Expiry Date -

Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: **Recommendation – APPROVE**
AWDM/0118/14

Site: **86 Ingleside Crescent**

Proposal: **Increase height of roof ridge by 0.5 m. Single-storey extension to south elevation. Car port to north elevation.**

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

The proposal is:

- raising of the roof ridge of the existing bungalow by 0.5 metres in height along a length of 16.8 metres
- single storey side extension to measure (at max) 5.6 metres in height, 9 metres in length, and 5.2 metres in width
- single storey car port to north side to measure (at max) 3.4 metres in height, 7.1 metres in length, and 3 metres in width

The application property is a detached bungalow exhibiting low eaves and positioned on a prominent corner plot, in a residential street with an open plan character and appearance.

The site is situated in an inner residential suburb in Lancing.

Relevant Planning History
None

Consultations
Lancing Parish Council: *Although there was two objections, Committee voted overall in favour of this application but wished to express the opinion that that whilst it did not object to the extension, it felt that the design could have been improved as it was not considered to be in keeping with the street scene.*

Representations
None

Relevant Planning Policies and Guidance

Adur Local Plan: AG1, AH7
National Planning Policy Framework

Planning Assessment

Principle

Upgrading of residential accommodation is acceptable in principle

Visual amenity

The existing bungalow building has a wide open frontage facing onto Ingleside Crescent. It is a prominent building visually.

This proposal would considerably extend the width of the building, bringing it closer to the open corner of Penleigh Close and Ingleside Crescent. Because the site is so prominent it is important than an open aspect to it is retained.

However even though the distance is foreshortened, there would still be sufficient distance between the building and the highway to avoid the building appearing cramped or out of character, as the open aspect of the site would remain.

The correct detailing of the extension in terms of its fenestration, roof form and adornments, would ensure the bungalow's architectural form would still be recognizable – despite it being a larger building overall. The car port would differ from the design of the bungalow but it is set back from the building's frontage and so would be read as a separate entity from it. The choice of materials and finishes would not be 'alien' to the surroundings.

The comment from Lancing Parish Council voting is noted. The officer assessment on visual amenity set out above was based on an amended scheme as a consequence of negotiations between officers and the planning agent securing reductions in the extension width. With regard to this revised scheme, insufficient visual harm would arise from it as to warrant refusal.

Residential amenity

> The extensions are physically removed from neighbouring buildings with sufficient distance retained between both so as to ensure adverse overbearing and overshadowing would be avoided.
>
> Some overlooking would arise from the rooflights in the front and rear roof slopes. However their position high up the roof slope would avoid invasive views into habitable rooms of neighbours, and result only in oblique views into their gardens.

Recommendation

APPROVE for the reason:-

The proposed development can take place without detriment to the local environment and would not detract from the character or appearance of the area. It would not result

in any detriment to the amenities of neighbouring properties and consequently does not conflict with saved Adur Local Plan policies AG1, AH7 or the policies of the National Planning Policy Framework

Subject to Conditions:-

1. Standard time limit
2. Approved plans
3. Exterior materials to match as far as practicable
4. Notwithstanding “pd” no further windows/openings in rear roof slope of 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 any representations? N

Case Officer signed: Matthew Porter Date: 20-3-2014

Authorised and signed by: Peter Barnett Date: 20 March 2014