Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/0675/15 Recommendation – APPROVE

Site: 58 Brighton Road Lancing West Sussex BN15 8ET

Proposal: Single-storey extension, basement extension with balcony roof terrace and external access staircase and raised decking area to rear (south) elevation (revisions to AWDM/1779/14).

Date of site visit: 16.04.2015 (Pre-app)

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Site and Surroundings

The application property is an extended bungalow located on the south side of the road (A259) backing onto land that leads down to the sea. The property is built to negotiate a fall in land level to the south so that the ground floor facing the road becomes the upper ground-floor at the rear.

The vast majority of the rear garden (but not the dwelling itself) is located within Flood Zones 2/3.

A similar style of bungalow adjoins to the east, No.60. Adjoining to the west is a 2-storey, semi-detached older style character house, No.56.

Relevant Site History

Permission was granted under AWDM/1779/14 for a part-subterranean flat-roofed rear extension consisting of an enlarged balcony at upper ground-floor with steps down into the garden, and basement accommodation below. It was proposed to retain the existing lightweight conservatory-type structure at the rear.

Proposal

The revised proposals involve demolishing the existing lightweight rear conservatory type structure and replacing it with a larger solid-built extension at upper ground-floor level extending a further 1.1m rearwards (south) in conjunction with the part-subterranean flat-roofed rear element with steps into the garden approved under AWDM/1779/14. The replacement extension would have a flat roof with a tiled-skirt edge on 3 sides and eaves height aligned with the original bungalow. No windows are proposed in the east and west side walls. The external finishes would be render and roof tiles to match the existing dwelling.

This latest application also seeks retrospective permission for a raised timber decked area that has been constructed mid-way along the depth of the rear

garden. The decking is enclosed by a combination of timber balustrading and rope fencing with 2.2m high sleeper fencing on the western boundary (with No.56). At its highest point, the raised decked area is some 1.5m above adjoining ground level.

The application is accompanied by an FRA in accordance with EA Standing Advice.

Consultations:

Lancing Parish Council has no objection to this application.

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

Principle

There is no objection in principle to the proposed development which involves upgrading of the existing housing stock. The key considerations are the effects on the residential and visual amenities of the locality and flood risk.

Visual amenity

The replacement rear extension would not be substantially larger than the existing conservatory structure – extending approximately 1.1m further southward. In conjunction with the lower ground-floor (or basement) element, rear terrace and decking, the rear of the dwelling will have a conspicuously more 'built-up' appearance than was previously the case – particularly in views from the public footpath along the sea front. However, the terraced or stepped form of development responds to the change in ground levels and would not appear out of scale with the original bungalow.

The adjoining dwellings on this side of the road are quite tightly spaced with shallow frontages such that the replacement rear extension would be unlikely to be perceptible in views from Brighton Road.

Residential amenity

To the east, No.60 is similar in scale, style and massing to the application property. It has been enlarged at the rear by a conservatory with high-level glazing to the west side. The conservatory provides access onto a rear terrace with a timber privacy screen in situ on the west side approximately 1.8m high. The proposed replacement upper ground-floor extension will project beyond the conservatory at No.60 but not beyond the southern extremity of the rear terrace and the privacy screen. It will have some

additional impact on the neighbouring property in terms of an increased sense of enclosure compared to the existing conservatory structure. However, the effect will not be so severe as to justify refusal on these grounds.

Beyond the raised terrace the long rear gardens of No.58 and 60 are open in character, overlooked from the rear of the both properties and those further east in Shopsdam Road (and also from the footpath along the seafront). It would be difficult to argue that the raised decking erected in the garden of No.58 has had a harmful effect in terms of an increased loss of privacy through overlooking since balconies and terraces facing toward the sea are of feature of the immediate locality.

To the west, No.56 is a 2-storey dwelling. The ground floor is set at a comparatively lower level than at the application property (which is raised). The existing conservatory at upper-ground level at No.58 extends beyond the 2-storey rear (south) elevation of No.56 by approximately 2 metres. There is a narrow passageway approximately 1m wide between the application property and the side wall of No.56. A ground-floor window in the latter appears to provide the sole means of daylight to a kitchen. There is a detached shed in the garden just to the south and east of the rear elevation adjoining the boundary with No.58. The proposed deeper replacement extension would have some additional impact on the receipt of daylight to the side window and an increased sense of enclosure to the rear of No.56 generally. However, the overall effect would not be significantly worse than exists at present, the angled outlook southwards from the kitchen being partially obscured by the existing shed in any event.

The boundary with the rear garden on this west side is more enclosed with hedging and shrubbery within the garden of No.56. The sleeper fencing that has been erected to the west side of the decked area will help safeguard the privacy for the neighbour on this side but is not considered to be unduly oppressive or overbearing in view of the existing taller hedge planting on this side.

Flood Risk

The Environmental Agency raised no objection to the previous application (AWDM/1779/14) other than recommending taking of the basement owing to high ground water levels locally. These latest revisions to the main living accommodation relate to the upper ground-floor and do not therefore raise any additional flood risk implications.

Recommendation

APPROVE

Subject to Conditions:-

1. Standard time limit
2. Approved plans
3. Materials to match
4. Privacy screen
5. No side apertures.

Informative

1. Proactive Statement – No Amendments

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

Case Officer: Jo Morin Date: 25.06.2015

Authorised by: Gary Peck Date: 26 June 2015