Expiry Date - 23/07/2010

# Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

**Application Number: ADC/0191/10** **Recommendation – Permit Application**

**Site:** **6 Osborne Drive Sompting Lancing West Sussex**

**Proposal:** **Demolish existing conservatory and erect a single-storey rear extension**

## The Application

The application relates to the eastern half of a pair of semi-detached, 1950's hipped-roof bungalows located on the north side of the street.

Permission is sought for a flat roofed rear extension to replace an existing conservatory. The proposed extension would be 7.9m in width, by 2.1 – 3.3m in depth by 3m in height. The stepped rear elevation would mean the 2.8m section of the extension to the east, closest to the shared drive would be only 2.1m deep to maintain vehicular access to the garage.

## Consultations and Representations

***Sompting Parish Council:*** No comments received.

***Third Parties:*** There have been no objections received.

## Relevant Planning Policies and Guidance

Adopted Adur District Local Plan 1993-2006 (ADC 1996) (saved policies): AG1, AH7 and Appendix II 'Supplementary Planning Guidance' comprising: Development Control Standard No.3 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings.'
PPS 1 'Delivering Sustainable Development' (ODPM 2005)

## Planning Assessment

***Policies***
Policy AH7 of the Local Plan states that extensions and alterations should be designed so as not to result in an unacceptable degree of overlooking, a loss of natural light or an overbearing effect on neighbouring dwellings. They should be of sympathetic design and materials to the original dwelling and the area in general.

Development Control Standard No.3 entitled 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings' states that the most important basic principle is that any extension should be in keeping with the appearance, scale, design and character of both the existing dwelling and the street scene generally. Rear extensions which are within 1m of a common side boundary with an attached dwelling should be no deeper than 3.5m.

***Visual amenity***

The proposed extension would be the whole width of the existing bungalow at the rear, with a stepped rear elevation. Ordinarily a flat roofed structure would be acceptable due to the lack of prominence in its siting, however in this case the flat roof as originally submitted would have wrapped around the hip of the roof with a 0.5m high fascia. It was considered that this would have had a detrimental effect due to the unsympathetic nature of the design.

The applicant has now amended the scheme to incorporate a tiled dummy hip roof on the easternmost section of the extension. The tiled roof form would be 1m in height and would wrap around the stepped kitchen area only. Whilst it would be preferable for the dummy pitch roof be on all three sides of the extension, it is considered the stepped rear elevation does provide a natural break for the roof form to stop at. The effect on the appearance of the dwelling from the street would now be of a sympathetic design which would no longer detract from the appearance of the building, and therefore is considered acceptable.

***Residential amenity***

The proposed extension would project into the rear garden by 3.3m adjacent to the boundary with the attached neighbour, who also has a similar length extension. The proposals would not impact the outlook or amount of sunlight available to either of the adjacent bungalows and would not adversely affect their privacy.

The rear of properties to the rear in Cokeham Road are located 36m away across a garage compound located between. Due to the separation the proposed extension would not have a significant affect on their amenity.

**Recommendation**

APPROVE for reason that :-

1PPi

1. C1Ci
2. C12Eii
3. C18Eiv – east
4. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: elevations, plans 1:500 block plan, 1:1250 site location plan No.4408:1 Rev A date stamped received 28.06.10

**Reason:** *For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.*

Case Officer Carlos Hone

Date 30.06.10

[redacted]