Development Management - Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/0102/19 Recommendation – APPROVE

Site: 82 Penhill Road, Lancing, West Sussex

Proposal: Two storey rear (south) extension with Juliet Balcony

Date of site visit: 5th February 2019

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

The application site is a narrow two storey house with a steeply pitched gable roof. There is as existing parking to the property frontage and a conservatory to the rear. The plot is narrow with the building being very close to the neighbouring dwelling to the east.

Penhill Road comprises of a variety of property type with purpose built flat development and flat conversions, bungalow and houses, many of which are unique and have been extended and altered over time.

Consent is sought here to remove the existing conservatory and to build a two storey rear extension. As originally proposed the plans showed a 5 metre extension with hipped roof and first floor rear Juliette balcony. A living space was proposed at ground floor and bedroom and ensuite at first floor. Officer's considered that the extension was overly large due to its scale in relation to the existing building and its proximity to neighbours. It was requested that the extension be reduced to 4 metres in depth. Amended plans have been received to show the ground floor extension remaining at 5 metres in depth with the first floor reduced to 4 metres. The ensuite is lost with the first floor being a large bedroom with Juliette balcony.

Lancing Parish Council: - No comment

Consultations

Adur and Worthing Councils: Environmental Health: - No adverse comments

Representations

1 email representation from owner/occupiers of no. 80 Penhill Road objecting to the application.

- The height of this extension will seriously block out the natural light to the kitchen.
- Also seriously block out the natural light to our dining room window.
- This 5 metre two storey extension is not in keeping with the buildings.

Following submission of amended plans.

- A 1 metre reduction would still block our kitchen window.
- A 2-3 metre reduction would be more acceptable.
- The proposed extension is still a very large increase in the overall size of the house.

Relevant Planning Policies

Adur Local Plan 2017 Policy 15
'Supplementary Planning Guidance' comprising: Development Management Standard No.2 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings''
National Planning Policy Framework (February 2019)

Planning Assessment

Principle

The proposal comprises 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.

Visual amenity

The extension is to the rear of the property, it is not visible within the street scene. The proposal as amended allows for a more subservient addition which respects the scale and character of the existing building. The hipped roof design, although not matching the existing simplistic gable roof form, does allow for a reduced scale addition which limits bulk. As this is to the rear it can be supported. The Juliet balcony is not a feature which is out of keeping in this locality and again will not be visible within the street scene. Materials used will be conditioned to match existing.

Residential amenity

The main properties to be affected are those either side of the site. The occupiers/owners of no. 80 are objecting due to the impact upon their side windows which both face onto the side elevation of no. 82. The kitchen window faces directly onto the side of the existing two storey section of house with only oblique views from this window toward the existing conservatory at the application site. The side dining room window looks onto the existing conservatory. The extension will result in some loss of light and overbearing impact as a result of the two storey addition. The oblique views from the kitchen window will be lost but the direct view from this window currently is towards the side of the existing house. The side window in the dining room will face onto the side of the two storey section of building. However, that room also receives light from windows in a rear extension and, on balance, it is not considered that the impact on the occupiers of No.80 is sufficiently harmful to justify a refusal in this case. Consideration must be given to the limited outlook and light which is currently the case here. The main aspect, outlook and light at this

property is to the rear. A single storey addition has been added and the space is quite open, internally and long.

There are ground floor windows proposed to the side at ground floor and a first floor window both facing toward no. 80. A condition is attached to ensure that these are to be obscurely glazed and opening above 1.7 metres only, to limit overlooking to the adjacent property. A door is also proposed which should be obscurely glazed.

To the other side no. 84 is a bungalow with a rear conservatory. The extension will be in close proximity to this dwelling. The ground floor extension will extend slightly beyond the rear of the bungalow adjacent to the conservatory. This relationship is considered to be acceptable and will not give rise to any loss of light, privacy or overbearing impact. A bedroom window is to be inserted in the original building on the eastern side here. This will not give rise to any overlooking. A condition is also attached to ensure that no additional side windows are to be inserted here.

Recommendation

APPROVE

Subject to Conditions:-

1. Approved Plans
2. Standard 3 year time limit
3. Materials to match existing
4. No additional windows on the east or west elevation of the extension.
5. The ground and first floor windows and door on the west elevation shall be fitted with obscure glazing at all times and shall be non openable except for above 1.7 metres finished floor level.

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

1. Proactive with amendments

Case Officer: Hannah Barker Date: 12th March 2019

Authorised by: Peter Barnett Date: 12 March 2019