Development Management – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/1507/16 Recommendation – APPROVE

Site: 9 Brook Way, Lancing

Proposal: Single storey rear extension to east elevation.

Date of site visit: 29.11.16

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Site, Surroundings and Proposal

The application relates to a semi-detached gabled bungalow with a rear flat roof dormer. There is also a conservatory to the rear of the bungalow. Consent is sought to remove the existing conservatory and erect a single storey hipped roof extension to the rear of the bungalow. The extension is proposed at 3.5 metres deep, 6.95 metres wide. It has a maximum height of 3.5 metres to the ridge of the extension with eaves at 2.3 metres high. 3 velux windows are proposed in the rear roof slope, the space will provide an enlarged kitchen diner. Due to the proposal resulting in the blocking off of a rear window the submitted plans also show a proposed side window to be inserted serving the rear bedroom. The front room will also become a bedroom and the existing side window and door will be replaced by a single window where the door currently is.

Consultations: Lancing Parish Council – No objections

Representations: None received.

Relevant Planning Policies

Saved Local Plan policies (ADC 1996): AG1, AH7
Development Control Standard No.3 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings'
National Planning Policy Framework (CLG 2012)
Adur Submission Local Plan Policy 15
National Planning Practice Guidance

Planning Assessment

There is no objection in principle to the proposed extension which would upgrade an existing property within an established residential area. The key concerns are the effects on the residential and visual amenities of the locality.

Visual Amenity

The proposed extension is unusual in design and it has a pitched roof with central ridge. The applicant's agent has stated that this design is a feature required by the applicants to give rise to a vaulted ceiling which will enhance the internal space, the proposed roof lights will add to this. The extension is to be rendered and tiled to match existing. Despite the awkward external appearance of the extension with its valley and pitch it is not considered that the design is such to warrant a refusal. The alternative would be a flat roof design which although would be more subservient in appearance would not improve the visual impact of the development. Being to the rear of the site the proposed extension is not a visible, dominant feature within the street scene.

Residential Amenity

The main dwellings to be affected are those either side of the site, no. 7 Brook Way to the north and no. 11 Brook Way the attached dwelling to the south. The attached bungalow has not been extended although there has been a recent submission for an extension 4 metres deep. If this is built the proposed extension will be screened from the adjacent dwelling, however it cannot be assumed that this will be built and as existing these is no extension and the current impact must be assessed. On this basis the case officer requested that the applicant hipped the side section of roof adjacent to no. 11 away from the boundary. This would be an attempt to alleviate any possible overbearing impact due to the height of the proposed ridge set away from the rear of the dwelling. The applicant's agent advised that this would ruin the design of the extension as it will appear unbalanced and it is likely that the clients would resort to a flat roof design therefore they would resist this suggestion.

It is therefore considered that in the light of the extension being to the north of no. 11, the maximum height of the ridge and depth of the extension both being restricted to 3.5 metres that in the absence of the requested amendments there would not be justification to refuse the application as submitted. Although not a determining factor here as the extension may never be constructed there is likely to be an extension at no. 11 Brook Way which would remove all impact. On balance therefore the proposal is acceptable.

To the north no. 7 is separated from the application site by the width of the driveways at no. 9 and no. 7. The side elevations of the bungalows face onto each other with side windows facing each other at a distance of approximately 5 metres. Mutual overlooking exists between the bungalows. It is not clear what rooms all the windows serve at the adjacent bungalow yet there appears to be habitable rooms. It is considered that the proposed side bedroom window will not cause any additional overlooking than already exists. This side elevation is open to the opposite property. Although this forms part of the application and its impact must be considered, in isolation this form of development would be permitted development.

The rear extension is at such a distance from no. 7 that there will be no significant impact with regards to overlooking, overbearing impact or loss of light, there is an existing rear extension at no. 7 with windows facing south towards the application site.

Recommendation

APPROVE

1. Time limit
2. Approved plans
3. Materials to match

Informative

1. Proactive without amendment

Is recommendation contrary to letter(s) of representation? N

Case Officer: Hannah Barker Date: 29th November 2016

Authorised by: Peter Barnett Date: 30 November 2016