Expiry Date - 07/06/2023

Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/0470/23 Recommendation – APPROVE

Site: 48 Ingleside Crescent Lancing West Sussex BN15 8EW

Proposal: Single storey extension to south and west elevations

Date of site visit: 15/05/2023

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Site and Surroundings:

The application property is situated on the south side of Ingleside Crescent within a residential area of Lancing. The property is a detached bungalow comprising facing brick elevations (white cladding board above eaves of front gable), a relatively steep sided gable roof, and white UPVC openings. The property is set back from the public realm a moderate distance behind a shallow wall and block paving driveway which extends alongside the dwelling to the west adjacent the boundary with No. 46 Ingleside Crescent and leads to the property's garage located behind the original rear building line of the dwelling. The garage comprises a yellow counterweight door, matching facing brick elevations and a faintly slanted felt flat roof. The property also exhibits a conservatory projecting from the rear of the dwelling which comprises matching facing brick to lower elevations, along with white UPVC openings and a plastic roof. The garage abuts the boundary with the adjacent neighbour to the west No. 46 and projects at a greater distance into the rear garden space than the conservatory.

The application property has a modest sized garden space which widely reflects other properties garden spaces along Ingleside Crescent. This section of Ingleside Crescent consists predominantly of detached bungalows of a similar scale and appearance. There is no distinct alignment or spacing of properties; the application property is situated in a staggered line with No. 46's rear building line positioned slightly behind the application property and No. 50's positioned slightly in front. These adjacent properties also exhibit rear conservatoires, although of a notably smaller scale than the application property's.

Proposal:

Permission is sought for the replacement of the existing garage and conservatory with a single-storey rear (south) and side (west) extension. Matching facing brick elevations and white UPVC openings are proposed,

along with tiles for the pitched roof rear extension and felt for the flat roof side extension.

The side (west) extension would be set back approximately 7.4m from the principal front of the dwelling and would project approximately 2.5m off the side wall, extend approximately 9.5m towards the rear, and have a height of approximately 2.8m to front elevation, stepped down towards the rear to 2.4m where the garden store element is proposed. The rear extension would project approximately 2.6m and span the entire width of the original dwelling from the side (east) elevation and conjoin the side extension, which would result in a maximum width of approximately 10m (right up to the boundary with No. 46). The pitched roof would extend from the original pitched roof and align at ridge and eaves height (approximately 5.15m and 2.4m respectively).

Openings for the extension are proposed to the front (north), rear (south) and obscure glaze to side (west), along with 5No. roof lights (2No. to each pitch and 1No. to flat roof). 1No. high horizontal window is proposed to the east elevation of the original dwelling.

Representations:

At time of submission multiple representations had been made by the occupants of the adjacent dwelling to the east No. 50 Ingleside Crescent. Concerns were raised regarding:

- Proximity to common boundary and property.
- Loss of light to conservatory, living room, and garden.
- Overbearing and oppressive form of development.
- Roof lights overlooking property.
- Loss of privacy.
- Unsightly form of development and harmful outlook.
- Proposed living room window would create noise and disturbance.
- Design and Massing.

Consultations:

Lancing Parish Council: Object on grounds of overdevelopment.

Relevant Planning History: None.

Relevant Planning Policies and Guidance
Adur Local Plan 2017 Policy 1, 15
Supplementary Planning Guidance comprising: Development Management Standard No.2 ‘Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings’
National Planning Policy Framework 2021

Expiry Date - 07/06/2023

Planning Assessment

Principle

The proposal comprises upgrading a residential property located within the built-up area and can be supported in principle. The relevant issues are the effects on the character and appearance of the surrounding area and the effects on the amenities of neighbouring residential occupiers.

Visual Amenity

The front of the side extension, which would measure the width between the side (west) of the dwelling and project close to the boundary with No. 46 (leaving a mere 0.15m gap), would be readily visible to the street scene and more prominent by virtue of its positioning forward of the principal rear building line of the dwelling and height and utilitarian form of the roof above eaves level of the original dwelling. Notwithstanding this, the extension would still be set a significant distance (approximately 7.4m) from the street scene and proposes a false pitched roof which would reflect more closely the character of existing dwelling.

