Expiry 28/05/07

Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: ADC/0193/07 Recommendation - Permit

Site: 4 Manor Road Lancing West Sussex BN15 0EU

Proposal: Single-storey rear extension and rear dormer

The Application

The application site is located on the northern side of Manor Road. It contains a single storey two bedroom detached dwelling with full gables at either end. There is a small flat roof extension at the rear which was constructed in the 1960s.

The applicant proposes to remove the existing rear extension and replace this with a new single storey extension stretching across the full width of the rear elevation. This will extend out into the rear garden to a depth of 3.7 metres. The extension will have a hipped roof with a ridge line height of 3.2 metres and will accommodate two bedrooms and an en-suite bathroom.

In addition, the applicant will create rooms in the roof, including a flat roofed rear dormer window with a width of 6.9 metres, a height of 1.8 metres and a depth of 2.4 metres. The roof space and dormer window will accommodate two bedrooms and a bathroom.

The plans originally submitted showed this dormer ~~to~~ positioned right on the ridgeline of the existing dwelling and of a greater depth so that there was no discernable roof visible between the bottom of the dormer and the roof of the rear extension. Following discussions with the application, the application has been amended so that the dormer window is set 200mm below the ridgeline and also reduced in depth so that the bottom of the dormer is now visibly above the roof of the rear extension.

The site is located in the North Lancing Conservation Area. The site is in the middle of a group of three detached residential dwellings of different scales and styles on large sites located between Lancing Manor Park (to the east) and Mill Road (to the west). Directly across the road is the Sussex Potter, a large public house on a spacious site.

Consultations and Representations

Consultees

The County Conservation Officer has commented that it is a non-descript rear proposal but to permit.

The Adur District Conservation Advisory Group has commented that the dormer is far too large and therefore out of proportion to the rest of the building. NB: The Plans have since been amended to take account of these comments.

No response has been received from the Lancing Parish Council.

Third Parties
No representations have been received from third parties in relation to this proposal.

Relevant Planning Policies and Guidance

Adur District Local Plan: AG1, AH7, AB4, AB6
Development Control Standard No. 3 "Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings"
Adur Development Plan – Core Strategy Submission: ENV10
West Sussex Structure Plan: DEV1, CH4

Planning Assessment

Policies
The policies relating to works in Conservation Areas aim to preserve and enhance historical and architectural qualities while allowing sympathetic new development and redevelopment. This is so that Conservation Areas remain alive and prosperous whilst retaining the special features and character which make them worthy of designation. Policy AB4 of the Local Plan requires that extensions and alterations are of a high standard of design and construction materials such as to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the particular Conservation Area. Policy AB6 states that the Planning Authority will seek the retention of original features or, where this is not possible, their reinstatement with appropriate materials and the removal of unsympathetic features. Policy CH4 of the West Sussex Structure Plan states that development will not be permitted unless Conservation Areas will be preserved and, where possible, enhanced.

The Appearance
The dwelling itself is a simple design bungalow and has an unremarkable character within the street scene. Both extensions proposed are located at the rear of the dwelling where they will have no impact on the street scene or character of the Conservation Area.

The existing dwelling is a small and reasonably compact bungalow with a simple pitched roof and gable ends. As such extensions which are too large could appear to dominate the building and would be inappropriate. The Development Control Standard No. 3, in relation to dormers, states that "*dormers should not be so large that they over dominate the dwelling,*

resulting in a top heavy 'box-like' appearance. They should be kept well below the ridgeline level of the existing roof and should not project out as far as the roof of the house. A large amount of the original roof should still be clearly visible".

The dormer window originally proposed was considered to be unacceptable and not to accord to these guidelines. It was located right on the ridgeline and of a depth which, when combined with the proposed hipped roof rear extension, made it appear to sit on the roof of that extension and very 'box-like'. No original roof was visible either above or below the dormer.

The amendments undertaken to the positioning and depth of the dormer have resulted in it appearing to be much more in keeping with the scale of the dwelling. It is now set down from the ridgeline and has been reduced in depth so that it is up off the roof of the rear extension. It does not stretch across the whole of the roof space and allows a large amount of original roof space to be visible. It is considered that the dormer now accords to the DC Standard guidelines.

The single storey rear extension has a depth of 3.7 metres which is considered acceptable in terms of the size of the dwelling. The hipped roof design is sympathetic to the roof design of the original dwelling.

Effects on Neighbours

The proposed windows in the rear elevation overlook only the applicant's own rear garden. The property directly to the rear contains a block of flats with facing windows over 50 metres away. There is also existing screening from trees along the rear boundary.

There is an existing window in the east side elevation at first floor level facing No. 2, which is proposed to be utilised for the new bedroom. While no objection has been raised by the resident of No. 2, it is noted that this dwelling does contain a number of windows at ground floor level which could potentially be overlooked by this window, now that the roof space will be used as a habitable room. As such, it is recommended that this window is obscurely glazed to prevent overlooking. The bedroom will still receive clear light through the roof light proposed for the roof plane in the front elevation.

The rear extension is not anticipated to have any effects on the amenity of neighbours as it is single storey, a reasonable depth and detached from any neighbouring dwelling by at least 4 metres.

Effects on the Site

The dwelling currently contains a rear garden with a depth of approximately 13 metres. The rear extension will reduce this to approximately 9 metres which is a lesser depth than recommended by the DC Standard. In this case, it is considered acceptable as the extension will not extend any further back on the site than the dwelling on the neighbouring site (No. 2) does. The depth of rear garden on the two adjacent sites will be virtually the same.

Recommendation

APPROVE for reason that :-

The proposed development would not detract from the character of the Conservation Area and can take place without unacceptable detriment to the amenities of neighbouring properties. It would consequently not conflict with the policies of the Adur District Local Plan (AG1, AH7, AB4, AB6), the Adur Development Plan Submission Core Strategy (ENV10) and the West Sussex Structure Plan (DEV1, CH4).

Conditions

1. C1Ci plan (Rev. A)
2. C14Ai .../23 April 2007...
   Reason: ... policy AG1, AH7 of the Adur District Local Plan and DEV1 of the West Sussex Structure Plan.
3. C12Ei
4. C18Ci ... first-floor window in the east side elevation of the building shall ...
5. C18Eiv ... side walls of the rear extension ...

Case Officer: ..... 1/5/05.

Date: ..... 2/05/07 .....

Head of Planning & Community Division: ..... Peter Daniels .....

Date: ..... 3.5.07 .....

Chairman of Planning & Regulatory Committee: ..... A. J. Mills .....

Date: ..... 14/05/07 .....