Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/1590/13 Recommendation – APPROVE

Site: 14 Hadlow Way Lancing West Sussex BN15 9DE

Proposal: Single storey pitched-roof rear extension; reduction in size of existing side conservatory

Date of site visit: 7th January 2014

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

The application site relates to a detached bungalow on the west side of the road in a street of similar dwellings. There is a stream running to the rear of the back garden and the land is flat. The dwelling has a rear paved area and a conservatory to the north western elevation. The area is predominantly residential. The neighbouring plot to the south east has a garage and wall to the boundary and the dwelling to the north west has a rear conservatory.

Permission is sought for a rear extension to the kitchen 3.9m deep and 4m wide with an angled glazed bay and a 1.6m reduction in depth of the current conservatory. The extension would continue the existing projection roof line and replicate the end hip. The current solar panel will be reinstated on the new extension rear roof. Materials would match the existing comprising brick and render walls and pvc glazing.

Relevant site history

L/15/83/TP/3520 Lounge Extension To Rear. Permitted
L/33/97/TP/16796 Enlargement Of Rear Of Roof From Hip To Gable Permitted.
L/82/04/TP/21191 Conservatory On NW Side. Permitted.

Consultations:

Lancing Parish Council – no objections.

Adur Worthing Engineering – no objections or requirements.

Environment Agency – no comments received.

Representations: None received.

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

Residential amenity

Although the proposed rear extension lengthens the rear of the dwelling, this portion of the dwelling would be sufficiently distant from any neighbouring windows as to avoid material loss of light. The single-storey form and modest scale of the addition would prevent any impression of undue dominance and the absence of side facing windows would mean there would result no serious loss of privacy for the purposes of neighbouring occupiers. Regard has been had to the proposed angled glazed rear bay of the extension, the reduction in the length of the conservatory and the low fence to the common boundary with no. 15 to the north which may all lead to some inter-visibility between the two properties but it is considered that a condition requiring obscure glazing to the angled panels of the extension would ensure adequate protection of privacy.

Visual amenity

The changes being wholly to the rear of the dwelling would mean that there would result no change to the street scene. Of itself, the proposal would harmonise sufficiently with the existing dwelling in terms of its design features as to avoid appearing discordant.

Flood Risk

Neither the Environment Agency nor the Council Engineers have raised any objections.

Therefore on balance, the proposals are considered acceptable.

Recommendation

Approve for the reason:-

The proposed development is considered acceptable and can take place without resulting in significant harm to the visual amenities of the locality or unacceptable detriment to the amenities of neighbouring properties. It consequently would not conflict with the saved policies of the Adur District Local Plan (AG1, AH7) or the policies of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Subject to Conditions:-

1. Standard time limit 3 years
2. Permission relates to approved plans:
   TP711/9, TP711/11 and TP711/12 received 30/12/13 and.
   TP711/10 received 30/1/14.

3. Matching materials
4. No further side windows
5. Obscure glazing to angled side panels in extension

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 letter(s) of representation? N

Case Officer: L Simmons Date: 30th January 2014

Authorised by: Jo Morin Date: 3 Feb 2014