Expiry Date – 10/4, EOT to 17/5 agreed

Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/0211/19 Recommendation – Grant

Site: 29 Fircroft Avenue, Lancing

Proposal: Single storey rear extension.

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Date of Site Visit: 23.3

Site and Surroundings

This application relates to a semi detached bungalow on the south side of Fircroft Avenue as it climbs the hill and rounds the corner opposite the junction with St James Avenue. The property has a drive way on its east side and has its front door and a kitchen window in its flank wall. No. 27, to the east also has its front door and a kitchen window in its flank wall facing the site. No. 27 sits on land approximately 0.5 metre lower than the site. It is angled away from the common boundary with the site and also sits further back in the street. Their side passage is partially covered by a lean to addition.

The application property is not in a conservation area and is not listed. There are no protected trees on the site. It is unextended.

Proposal

Planning permission is sought to erect a single storey rear extension measuring 4.4 metres in depth and 5.2 metres to ridge height. It will have the same eaves height as the bungalow.

It extends off the outside wall and is 4.6 metres wide only.

Relevant Planning History

None.

Consultations

Lancing Parish: No objection.

Representations

None received.

Relevant Planning Policies and Guidance

The National Planning Policy Framework 2019
Adur Local Plan 2017 Policies 1, 2 and 15 including 'Development Management Standard No. 2 Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings'.

Planning Assessment

Principle

The principle of development can be supported as it upgrades a dwelling within the built up area boundary. For consideration is the impact of the proposals on the character and appearance of the area and the impacts of the development on neighbour amenity.

Neighbour amenity

The extension sits off the boundary with No. 30, to the west, by 3 metres. On the shared boundary is a high fence with bamboo screening above to a covered pergola in the garden of No. 30. No harm will occur.

The 'front' door and 2 side kitchen windows at 27 will face the side wall of the proposed extension. No. 27 also has an open plan rear extension off their kitchen. The proposed extension does not extend beyond the original rear wall of No. 27.

No. 27 sits on ground 0.5m lower than on site and sits further back from the road. There is a fence on the shared boundary to eaves height at No. 27. Where the kitchen window at No. 27 faces the extension it is approximately 1.8 metres off the boundary. The extension is to be no nearer than 900mm to the boundary.

As the extension does not extend beyond the rear wall of No. 27 and given the separation distance of 2.7 metres, sufficient light to the kitchen at 27 will still be received. The high boundary fence restricts some light.

It would be preferred if the roof of the extension was hipped back but the applicant has declined to do so. He argues that the extension will allow adequate light to be received to the side of No. 27 and significant harm is not caused. The neighbour at No. 27 does not object to the proposal.

The extension is not untypical of rear additions and therefore not out of character.

Recommendation APPROVE subject to the following conditions:

1. Approved Plans
2. 3 years
3. Materials to match
4. No east side windows

Informative

The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by assessing the proposal against all material considerations, including planning policies and any representations that may have been received and subsequently determining to grant planning permission in accordance with the presumption in favour of sustainable development, as set out within the National Planning Policy Framework.

Is recommendation contrary to any representations? No.

Case Officer signed:	MOK	Date: 16.5.19
Authorised and signed by:	Peter Barnett	Date: 16 May 2019