Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/0222/12 Recommendation – APPROVE

Site: 14 Cokeham Lane Sompting Lancing West Sussex

Proposal: Single-storey extension to front/south side

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

The application property comprises a detached, gabled-ended bungalow on the west side of Cokeham Lane, having an unusual V-shaped layout. A large detached, pitched-roof garage building has been erected on the south side of the frontage. The bungalow has been enlarged by various extensions to the rear and most recently a conservatory-style porch in the centre of the front elevation.

The proposed single-storey extension would be attached to the southern 'wing' within an area currently enclosed by fencing located between the bungalow and the garage building. It would extend forward of the front building line by 2.4 metres, sited parallel to the southern boundary at a distance of 0.9m, having a flat roof with tiled edging on 3 sides. The accommodation would consist of an en-suite shower room and dressing room serving an existing bedroom.

Relevant site history

The pitched roof was added to the garage in 2001 (S/31/01/TP refers). There are no records relating to the recent porch.

Consultations

Adur and Worthing Councils: The Environmental Health Officer recommends a precautionary condition relating to possible contamination.

Sompting Parish Council: No objection.

Representations: None received.

Relevant Planning Policies
Adopted Adur District Local Plan 1993-2006 (ADC 1996) (saved policies): AG1, AH7 and Appendix 11 'Supplementary Planning Guidance' comprising: Development Control Standard No.3 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings'
South East Plan (GOSE 2009): CC1, CC6, BE1
National Planning Policy Framework (CLG 2012)

Planning Assessment

Principle

There is no objection in principle to the proposal which comprises up-grading of the existing housing stock. The site is not identified as contaminated and an informative is considered satisfactory to inform the applicant of the potential risks.

Visual amenity

The existing bungalow retains much of its original character in views from the front, albeit partially obscured by the 'bulk' of the detached garage building. The proposed extension would unbalance the existing symmetry, but would appear as a subservient element. The proposed flat roof with tiled-edging would not demonstrate a high quality of design, but in this situation where it would be largely screened from public view by the larger mass of the garage building it is considered that refusal would be difficult to substantiate on grounds of visual amenity.

[The alternative of a taller pitched roof would be difficult to integrate successfully with the angle of the existing roof owing to the juxtaposition of the extension in relation to the splayed position of the existing gable-end and would appear as a more prominent addition in public views.]

Residential amenity

The most affected property would be No.16 to the south comprising a detached bungalow enlarged by rooms in the roof including a dormer on the north side facing the site. There are a number of outbuildings within the side garden of No.16 adjacent to the southern site boundary. A ground floor window in the north side elevation serves a habitable room. The 'bulk' of the garage roof at No.14 has some impact on the outlook from this window. The tiled-edge of the proposed extension would project above the fence which demarcates the common boundary, but would not be overbearing in effect, or result in an unacceptable loss of daylight.

Recommendation

APPROVE for the reason:-

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) or the policies of the South East Plan (CC1, CC6, BE1)

Subject to Conditions:-

1. Standard 3 year time limit
2. Materials to match existing dwelling
3. No windows or other openings in south side wall of the extension
4. Permission relates to approved plans:
   Drawing No: JW/12/011 Date Valid 23 March 2012

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

Case Officer: Jo Morin Date: 8 May 2012

Authorised by: Peter Barnett Date: 9 May 2012