Development Management – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/0979/16 Recommendation – APPROVE

Site: 71 Hillrise Avenue Sompting, Lancing

Proposal: Single storey rear extension and porch to front (east) elevation.

Date of site visit: 19.07.16

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Site, Surroundings and Proposal

The application site is a detached chalet bungalow, with a gabled roof and front and rear dormers. There are existing garage and outbuildings within the rear garden which are to be removed and at the time of the site visit a brick garage building was being built to the rear of the garden towards the western boundary. There is an existing access track to the rear of the site accessed from Hillrise Avenue. Beyond this to the rear are two-storey semi-detached dwellings. Within Hillrise Avenue there are bungalows and chalet bungalows. Most of which are detached on the western side of the road and semi-detached opposite on the eastern side. The bungalow in particular is unique in design with a gabled symmetrical frontage, the flat roof dormer and bay windows contribute to this character. Other bungalows within proximity of the site are hipped roof properties of a different form and character.

Permission was originally sought for a front porch, enlargement to the rear flat roof dormer and single storey rear additions. Concern was expressed with regards to the scale of the rear additions and the combination of the flat roof rear additions and the rear dormer extending to meet the roof of the rear additions. It was considered that the scale of the dormer should be reduced and separated from the single storey additions. It was considered to be overly large, incongruous and out of scale with the modest bungalow. Concerns were also expressed with regards to the front porch extension and how this would impact upon the simplistic and symmetrical appearance of the front of the building.

Amended plans have been received showing the rear dormer unchanged, in line with officer's advice. The rear single storey flat roof extension is 5 metres in depth adjacent to the southern boundary. To the northern side of the extension is a utility projection which brings the extension up to 5.8 metres in depth. The extension is larger than the full width of the bungalow at 10.8 metres wide. It is 3 metres high with a raised patio to the rear. The amended plans show a privacy screen on the southern side of the raised patio area. The applicant did not wish to amend the porch following officer advice that it should be a more lightweight structure which is less dominant to the property frontage. The porch for consideration here is as submitted, a gabled roof front projection, 3.7 metres high, 2.2 metres wide and 0.8 metres deep.

Consultations: ***Southern Water: -*** Consent is required for a connection to the public sewer, standard informative to be attached.

Representations: 52 Halwick Lane – Objection - noise and increased in size of property, lack of parking in the road.

69 Hillrise Avenue – Objection – negative impact on living conditions, property too substantial for area. Overlooking due to changes in levels. Bungalows in the area are modest in nature as existing.

Further letter written by application and signed by Mr Howard of no 69 – stating he is ok with all aspects of the planning application and wish to withdraw my previous objection.

Sompting Parish Council: - Support

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)
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 single storey extensions are to the rear of the bungalow and are therefore not visible within the street scene. In relation to the scale of the overall bungalow they are large additions being in excess of 5 metres. However taking into account that they are to the rear, the outbuildings adjacent to the southern boundary are to be removed and the plot is large then on balance extensions of this scale will be acceptable.

Despite the request to amend the front porch which is visible within the street scene when considering its harm it is not considered that it would be such to warrant a refusal in this case. It is the view that a lightweight construction approach here would be more appropriate however the current design is not to the direct detriment of the character and design of the bungalow. It will be built in materials to match existing as the single storey extension.

Residential Amenity

Ground levels increase from south to north, therefore the bungalow to the north, 73 is at a higher ground level. This property has a flat roof addition to the rear, although

the proposed extension on the boundary at no. 71 will be deeper it is not considered that it will be detrimental to the occupiers of this adjacent dwelling due to their extension. There is a window on the side elevation however this is a secondary window and will not be impacted to such a degree to warrant a refusal in this case.

The dwellings to the rear of the site are two storeys and are at a distance of approximately 43 metres from the proposed extension. There was an objection from an occupier to the rear due to the proposed alterations to the dormer. These works have since been removed from the application. There will be no adverse impact upon the occupiers of the dwellings to the rear.

To the south the dwelling is at a lower level, there is currently some screening between the properties due to the existing outbuildings along the boundary. The extension is not considered to have any adverse impact here to warrant a refusal in this case with regards to loss of light, overbearing impact or privacy. However the raised platform does give rise to some overlooking. The amended plans show the privacy screen proposed to remove any overlooking in this case. A condition is attached to ensure that this is constructed prior to use of the patio. The owner of no. 69 to the south originally objected to the proposals however the applicant sent a signed copy of a letter that the neighbour agreed to withdrawing his concerns.

Recommendation

APPROVE

1. time limit
2. materials to match existing
3. approved plans
4. The privacy screen hereby approved shall be installed prior to the use of the raised patio area hereby approved. It shall be of an opaque construction or obscurely glazed and shall be erected in accordance with the details annotated on the approved drawings. The privacy screen shall remain in place at all times.
5. No windows on side elevations

Informative

1. proactive amendments
2. southern water

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

Case Officer: Hannah Barker Date: 20th September 2016

Authorised by: Jo Morin Date: 22.09.2016