The proposal seeks to incorporate the footprint of the existing garage and conservatory and infill the 'void' areas in-between, denoting an effective use of the garden space available. Whilst the proposed development as a whole would not necessarily be considered harmonious with the existing dwelling by virtue of the flat roof to side extension, on balance, this functional and effective layout in the context of the existing dwelling is acknowledged and considered acceptable. Matching materials are proposed which would respect the character of the existing dwelling.

It is therefore considered that the proposal would not dominate views and there would be no material harm to the visual amenities of the area.

Residential Amenity

The most affected properties would be the adjacent neighbours to the west (No. 46 Ingleside Crescent) and to the east (No. 50 Ingleside Crescent).

The proposed side extension would retain the existing depth projecting into the garden and would only differ from the outlook of No. 46 by way of its height, which would be approximately 0.4m taller at maximum, and the projection towards the front of the dwelling by approximately 4.5m. The additional height and forward projection from what exists may result in some loss of light to the rear conservatory and side (east) windows of No. 46, and the proposed rear extension by virtue of its height and mass would exacerbate this. However, the cumulative impact would still not result in the loss of light being to an unacceptable degree to warrant a refusal by virtue of the maintained spacing between the properties and south facing gardens. The forward projection of the side extension would be assimilated by the existing

dwelling when viewed from this neighbour and virtually align with their original rear building, therefore, the outlook is not considered to be a materially oppressive one. 1No. obscured glazed window is proposed to this west elevation facing this neighbour so no unneighbourly overlooking would occur.

The side extension would pose no material impact to the neighbour to the east No. 50 owing to the separation distance and its similar form and scale when viewed from this direction.

The applicant has agreed to reduce the depth of the rear extension by 0.4m to address the concerns raised by No. 50. It is acknowledged that the existing conservatory at the application property (which is to be replaced by the extension) currently measures a depth of approximately 3m. In view of this and the high fence to this boundary, it is considered that the main material impact the proposal would have on this neighbour would be its closer proximity and the height and massing of the proposed roof. The side (east) elevation of the proposed extension would be set towards No. 50 by a marginal 0.3m compared to where the existing conservatory is situated, this would align with the existing side (east) elevation of the dwelling; the existing gap to this neighbour would be retained (approximately 1.1m). Whilst the proposed height and massing of the roof may result in some loss of light in the afternoon for No. 50, this is not considered to be to an unacceptable degree owing to the modest projection of the proposed rear extension, the neighbours rear building line being situated in front of the application property's, and the south facing garden. The proposed roof design is considered to be the most appropriate in this instance as it would reflect the existing character of the property and harmonise with its form. It is therefore considered that the proposed extension would not result in a materially overbearing or oppressive outlook for this neighbour.

The proposed roof lights would not result in unneighbourly overlooking owing to their height at some 3.4m above ground level. The high horizontal window to the side (east) would not result in unneighbourly overlooking owing to its height and position in relation to the boundary fence and the absence of side (west) facing windows at No. 50. The front (north) and rear (south) windows are considered acceptable owing to their orientation and distance from neighbouring amenity.

There are no residential amenity grounds to resist the proposal.

Recommendation:

APPROVE subject to Conditions:-

1. Approved Plans
2. Standard Time Limit
3. Matching Materials
4. No Add Windows Side Wall/ Roof
5. Obscure glaze side window

Expiry Date - 07/06/2023

Informatives:-

The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by identifying matters of concern within the application (as originally submitted) and negotiating, with the Applicant, acceptable amendments to the proposal to address those concerns. As a result, the Local Planning Authority has been able to grant planning permission for an acceptable proposal, in accordance with the presumption in favour of sustainable development, as set out within the National Planning Policy Framework.

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

Case Officer: Jason Albon Date: 07.06.2023

Authorised by: Peter Barnett Date: 7 June 2023