Development Management - Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/0341/25 Recommendation – APPROVE

Site: 94 West Way, Lancing, West Sussex

Proposal: Proposed single storey front and rear extensions

Date of site visit: 28 April 2025

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

The application site is a semi detached bungalow of hipped roof design with a front hipped roof projection on its west end matching the attached property and leaving a central recess at the front. The street is characterised by bungalows of various designs, many of which have been altered and extended with many additions visible to the front within the street scene. The current application seeks permission to infill the recessed section to the front of the bungalow with a single storey flat roofed extension.

It is also proposed to construct a single storey flat roofed extension to replace an existing smaller rear extension. It will measure 6m deep.

Relevant Planning History

Many examples of front infill extensions in West Way, including most recently

No. 58 – AWDM/1121/24

No. 62 – AWDM/0180/22

No. 151 – AWDM/1334/16

Consultations

Lancing Parish Council: - Support

Representations

None received

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 (July 2021)
WSCC Guidance on Parking at New Developments (Sept 2020).

Planning Assessment

Principle

The relevant issues are the effects on the amenities of neighbouring residential occupiers and the effect on the character and appearance of the area.

Visual amenity

The front extension will be clearly visible within the street scene. It will remove the symmetry between the pair of properties. However, it is noted that there are other examples of similar development visible within the street scene. Some have extended together to form a combined infill, but there are other examples where only one half of a pair has infilled this space. Some have pitched roofs and others have flat roofs which sit above the eaves of the original bungalow, as is the case here. Consequently, there is variation and it is not considered that this proposal will be out of character.

The rear extension will not be visible from the street and will have limited impact. It will be of a similar size to other extensions in the locality, including on those properties to either side of the site.

Residential amenity

The front extension will be built up to the boundary with the window at the adjacent property, leaving it in a recess. It is believed to be a bedroom window. On balance it is not considered that there will be a harmful loss of light or outlook. The window faces south and no objections have been received.

The rear extension is deep at 6m but it will be no deeper than extensions on the immediately neighbouring properties. To the east, No. 92 has a blank side wall and what appears to be a small obscured glazed bedroom window in a narrow recess. While that window will lose significant light, the room also receives light from a rooflight. The extension will be set off the boundary by 0.9m and the application property will be introducing its own window in the recess to serve a bedroom. It is not considered that the impact overall will be sufficiently harmful to justify refusal.

To the west, No. 96 has a deeper extension which contains an obscure glazed side kitchen door but no other openings. No harm to amenity will occur.

Recommendation

APPROVE

Subject to Conditions:-

1. Approved Plans
2. Standard 3 year time limit
3. Material to match existing.

4. No side windows

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

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.

Case Officer: Peter Barnett Date: 29 April 2025

Authorised by: Louise Prew Date: 29/04/2025