# Development Management - Delegated Officer Report

**Application Number: AWDM/1542/19 Recommendation – Approve**

**Site: 22 Upper Boundstone Lane, Lancing**

**Proposal: Demolition of existing double garage and construction of replacement double garage to south side elevation, plus single-storey rear extension with raised platform. Hip to gable roof extension and rear dormer (retrospective).**

**Date of site visit: 28 October 2019**

**Neighbours checked: Y**

**Additional neighbour notifications: N**

**Proposal, Site and Surroundings**

The application relates to a semi-detached bungalow on the east side of Upper Boundstone Lane. Retrospective permission is sought to retain a flat roofed attached garage at the side of the property and a flat roofed extension at the rear with raised platform.

Following the refusal of a separate application for a Certificate of Lawfulness for a hip to gable roof extension and rear dormer (AWDM/1541/19) this application has been amended to also include those elements.

The side extension replaces a previous extension in the same position. It measures 5.5m wide, 6m deep and 2.7m high. The previous garage measured 5.1m wide, 6m deep and 2.3m high.

The rear extension measures 8.2m wide, 3.2m deep and 3.1m high at its furthest point from the house. The land slopes to the rear and a raised platform has been constructed which wraps around the side and rear of the extension to a maximum height of 0.49m at the rear. A 1m high screen is shown running along the edge of the platform. There was previously a conservatory at the rear.

The rear dormer measures 8.4m wide, 2.7m tall and 2.9m deep. The rear bedroom windows of the dormer are shown as being obscure glazed. The applicant is also proposing to increase the height of the rear garden fence to 2.5m.

**Relevant Planning History**

As above.

**Consultations**

**Lancing Parish Council:** No objection

**Representations**

Original Plans: 2 letters of objection received from the occupiers of 44, 46 Hamilton Road:

- Extension is very close to back garden and will overlook
- Garage is larger than original – looks like it might be living accommodation
- Rear extension and platform is overbearing and intrusive
- Loss of privacy to lounge and garden

Amended Plans: Letter received from the occupier of 44 Hamilton Road:

- Still not happy with the roof extension, which is oversized, intrusive and out of keeping
- Windows should be obscured
- 2.5m high fence is welcomed

**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 (February 2019)

**Planning Assessment**

**Principle**

The proposal comprises upgrading the existing housing stock located within the built up area and can be supported in principle. The relevant issues are the effects on the amenities of neighbouring residential occupiers and the effect on the character and appearance of the dwelling and its surroundings.

**Visual amenity**

In visual terms it is not considered that the garage has a significantly different visual impact on the street scene than the original. While slightly higher and wider it retains a gap of 3.5m to No.21 to the south and does not appear out of scale or character.

The rear ground floor extension is not visible from the street. At 3.2m deep it complies with the Council's DM Standard which specifies a maximum of 3.5m for single storey extensions.

The hip to gable roof extension does imbalance the semi-detached pair as No.23 currently has a hipped roof. However, there are examples of gables with barn hipped ends and, while the extension at No.22 is a full gable, insufficient harm is caused to the street scene to warrant refusal.

The dormer is large and fills much of the rear roofslope. It would be preferable to reduce the size of the dormer so that it more closely complies with the guidance on roof extensions in DM Standard No.2. However, it has been

largely constructed and, notwithstanding that the works should not have been carried out without consent, it must be considered whether the harm caused by the dormer is sufficient to justify the cost of works to reduce its size. The applicant also believed that the roof extensions were 'permitted development' (they are not because the original eaves have been obliterated). In the circumstances, and because the dormer is not widely visible in the street scene, it is considered that it can be supported as constructed.

**Residential amenity**

The garage does not cause harm to the amenities of neighbouring properties. No.21 to the south has a blank side wall facing the site and it is sufficiently distant from the properties to the rear to not cause a loss of light or outlook.

Its use has been questioned by an objector. The floor plans show it as being a double garage and it can be restricted by condition to be used as garaging and storage space only. This is considered to be necessary as parking within Upper Boundstone Lane can be problematic during term time when the school opposite is in use.

The rear dormer faces bungalows in Hamilton Road at the rear of the site, the gardens of which are short. Clear glazed windows would afford intrusive views towards windows at the rear and side of those properties and the applicant was requested to obscure glazed them, which he has agreed to do. The converted roofspace serves a single bedroom and en suite only and light and outlook will be possible from the front rooflight. Consequently, there are no concerns at obscure glazing the windows on this occasion as a satisfactory living environment will be provided.

The raised platform may also result in a loss of privacy for the occupiers at the rear, although there are plants and shrubs which provide a partial screen along the boundary. Nevertheless, the plans have been amended to provide a 1m high screen along the edge of the platform, to reduce the impact when people are sitting on the platform. This is to be supplemented by an increase in the height of the boundary fence to provide further privacy.

On balance, and with the amendments secured, the extensions are not considered to result in serious harm to the amenities of neighbouring occupiers.

**Recommendation**

**APPROVE**

**Subject to Conditions:-**

1. Approved Plans
2. Materials to match existing
3. Obscure glaze rear windows
4. Screen and raised fence to be installed prior to first use of raised platform
5. Garage to be used for parking and storage only

**Is recommendation contrary to letter(s) of representation? Y**

The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by identifying matters of concern within the application (as originally submitted) and negotiating, with the Applicant, acceptable amendments to the proposal to address those concerns. As a result, the Local Planning Authority has been able to grant planning permission for an acceptable proposal, in accordance with the presumption in favour of sustainable development, as set out within the National Planning Policy Framework.

Case Officer: Peter Barnett Date: 13 January 2020

Authorised by: Gary Peck Date: 13 January 2020