Expiry Date -

Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: **Recommendation – APPROVE**
AWDM/0838/12

Site: **27 Fourth Avenue Lancing**

Proposal: **Ground floor rear extension**

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: /N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

The proposal is for a single storey rear extension to measure (at max) 2.9 metres in height, 5 metres in length, and 5.1 metres in width.

The application property is a mid-terraced two-storey property with pebble dash rendered walls. The application site is in a residential street in an outer suburb of Lancing.

Relevant Planning History

None

Consultations

Worthing & Adur Councils: The **Environmental Health officer** *requests precautionary contaminated land condition*

Lancing Parish Council: *concerned further extension rather large and took up more garden space*

Representations

None

Relevant Planning Policies and Guidance

South East Plan (GOSE 2009): BE1, CC1, CC6
Adur Local Plan: AG1, AH7

Planning Assessment

Principle

Upgrading of residential accommodation is acceptable in principle

Visual amenity

The extension would not be visible from public vantage point. It is rudimentary in its design and style, but would exhibit matching external materials and finishes to the main building. It scale is appropriate to that of the main house. Its visual impact would not therefore be such as to warrant refusal.

Residential amenity – effect on existing dwellings

The neighbours principally affected are those either side of the application property (the extension is removed from the remainder).

The depth of the extension exceeds the Council's adopted space standards, and it reduces the amount of private garden for the applicant. However non-compliance with the standard can be allowable in certain circumstances if no harm to the living conditions of neighbours and/or a future occupier results.

This is the case with this proposal, as both neighbouring buildings to either side of the application property have themselves been extended. The rear projection of the proposed extension beyond these is 2 metres. This relationship between the extension and its neighbours conforms to the Council's adopted standard.

This is because such a depth would not harm the neighbours by way of unacceptable overbearing and overshadowing as the height of the extension is roughly comparable to those other extensions, and the extension walls to both neighbouring properties facing the application site are solid with no glazing. Therefore the neighbour's outlook is entirely restricted to views down into their own respective gardens, and the light entering their rear rooms receive is dependent upon this aspect also. In both cases, this circumstance would be unchanged where the proposed extension built.

Also overlooking and loss of privacy onto neighbours is negated by the close boarded fencing demarking the shared boundaries and the absence of neighbour's fenestration facing onto the application site.

The extension is to benefit the current occupiers, and would still allow for a reasonable amount of garden to cater for the needs of future occupiers of the property of this size. It is still of good length without being unduly shallow. Therefore the living condition of future occupiers would not be materially harmed by it.

Finally, although the planning system is principally to serve the public interest, in this case the personal circumstances are compelling enough to warrant a deviation from adopted standards since it has been assessed no harm to the residential amenities of neighbours would arise from it. According to the agent, the current occupier is suffering ill health after being recently hospitalised and needs increased internal space to cater for a future wheelchair. This has dictated the size of the extension.

Contaminated Land

The site is not contaminated so an informative would suffice to raise the applicant's awareness of this risk

Recommendation

APPROVE for the reason:-

Given the individual circumstances of the site (principally that the two adjoining buildings have been extended) and the personal circumstances of the applicant, it is judged on merit that, although the proposed development would technically breach the Council's adopted standards, it can take place without detriment to the local environment and would not detract from the character or appearance of the area. It would not result in any detriment to the amenities of neighbouring properties and consequently does not conflict with saved Adur Local Plan policies AG1, AH7 and the South East Plan policies BE1, CC1, CC6

Subject to Conditions:-

1. Standard time limit
2. Approved plans
3. External materials and finishes to match existing
4. Notwithstanding "pd" no windows/openings in flanks

Informative

> *If during development, any visible contaminated or odorous material, (for example asbestos containing material, stained soil, petrol/diesel/solvent odour, underground tanks or associated pipework) not previously identified, is found to be present at the site, then no further development (unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority) shall be carried out until it has been investigated by the developer. The Local Planning Authority must be informed immediately of the nature and degree of the contamination present and a method statement detailing how the unsuspected contamination shall be dealt with must be prepared and submitted to the Local Planning Authority for approval in writing before being implemented*

Is recommendation contrary to any representations? N

Case Officer signed: Matthew Porter Date: 2-08-2012

Authorised and signed by: Peter Barnett Date: 3 August 2012