expires 21/9

Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: ADC/0284/09 Recommendation - Permit

Site: 80 Busticle Lane Sompting Lancing West Sussex

Proposal: Single-storey extensions to front and rear

The Application

The application property is the southern half of a pair of semi-detached bungalows located on the east side of the road, 40m from the junction with the main A27 Upper Brighton Road.

The proposal is for a rear extension 6.7m wide, by 4m deep, by 4.1m in height to the top of the dummy-pitch roof, and for a front extension that would be 3.5m wide, by 2.2m deep, by 5m in height to the apex of the hipped roof.

The bungalow and its attached neighbour (No.82) are the most northern of three pairs of similar designed bungalows, all of which are on a stepped building line, with the application dwelling being inset 2.2m further to the east from its neighbour to the south. Directly opposite are pairs of semi-detached houses on lower ground level. To the north and northwest are detached buildings, one on the east side of the main road junction is a car sales and mechanics garage, whilst to the west is a pair of semi-detached houses fronting the junction.

Consultations and Representations

Sompting Parish Council: No comments received.

Third Parties: There have been no third party objections to the proposals.

Relevant Planning Policies and Guidance

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

Local Plan Policy AH7 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.

Development Control Standard No.3 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings' states that it would not usually be acceptable for extensions to leave neighbouring properties within deep recesses due to extensions up to the boundary. It goes on to state that single-storey extensions which abut or are within 1m of the boundary should normally be no deeper than 3.5m, to prevent loss of daylight and outlook. Front extensions should not usually extend significantly beyond the building line, or abut side boundaries, and they will only be permitted on semi-detached dwellings where the extension can be successfully assimilated into the streetscene and not unduly affect neighbours.

Visual amenity

The rear extension would not be visible from the main road to the front and would therefore not impact on the visual amenity of the streetscene. The dummy-pitch roof is considered to be sympathetic to the roof form of the original bungalow, and although it adds bulk to the extension, it is not considered that it would appear overly large or ungainly. The garden slopes steeply to the east however the area the extension will occupy is terraced level with the dwelling. It is not considered that the rear extension would appear cramped within the plot.

The front extension is considered to be sympathetic to the design of the original bungalow, with rendered walls, a tiled hipped roof form and centrally located window. The height of the front extension does appear large at 5m however this is as a result of the sloping ground levels. The extension would not be considered to dominate the dwelling and its scale is considered to be acceptable. From the south the front extension would not be visible from the street due to the stepped building line of no. 78. The dwelling is well set back from the road, and the 2.2m front projection is not considered too bulky or prominent for the host building to accommodate successfully.

Residential amenity

The proposed rear extension would be within 1m of the boundary with the attached bungalow (No.82), however it has already been extended to the rear by approximately 3m. Thus the rear extension would not appear overbearing or have a harmful effect on their outlook or sunlight.

To the south the bungalow is set forward of the site property and sits on lower ground level, however it too has been extended to the rear so that the rearmost part is level with the rear elevation of the site property. A separation exists between the two dwellings of 2.5m and it is considered that as the proposed extension is to the north that it would not have an impact on outlook or light or feel particularly overbearing.

Recommendation

APPROVE for reason that :-

1PPi

1. C1Ci.
2. C12Eii.
3. C18Eiv (south wall of the rear extension and north and south elevations of the front extension).

Case officer: [redacted]
Date: 21/08/09 PB 24/8/09