DELEGATED APPLICATIONS ASSESSMENT SHEET

APPLICATION NO./ADDRESS: 11 Boundary Road AWDM/0718/11

DATE OF SITE VISIT: 3.10.2011

NEIGHBOURS CHECKED: Y

ADDITIONAL NEIGHBOUR NOTIFICATIONS: N

PROPOSAL, SITE AND SURROUNDINGS:

The application property comprises a semi-detached L-shaped hipped bungalow with a front-projecting gable and feature bay window, located on the west side of Boundary Road. The road constitutes a private estate road made up of similar, but not identical, semi-detached bungalows.

Permission is sought for a front extension to enlarge an existing bedroom, infilling the recess adjoining the front gable feature. It would align with the main front wall of the gable (not the bay window) and would have a part pitched, part flat-roof. In addition, permission is sought for a single-storey extension 3.5m deep to provide a sitting room. It would be finished in render with a pitched, tiled roof skirting a flat roof on three sides, plus centrally positioned roof lantern.

The application is accompanied by details of the proposed flood resilience measures.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY None.

RELEVANT PLANNING POLICIES

Saved Adur District Local Plan policies: AG1, AH7
Development Control Standard No.3 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings'
South East Plan: CC1, CC6, BE1

RELEVANT CONSULTATION RESPONSES AND REPRESENTATIONS:

Lancing Parish Council: No objection.

PLANNING ASSESSMENT:

The proposal comprises up-grading of 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 design of the extension and effect on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

The impact on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers

The depth of the proposed rear extension would accord with policy AH7. The flank wall has been marginally 'set in' on the south side to accommodate the proposed eaves wholly within the site curtilage. The depth, height and massing of the proposed rear extension would not impact unacceptably on the amenities of the adjoining properties.

The proposed front extension would align with a similar infill extension undertaken at No.9 and consequently would have no adverse amenity implication for the neighbour.

Design and the effect on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

The scale and design of the proposed rear extension constitutes an appropriate form of rear extension to this bungalow within a suburban context.

The design of the front infill extension, having a part-pitched roof, would not match the neighbour's existing flat-roofed front extension. However, the latter is not an attractive feature, having being built as 'permitted development' at the time (prior to 1 October 2008), and it is considered unreasonable to require the applicant to amend his proposal for the sake of harmonising with a visually unsympathetic form of existing development.

RECOMMENDATION APPROVE SUBJECT TO:-

1. Standard time limit (3 yrs)
2. Approved drawings
3. Matching materials
4. No windows in side walls of rear extension.

REASON FOR APPROVAL

The proposed development would not detract from the local environment and subject to the conditions of this planning permission can take place without resulting in unacceptable detriment to the amenities of neighbouring properties. It would consequently not conflict with the 'saved' policies of the Adur District Local Plan (AH7, AG1), or the policies of the South East Plan (CC1, CC6, BE1).

HUMAN RIGHTS:

Article 8 (Right to Respect of a Private and Family Life) and Article 1 of the First Protocol (Protection of Property) of the Human Rights Act 1998 are relevant to this application. It is accepted that the proposal, if approved, would have some impact on the neighbouring properties. However, it is considered that on balance, existing residential quality of life would not be significantly adversely affected as a result of the proposal. Accordingly it is considered that it is acceptable with regard to Article 8 and Article 1.

IS RECOMMENDATION CONTRARY TO LETTER (S) OF REPRESENTATION?

No

Delegated Decision

Case Officer
Sign……..Date……..

Authorising Officer
Sign……..Date……..