matters of concern with the proposal and discussing those with the Applicant. However, the issues are so fundamental to the proposal that it has not been possible to negotiate a satisfactory way forward and due to the harm which has been clearly identified within the reason for the refusal, approval has not been possible.

Case Officer:	MOK	Date: 18/9
Authorised by:	Peter Barnett	Date: 22 September 2026