expired 13.08.08

Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: ADC/0213/08 **Recommendation - Permit**

Site: **56 Cokeham Road Sompting Lancing West Sussex**

Proposal: **Single-storey rear extension**

The Application

The application property is the western half of a pair of semi-detached bungalows on the north side of Cokeham Lane, within the built-up area of Sompting. The properties are well set back from the main road and are opposite a parade of shops.

The existing dwelling is different in style to that of the attached neighbour in that it has as a projecting gabled feature which is currently 4.5m in length. Attached to it at the rear on the west side is a small flat-roof extension. The attached property to the east (No. 54) has been extended with a west side conservatory approximately 3.0m in depth and a small flat-roof kitchen extension to the east of that. To the west is No.58, the east side of a pair of bungalows, which has a small rear conservatory.

The proposal is for a flat-roof rear extension to replace the existing extension. It would be 3.6m in depth, by 6.9m in width (the width of the existing projecting element), and 2.8m in height. It would serve as a kitchen and dining room extension.

Consultations and Representations

Third Parties: There has been one letter of objection from the owner No.58, the bungalow to the west. They are concerned about the size of the proposed extension and any loss of privacy. They state that the property may be used for running a business and that there would be an increase in parking in the area.

Contributors: Sompting Parish council have made no comment.

Relevant Planning Policies and Guidance

Adopted West Sussex Structure Plan 2001-2016 (WSCC 2005) (saved policies): LOC1, DEV1
Adopted Adur District Local Plan 1993-2006 (ADC 1996) (saved policies): AG1, AH7 and Appendix II 'Supplementary Planning Guidance' comprising: Development Control Standard No.3 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings.'

PPS 1 'Delivering Sustainable Development' (ODPM 2005)

Planning Assessment

Policies
Structure Plan policies seek to protect, and where possible, enhance the character and distinctiveness of an area, requiring high standards of design, layout and construction (DEV1). Policy AH7 of the Local Plan states that extensions and alterations should be designed so as not to result in an unacceptable degree of overlooking, a loss of natural light or an overbearing effect on neighbouring dwellings. They should be of sympathetic design and materials to the original dwelling and the area in general.

Visual amenity
The proposed extension is not of excessive size given the size of the original dwelling. It would be flat roofed, however this would not be visible from view from the front of the property and therefore there would be no impact on the visual amenity of the streetscene. A garden length of 15m would be retained preventing it from appearing cramped or out of scale.

Residential amenity
The proposal would replace the existing west side extension which itself projects by 2.2m and would create a building line that would be 5.0m in front of the rear of the neighbour at No.58. A 2.5m gap exists between the two properties and it would only be an increase in depth of 1.5m of what already exists. It is considered the proposed extension would not have an effect on the amount of natural daylight or outlook from the rear of No.58.

The attached neighbour (No.54) has extended with a rear west side conservatory which is screened from view by a 2.0m high panelled fence. The proposed extension would not have an overbearing effect or result in loss of privacy or loss of light.

The only concern is that the rear bedroom of the application property is already left in a deep recess as a result of the original rear projection of the property and the conservatory of the neighbour. The proposed extension would increase the effect on the outlook from the rear bedroom, however it is considered that the angle of outlook affected would be so small that it would not be materially different from what exists. The applicant would also have taken this into consideration prior to making the planning application, and it is considered that as the proposed extension would not be harmful to the neighbouring properties it would not warrant a refusal on loss of outlook from the host dwelling alone.

Recommendation

APPROVE for reason that :-

1PPii

1. C1Ci
2. C12Ei
3. C18Eii (east or west)
4. C18Cii (west)

PB 6/6/08

Case Officer:
Date: 6/6/08

Chair of the Development Control Committee:
Date: 14/07/08

Planning Services Manager:
Date: 30/6/08