Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/0112/15 Recommendation – APPROVE

Site: 6 Crabtree Lane, Lancing, West Sussex

Proposal: Retention of single storey rear extension and side porch (retrospective)

Date of site visit: 03/03/15

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

The application property is a semi-detached bungalow with a flat roof garage attached to the side. There is a driveway to the front with off street parking. As existing there is a flat roof, single storey extension, to the rear of the garage. This provides the main entrance to the bungalow and is accessed through the front door adjacent to the western boundary. There is also, as existing a flat roof dormer to the rear roof slope and a single storey flat roof rear extension.

The rear dormer, although shown on the submitted plans does not form part of this application. Planning permission was not required and it was built under permitted development. AWDM/0379/13 was approved in May 2013 and was an application for Certificate of Lawful Development for a hip end extension to roof, rear dormer and front roof lights. This has been constructed with Juliette balcony and railings. Also forming part of this application was a proposed single storey extension also to be benefitting from permitted development. This was not constructed in accordance with these approved plans which showed a 3 metre deep extension.

The single storey extension as built and the existing porch to the rear of the garage are the subject of this planning application. The single storey extension to the rear is of flat roof design to a maximum of 3.4 metres in depth reducing to 2.5 metres on the western side. It has a maximum height of 3 metres. The single storey flat roof porch extension is of irregular design in footprint to follow the western boundary. It is 2.3 metres in depth, has a maximum width of 4 metres and a height of 2.8 metres.

Consultations:

Lancing Parish Council has no objections.

Representations: 1 letter of objection received from owner/occupier of Waverley, Orchard Avenue: -

Concern over the French doors of the roof extension which have now been replaced with grating across the whole area. Therefore resolved.

Object most strongly to the side extension, it is encroaching on my property, but also because there has been no consultation with me by the builder regarding this extension. Demolition of the front boundary wall separating the two garage forecourts in Crabtree Lane. The garage wall does not constitute the boundary to my property. The boundary of the property runs to the right of the garage wall. There was a wall to the right hand side of the garage therefore leaving space for repair and maintenance. The side extension is hanging over and around the back end of my garage roof. How can I therefore maintain this section of garage wall? Also a bit of my property has been claimed. The boundary is no longer a bend the fence panel that is in place is straight.

Relevant Planning Policies

Adopted Adur District Local Plan 1993-2006 (ADC 1996) (saved policies): AG1, AH7 and Appendix 11 ‘Supplementary Planning Guidance’ comprising:
Development Control Standard No.3 ‘Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings’
National Planning Policy Framework (CLG 2012).

Planning Assessment

Principle

There is no objection in principle to the proposed development which involves extensions and improvements to an existing dwelling.

Visual amenity

The existing porch extension and roof extension are visible within the street scene. The roof extension does not form part of this application. The porch is of flat roof design and is set back from the highway by 10 metres according to the submitted plans. Only a small section of the porch is visible. It is a subservient addition which does not over dominate the bungalow or the street scene. The flat roof rear extension is not visible within the street scene.

Residential amenity

The single storey rear extension abuts the boundary with the attached bungalow to the east, no. 2 Crabtree Lane. There is an existing single storey extension on this boundary approximately 3 metres in depth. The existing extension at the application site is 3.4 metres in depth, adjacent to this boundary. There is therefore no loss of light, privacy or overbearing impact to the occupiers of the attached bungalow as a result of the existing single storey extension. Development Control Standard No. 3 ‘Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings’ states that extensions up to 3.5 metres in depth can be built on the boundary with an attached neighbour where there is no existing extension adjacent. This extension is therefore acceptable in the light of this supplementary planning guidance.

The single storey extension, porch and roof extension are visible from the properties to the west in Orchard Avenue particularly Waverley (representations received)

whose boundary runs along the western boundary of the site. The site abuts the rear boundary of the rear garden and also an area to the south with a garage within the ownership of Waverley, Orchard Avenue. There is concern that the applicant has encroached on the land of this adjacent property adjacent to the neighbouring garage to the west, (see above representation.) It is not considered that this is a planning matter and that if there is a boundary dispute then private legal advice should be sought and the matter investigated between the parties involved. The extensions as built are not considered to result in any loss of light, privacy or overbearing impact that would warrant a refusal on planning grounds in this case.

The neighbour refers to the removal of a wall at the property frontage adjacent to her boundary, also the rebuilding of a replacement wall in the incorrect location. These matters are for private discussion between the property owners and legal advice should be sought if necessary. Having said this these concerns were brought to the attention of the applicant's agent during the application process and the following has been confirmed in writing via email from the agent: "I have received confirmation from the applicant, Mr J White that the red line shown on the drawing submitted for Planning Permission is the correct alignment, showing a gap between the neighbours' garage and the end of his porch." Therefore the application is considered on this basis and results in no adverse impact on planning grounds to neighbours or street scene.

Recommendation

APPROVE

1. The approval is in accordance with the submitted plans:
   Drawing no. 1231.P1 – received 29th Jan 2015
   Drawing no. 1231.P2 – received 29th Jan 2015
   Drawing no. 1231.P3 – received 29th Jan 2015

Informative

1. Proactive Statement – No Amendments

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

Case Officer: Hannah Barker Date: 24th March 2015

Authorised by: Jo Morin Date: 25.03.2015