Development Management – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/1654/17 Recommendation – APPROVE

Site: 135 Kings Road, Lancing, BN15 8EQ

Proposal: Single storey rear extension to south elevation to replace existing conservatory.

Date of site visit: 23.11.17

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Site, Surroundings and Proposal

The application relates to a semi-detached bungalow within Kings Road. The dwelling has previously been extended to the south (rear) with a single storey conservatory across the full width of the bungalow. There is also a single storey side extension to the boundary with no. 133, which runs nearly the whole length of the bungalow.

Permission is sought to erect a single storey rear extension which will replace the existing conservatory, it will be 3.09m deep x 6.23m wide. This is comparable with the existing conservatory which measures 3.06m deep x 6.02m wide. Although the height is greater than the existing, which is approx. the same height at the neighbours conservatory.

The height of the mono pitch extension will be approx. 3.35m (3.5m to the top of the roof light). The height difference will therefore be some 700mm between the proposal and the neighbouring conservatory.

Because of the land height difference to the rear, there will also be a raised platform and steps leading down to the garden.

Consultations:

Environmental Health : Potentially contaminated land

Representations: Lancing Parish Council : No objections

Relevant Planning Policies

Development Management Standard No.3 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings'
Adur Local Plan (2017) Policy 15
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 and Impact upon Character and Appearance of the Area

The proposed extension will replace the existing rear conservatory to a more robust and heat efficient extension of a very similar size, being only 30mm longer, which is negligible, and certainly will not result in unacceptable harm onto the neighbouring properties existing conservatory, which is positioned quite close to the shared boundary.

The height will increase by some 700mm above the neighbouring conservatory, however this is not considered to be overbearing onto the neighbour, as the depth of the conservatory will not be significantly deeper than the existing conservatory.

Residential Amenity

The proposal will be over 4m distant from the neighbouring property to the east and therefore will not cause a loss in the residential amenities.

The contiguous property no. 137 also has a conservatory very close to the boundary with the application site, however in view of the fact that the proposed conservatory will not be significantly deeper than the existing structure, it is not considered that it will result in a loss in residential amenity to this neighbour, nor will the proposed height differential cause a material loss of residential amenities.

The platform outside of the extension would have come up to the boundary with the neighbouring property, the use of which would have resulted in overlooking of the neighbours and therefore an unneighbourly form of development. However, the application has been amended to take the platform off the boundary and will now be positioned next to the side of the new glazed doors. This new position of the platform will now be acceptable, and will not result in a material loss of residential amenities to no. 137. A 1.8m high privacy screen will also be installed along the edge of the platform.

Recommendation

APPROVE subject to the following conditions

1. Approved plans
2. Standard time limit
3. No windows on the side elevation facing no. 137
4. Materials to match existing
5. Privacy screen to be installed prior to first use of platform

Informative

1. Approved following amendment

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

Case Officer: Eve Hearsey Date: 28.12.2017

Authorised by: Peter Barnett Date: 2 January 2018