Development Management - Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/1040/22 Recommendation – APPROVE

Site: 122 Tower Road, Lancing, BN15 9JJ

Proposal: Proposed single storey side and rear extension

Date of site visit: Assessment has been assisted using the Applicants plans, Earthlight mapping; and Google 3D of the site

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Site and Surroundings:

The application site is located on the north side of Tower Road, and is a hipped roof, storey semi-detached dwelling, with a south facing rear garden.

The other half of the semi, no. 124, is the immediate neighbour to the west, who have undergone large (5m) rear extension and a full width side garage extension. Other properties within Tower Road have undergone rear extensions.

Proposal:

This application seeks planning permission to:-

- Provide an 'L' shaped, single storey, side and rear extension;
- The rear section measuring approx. 6.2m deep x 7.5m – 8m wide x 2.9m high;
- The side section measuring approx. 2.8m wide at the front elevation x 3.6m deep x 2.9m high (3.8m high to the top of the false pitched roof at the front elevation;
- A gap of some 600mm between east side elevation and mutual boundary to no. 42 Hurstfield and some 300mm between the west side elevation and the mutual boundary with no. 124 Tower road is shown;
- 3no. rooflights are indicated on the roof of the proposal.

Relevant History: None

Representations: Lancing Parish Council: No comment

Consultations: None

Relevant Planning Policies and Guidance

Adur Local Plan 2017 Policy 1, 15

Supplementary Planning Guidance comprising: Development Management Standard No.2 ‘Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings’
National Planning Policy Framework 2021

Planning Assessment

Principle:

The proposal comprises upgrading a residential property 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 surrounding area.

Visual & Residential Amenity:

The extension is quite large, but the site has a large rear garden and wide plot, which will absorb the proposal. The extension will also be only single storey, thereby minimizing its impact onto the street scene and the neighbouring properties.

The rear garden to the adjoining dwelling no. 124 to the west, does not run in a straight line from the dwelling, but instead kicks out at an angle to the east from its original rear elevation. This line thereby runs directly behind the application site’s rear area. The plans for the extension therefore has had to reflect this angle within the proposal, and has followed the boundary line at a distance of approx. 300mm.

The proposal will be to the east of no. 124, and the proposal will only be approx. 1m deeper than their 5m rear extension, which is considered to be acceptable, and there are no side windows within the neighbouring extension to be effect by the proposal.

The boundary to the other neighbouring property no. 42 Hurstfield, changes direction slightly itself, and again the proposal has altered direction to accommodate the change, and largely the gap between the side elevation of the proposal and the mutual boundary with no. 42 Hurstfield is relatively consistent at approx. 500mm.

No. 42 is some 2.6 away from the mutual boundary, and the dwelling is stepped back from no. 122 by some 3.5m. It is considered that this combination of events will be reasonable to avoid and demonstrable negative impacts on this property.

To correspond with the high roof of the existing dwelling, the proposal shows a high false pitch to the extension and this drops down to a flat roof after about 2.3m, however, as the front elevation of the proposal is set back some 4.3m from the front elevation of the host dwelling, this change from pitched roof to flat will not be readily viewed from the street.

The rear garden has a depth of approx. 23m and thereby the loss of some 6m from the rear garden will still leave approx. 17m, which is more than acceptable.

Recommendation

APPROVE

Subject to Conditions:-

1. Approved Plans
2. Standard time limit
3. Materials
4. Windows

Informatives:-

1. Approved without amendment

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

Case Officer: Eve Hearsey Date: 15.09.2022

Authorised by: Peter Barnett Date: 15 September 2022