Development Management – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/1258/17 Recommendation – APPROVE

Site: 55 Barfield Park, Lancing, West Sussex

Proposal: Single storey side and rear extensions (existing detached garage to be demolished)

Date of site visit: 23.10.2017

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Site, Surroundings and Proposal

The application relates to a detached, hipped roof bungalow within a street of similar properties. There is a driveway to the side and front garden area with dwarf front boundary wall. The application referred to the demolition of a detached garage which at the time of visiting the site had been removed, yet it is clear where the garage was sited and this is shown on the submitted plans. The application site is wide to the front narrowing to the rear with a very long, narrow rear garden.

Consent is sought for a single storey side extension with half hipped roof. This has a maximum width of 3.8 metres and depth of 6.4 metres. The height of the extension is lower than the main ridge at 4.1 metres high. This extension will provide a bedroom and ensuite. Amended plans have been received showing this side extension set back by 0.75 m. The extension was originally proposed with a front bay and was flush with the existing front bay. It was considered that the side extension should be more subservient to the main dwelling. There should be some form of set back and break up in the roof line and not a continuation of the existing roof. Originally a greater set back of 1.5 metres was recommended by the case officer, yet the applicant's agent argued that the setback proposed here was significant enough to allow the extension to appear subservient and overcome the concerns of officers. The amended plans are for consideration here.

In addition to the side extension a single storey flat roof rear addition is proposed. This extension is 7.2 metres wide and 5 metres deep. This extension will provide a sitting room and dining room.

Lancing Parish Council: - No objection

Representations: None received.

Relevant Planning Policies

Saved Local Plan policies (ADC 1996): AG1, AH7,
Development Control Standard No.3 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings'

Adur Submission Local Plan (2016) Policy 17
National Planning Policy Framework (CLG 2012)
National Planning Practice Guidance

Planning Assessment

There is no objection in principle to the proposed works to upgrade an existing dwelling house within the built up residential area. The main issues for consideration are the impact upon the character and appearance of the existing building and street scene and residential amenity.

Visual Amenity and Impact upon Character and Appearance of the existing bungalow and street scene.

As amended it is considered that the side extension is subservient and in keeping in character and scale with the host dwelling. The original part of the bungalow appears as such and remains as the main front projection. When approaching the site from the west the extension does not appear overly dominant it is set back further than the original garage was. The roof is significantly lower than the main ridge.

The rear addition is not visible within the street scene, although large and of flat roof design it is considered that the extension is acceptable with regards to scale and is relative to the large plot. It will not be detrimental to the street scene. It is proposed that the bungalow will be rendered with roof tiles to match existing. Although the bungalow is brick as existing the render would not appear out of keeping in this case. The bungalows to the west are finished with render.

Residential Amenity

The main properties to be affected by the development are those either side of the site. No. 47 Monks Avenue to the west and no. 57 Barfield Park to the north east (the application site is on a bend.) There is separation between no. 47 and the application site due to an electricity sub station and associated land. The side extension is adjacent to no. 47 Monks Avenue. Yet due to the distance provided by the adjacent sub station there would be no significant adverse impact. A distance in excess of 6 metres would exist. There are no windows proposed on the western side of the side extension. Similarly the rear extension is in close proximity to the western boundary yet the separation means that there is no adverse impact. No. 47 has side windows and a rear conservatory yet the proposed rear extension will not result in any loss of light, privacy or overbearing impact in this case. The high level side window is acceptable in this case.

The rear extension is closer to no. 57 to the north east. No. 57 is set back further from the road than the application site due to its position in relation to the highway. There are windows on the side of the adjacent dwelling including a side dormer. The proposed extension will project further to the rear than existing yet it will not be further back than the rear of no. 57. Although there may be some loss of light to the side windows at no. 57 this is not considered to be of such significance to warrant a refusal in this case. No side windows are proposed in the extension and a condition is attached to ensure no windows are added.

Recommendation

APPROVE

1. Standard time limit
2. Approved Plans
3. Materials to match existing, (render and tiles to match existing)
4. No openings in the north east side elevation.

Informative

1. Proactive with amendments

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

Case Officer: Hannah Barker Date: 31st October 2017

Authorised by: Peter Barnett Date: 1 November 2017