Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: **Recommendation – APPROVE**
AWDM/0397/13

Site: **92 Grand Avenue Lancing**

Proposal: **Demolition of existing conservatory and erection of single storey rear extension with new decking/patio area**

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

The proposal is for a rear extension to measure (at max) 3.5 metres in height, 4.4 metres in length, and 5.4 metres in width.

The application property is a semi-detached bungalow with an existing rear conservatory and raised deck. The adjoining half of the pair has itself been extended via a brick walled rear extension.

The surrounding area is an outer residential suburb of Lancing.

Relevant Planning History
None

Consultations:

Worthing & Adur Councils: *Environmental Health contamination officer* requests precautionary contamination condition

Lancing Parish Council: Although there was some concern due to the possible loss of privacy to adjoining properties, it was hoped that ADC would rule on this matter if it arose and therefore Committee raised no formal objections

Representations
None

Relevant Planning Policies and Guidance
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

Upgrading of residential accommodation is acceptable in principle.

Visual amenity

The scale of the extension is appropriate to that of the main building, and its external surfaces match that of the main house. Its roof sits close to the eaves of the main house. It would not be visible from the public street.

In all, the visual harm that would arise from it would not be so severe as to warrant refusal.

Residential amenity – effect on existing dwellings

It is the neighbours either side of the application site who are principally affected by this development (it is physically removed from the remainder).

The length of the proposed extension exceeds the Council's adopted guidance on the household extensions. However there can be exceptions to this, if site circumstance allow. This would apply in this case.

The proposed extension is set off from the shared boundary with the adjoining neighbour. It is only marginally forward of this neighbour's own rear extension, and the flank doors facing this neighbour would be screened. Noise and disturbance from the decking would remain domestic in nature.

Turning to the neighbour to the north, the extension is largely screened by this neighbour's own garden store and shared boundary treatment and the passageway between the two buildings would be retained. The neighbour's kitchen window would experience some loss of outlook and light. However over half of this window would avoid being cast in shadow. Outlook from it is already curtailed by boundary treatment and the neighbour's own garden store ensuring the living conditions of occupiers using this room would not be demonstrably harmed.

Under this circumstance, adverse overbearing and overshadowing effects onto both neighbours is avoided and overlooking would not be intrusive.

Recommendation

APPROVE for the reason:-

The proposed development can take place without detriment to the local environment and would not detract from the character or appearance of the area. It would not result in any detriment to the amenities of neighbouring properties and consequently does not conflict with saved Adur Local Plan

policies AG1, AH7 and the planning policies set out in the National Planning Policy Framework

Subject to Conditions:-

1. Standard time limit
2. Approved plans
3. Exterior materials to match
4. Notwithstanding “pd” no windows in flanks

Informative

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 any representations? Y

Case Officer signed: Mathew Porter Date: 10-5-13

Authorised and signed by: Peter Barnett Date: 10 May 2013