Expiry 21/10/07

Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: ADC/0478/07 **Recommendation - Permit**

Site: **32 Burrell Avenue Lancing West Sussex BN15 8QB**

Proposal: **Proposed two-storey extension to side**

The Application

The application property is a 1970's detached, gable-fronted house, located on the north side of Burrell Avenue and on the west of Norton Road. The house is the only one which fronts this part of Burrell Avenue. No's 28 – 31 are semi-detached houses and are sited so they back onto the side of the application house and its garden from the west.

To the east are bungalows in Kimber Close whose rear gardens face towards Norton Road. They are located approximately 25m from the application property to the west.

A 2.0m high part-brick, part-close boarded fence bounds the application site to the east. The bungalows to the east also have a high brick wall as their rear boundary.

Previous applications have been permitted for an extension to provide kitchen, wc and bedroom (L/380/72) and a front two-storey extension incorporating the existing porch (L/64/91), neither of which has been implemented.

Consultations and Representations

Third Parties: A letter of objection has been received from the owner of No.29 to the west, who works nights and feels that the proposals would definitely upset his sleeping pattern due to it being at the bottom of his small garden.

Lancing Parish Council: No objection to the application.

Relevant Planning Policies and Guidance

Adopted West Sussex Structure Plans 2001-2016 (WSCC 2005): LOC1, CH1, DEV1, DEV4-5.
Adopted Adur District Local Plan 1993-2006 (ADC 1996) AG1, AH7, AT12 and Appendix 11 'Supplementary Planning Guidance' comprising:

Development Control Standard No.3 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings'.
Design Bulletin No.1 'Trees and Landscaping' (ADC 1996)

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.

Development Control Standard No.3 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings' states amongst other things that: two-storey side extensions should be set back at least 1.0m from the side boundary to prevent accumulative terracing, which would destroy the character of the area; side extensions clearly visible from the road should be designed to closely match the existing dwelling; extensions should be set back slightly from the main front wall of the dwelling to create a visual break, ensuring the extension is subordinate to the main dwelling and that very wide extensions should be avoided.

Visual amenity

The application as originally submitted proposed an extension which was stepped in depth, the ground floor being the total depth of the building (7.7m) and the first floor being set back slightly by 1.0m. A sloping tiled roof at the front of the proposed extension joined ground and first floor level, and due to the total depth there was proposed a small flat roof at the apex of the gable end. It was considered that the sloping tiled roof would have been out of character for the area, and that the flat roof section would have appeared incongruous. It was concluded that the proposal would have appeared out of character and too dominant for the existing house.

The proposed extension has been amended and now shows the front elevation at ground and first floor level being at one level, set back from the main front elevation of the building by 0.9m. This is considered enough of a visual break to prevent the extension from appearing too dominant. A tile hung panel between the windows of the first and ground floor would be in keeping with those of the original house and others in the locality.

The depth of the proposed extension has been reduced which has had the effect of eliminating the small flat roof section at the apex of the gable which would improve the appearance of the proposals.

Whilst the above Dev Control Standard states two-storey extensions should be at least 1.0 metres from the boundary, this is required to prevent a terracing effect with neighbouring properties. In this instance there are no

neighbours directly adjacent to either side of the property and therefore it is considered the 0.5m gap to the boundary would be acceptable.

The gable end design, whilst increasing the visible bulk of the proposal, is in keeping with the other houses in the road, and it is considered that the reduction in overall depth of the extension would prevent it from appearing too dominant for the existing property.

Trees
A small tree is located in a grass verge adjacent to the footpath which overhangs the site. It would need to be severely pruned to allow for the proposals to be built, however it would continue to grow at the roadside maintaining an element of added street interest.

Residential amenity
The proposals would be built on the east side of the building, the opposite side to the properties which back onto the west side of the site (No's 28-31). Whilst there may be some disturbance to properties in the vicinity during the construction of the proposals this would be for a limited period of time, and in itself would not be considered a reason for refusal.

The property backs onto the rear of the house at No.27, and whilst the proposals would introduce an additional window at first floor level it would only serve the ensuite and would not prove to have an adverse effect on levels of privacy. Properties to the east are 22m away and would not have the privacy of their west facing rear rooms or gardens adversely affected by the proposals.

Parking
The proposed extension would provide an additional bedroom with ensuite and kitchen / dining area for the house. The house currently has off street parking for three cars and a caravan in the place of where the extension would be sited. Parking for three cars would be retained which is considered to be acceptable in terms of the size of the extended property.

Recommendation
APPROVE for reason that :-

1PPii

1. C1Ci
2. C14Ai – amended
   Received on 14.09.07....AH7 of the ADLP and DEV1 of the WSSP
3. C12Ei

Case Officer: [signature] Date: 18-09-07

Planning Services Manager: [signature] Date: 18-9-07

Planning and Regulatory Committee Chairman: A J Mills Date: 20/09/07