DELEGATED APPLICATIONS ASSESSMENT SHEET

APPLICATION NO./ADDRESS: 17 Fifth Avenue AWDM/0747/11

DATE OF SITE VISIT: 3.10.2011

NEIGHBOURS CHECKED: Y

ADDITIONAL NEIGHBOUR NOTIFICATIONS: N

PROPOSAL, SITE AND SURROUNDINGS:

The application property comprises an end-of-terraced house on the south side of Fifth Avenue. It has previously been enlarged by a rear lean-to conservatory and large rear dormer. The street is made-up of similar terraced properties. The rear of the site is bounded by private track which provides rear access to the properties on this side of Fifth Avenue (and also Fourth Avenue to the south).

Permission is sought to replace the existing lean-to conservatory with a brick-built rear extension. It would be 3.95m deep and 5.5m wide with a flat roof 2.95m high. There would be a pair of French doors in the south elevation providing access to the garden. No windows or other openings are proposed in the side walls.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY None.

RELEVANT PLANNING POLICIES

Saved Local Plan policies: AG1, AH7
Development Control Standard 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 above DC Standard states that single-storey rear extensions on terraced properties that are within 1m of a boundary should not normally exceed 3.5m in depth. The proposed extension would be 0.45m in excess of this depth. However, both of the neighbouring properties on either side have been enlarged by rear additions. No.15 (east) has been enlarged by a brick-built,

flat-roofed extension approximately 3.5m deep as 'permitted development'. No.19 has been enlarged by an L-shaped timber/glazed rear lean-to, approximately 2m deep adjacent to the site boundary. The proposed extension would project 2m beyond the existing addition at No.19 and approximately 0.5m beyond the rear of No.15. Thus, taking account of the neighbouring properties which have been extended, the generous rear garden depths and southern aspect, it is considered the proposed extension would not have an unacceptably overbearing effect or result in an unacceptable degree of overshadowing, notwithstanding its depth.

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

The scale and flat-roofed design is considered an acceptable form of rear extension to this terraced house, of which only glimpsed views would be possible through the side passage at a very restricted angle. The proposed brickwork would match the ground-floor finish of the existing dwelling.

RECOMMENDATION APPROVE SUBJECT TO:-

1. Standard time limit (3 yrs)
2. Approved drawings
3. Matching materials
4. No windows in side elevations

REASON FOR APPROVAL

The proposed development would not detract from the local environment and 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 (AG1, AH7) the South East Plan policies (CC1, CC6, BE1) and the Council's Development Control Standard No.3 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings'.

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……..