Expiry Date – 18/9, ppa sought to 21/9

Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/1108/18 Recommendation – Grant

Site: Stanmore, 148 Crabtree Lane, Lancing

Proposal: Rear single storey extension to North elevation, single storey garage to East elevation.

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: Y

Date of Site Visit: 17.9

Site and Surroundings

This application relates to a detached bungalow on the north side of Crabtree Lane and junction of Greet Road. The bungalow has a large side and rear garden and has a detached garage in the rear garden accessed off Greet Road. There is separate vehicle access and parking off Crabtree Lane.

The bungalow is white painted render on a red brick plinth. It is not in a conservation area and is not listed. Internal floor level is two steps up from garden level.

Proposal

Planning permission is sought for a rear extension measuring 4.8 metres in depth. It has been revised since first submitted and is flat roofed to a maximum external height of 3.25 metres, 2.992 to eaves, and a lantern light. Also proposed is a garage on the east side of the bungalow. The garage is 2.5 metres in width, 4.9 metres deep and 3.495 to ridge. It is to have the same eaves line as the existing bungalow.

Relevant Planning History

None.

Consultations

Highways:

This proposal has been considered by means of a desktop study, using the information and plans submitted with this application, in conjunction with other available WSCC map information. A site visit can be arranged on request.

Summary

This proposal is for the construction of a rear single storey extension and garage, demolition of existing garage and re-instatement of the vehicular access onto Crabtree Lane.

Access and visibility
The site is located on Crabtree Lane, a C-classified residential road subject to a speed limit of 30mph. The site is currently served by a vehicular crossover (VCO) onto Greet Lane, an unclassified residential road subject to a speed limit of 30mph. The applicant proposes to reinstate the use of the VCO to the front of the property, onto Crabtree Lane. Local mapping indicates that whilst the site frontage was fenced off, the kerb in this location was not re-instated. Whilst this area is subject to a policy that a second access would not be granted without the closing off of the existing access, this site has historically been served by two accesses. As such, the Local Area Engineer has confirmed that he could not insist on the closing off of the access onto Greet Lane.

Vehicular visibility splays for the proposed access have not been provided by the applicant; however local mapping indicates that vehicular visibility appears sufficient for a 30mph road. In addition to this, splays are wholly maintainable within the public highway. An inspection of data supplied to WSCC by Sussex Police over a period of the last five years reveals that there have been no recorded injury accidents within the vicinity of the site. Therefore the re-instatement of the former access point onto Crabtree Lane is not anticipated to exacerbate an existing safety concern.

Parking and turning
An existing site plan has not been provided, although local mapping indicates that off-street parking for 2 vehicles is currently provided on site. The proposed plans indicate that a single garage will be constructed on site. In order for the garage to be counted towards parking provision, the garage must meet minimum internal dimensions of 3 x 6m as set out in Manual for Streets (MfS). Due to the position of the existing window of bedroom 3, the required internal dimensions are not achievable and therefore the proposed garage cannot be counted towards the parking provision. The WSCC car parking demand calculator expects that a minimum of one parking space will be required for a dwelling of this size and location. There appears to be sufficient space on the site frontage to enable off-street parking for at least one vehicle. However, the LPA may wish to consider the potential impact of any overspill parking on-street from an amenity point of view.

A turn on site would be preferred however clearly there is insufficient space to accommodate this. Mapping indicates that neighbouring properties have similar arrangements without evidence of safety concern.

Conclusion
The Local Highway Authority (LHA) does not consider that this proposal would have 'severe' impact on the operation of the Highway network, therefore is not contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework (paragraph 109), and that there are no transport grounds to resist the proposal.

Lancing Parish: No objection.

Representations

None received.

Relevant Planning Policies and Guidance

The National Planning Policy Framework 2018
Adur Local Plan 2017 Policies 1, 2 and 15 including 'Development Management Standard No. 2 Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings'.

Planning Assessment

Principle

The principle of development can be supported as it upgrades a dwelling within the built up area boundary. For consideration is the impact of the proposals on the character and appearance of the area, impacts of the development on neighbour amenity and the highway network.

Neighbour amenity

The application site is set off the shared boundary with No. 150 to the west by 1 metre and No. 150 has its driveway along the shared boundary. No. 150 has 4 secondary windows in its flank elevation, two each to front and rear living rooms. The rear building line of the application site is already approximately 1.2 metres beyond the rear wall of No. 150. The extension is a further 4.8 metres in length.

However, as the extension is to the east of No. 150 and more than 3 metres away it is not considered that any significant light will be lost. The extension proposed will have a higher eaves level than the existing bungalow. The boundary is defined by fencing in excess of 2 metres in height and No. 150 has a shed on the boundary which would sit, in part, parallel to the extension. It is not anticipated that the extension will be overbearing. Owner occupiers at 150 confirmed on site that they have no objection to the extension in principle. They would like to see the side kitchen window obscurely glazed to avoid overlooking. This is reasonable.

No. 2 Greet Road has a high level obscurely glazed utility room window facing the rear garden of the application site. This is a non habitable room and so impacts on light are not considered.

No other neighbour is affected.

Streetscene.

The proposed garage is on the east side of the house with access from Crabtree Lane via an existing drop kerb which is in use by the applicant already. The garage is too small to accommodate a car and so is more likely to be used for storage purposes.

The side garden is 6 metres wide. The garage is only 2.5 metres in width thus leaving a gap of 3.5 metres to the side boundary. The opposite corner bungalow has not

extended to the side. Nonetheless it is considered that adequate space is retained to the side boundary not to significantly impact on these open corners or cause real harm to the character of the streetscene.

The rear extension will be visible from Greet Road. It is however not the full width of the rear elevation and so will be nearly 10 metres from the Greet Road boundary. The bungalow on the opposite corner has a similar flat roofed rear extension. It will not be intrusive.

Highways

Highways has confirmed that this site already has two crossovers and that this development does not require the Greet Road crossover to be obliterated. It is not clear whether the existing garage is to be removed. It is not a requirement of this recommendation that it is. Adequate garden space, including enclosed side garden is retained.

Recommendation APPROVE subject to the following conditions:

1. Approved Plans
2. 3 years
3. Materials to Match
4. Side kitchen window obscure and fanlight opening only.

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? No.

Case Officer signed:	MOK	Date: 20.9.18
Authorised and signed by:	Peter Barnett	Date: 20 September 2018