Expiry Date - 23/06/2010

Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: ADC/0152/10 **Recommendation – Permit Application**

Site: **95 First Avenue Lancing West Sussex BN15 0ET**

Proposal: **Single-storey rear extension and front gable end (rear dormer constructed under 'permitted development')**

The Application

The application property is the northern half of a pair of hipped-roof semi-detached bungalows located on the eastern half of the northernmost part of First Avenue. This part of First Avenue is located to the north of the A27 Upper Brighton Road and is fronted by three pairs of semi-detached dwellings only.

The application is for a single-storey flat roofed rear extension that would be the full width of the property 9m, by 5m – 3m in depth, by 2.7m in height; and for a projecting front gable that would increase the proposed loft extension, which in the main is proposed to have a large rear dormer constructed under 'permitted development'.

To the north and south of the site are the only other pairs of semi-detached bungalows which front this part of the road (No's 89 & 91 to the south, and No's 97 & 99 to the north). All four dwellings have a projecting front gable feature, the same as proposed. The attached property has a large rear extension with parapet wall to the boundary with the site, it projects 3m to the east: No.97 to the north also has a similar depth extension which projects 3m to the east with no windows in the south elevation.

Consultations and Representations

Lancing Parish Council: No objection.

Third Parties: The owner of No.93 First Avenue has no objection 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)

Expiry Date - 23/06/2010

Planning Assessment

Policies

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 and accord with the Council's DC standards.

The Council's Development Control Standard No.3 entitled 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings' states that the most important basic principle is that any extension should be in keeping with the appearance, scale, design and character of both the existing dwelling and the street scene generally. When specifically relating to front extensions it states, in the case of semi-detached or detached dwellings, front extensions will only be allowed where the extension can be successfully assimilated into the streetscene and not unduly affect neighbours.

Visual amenity

The large rear extension would be hidden from view from the main street and thus would have limited impact on the character of the streetscene. Although it would project further to the east than either of the neighbouring extensions, the garden is of an adequate size to prevent it from appearing cramped or out of keeping. The large flat roofed is not sympathetic to the roof of the existing bungalow however it is a common feature in the surrounding area, and is therefore considered acceptable.

The front gable design is sympathetic in scale and design to those of the two adjacent pairs of bungalows and would not result in the dwelling from appearing out of character. Whilst the proposed gable may not be particularly in keeping with the attached dwelling (No.93), it is noted that the attached neighbour has a front dormer which already results in a mismatched appearance to the pair. It is therefore considered that the gable feature would not be so obtrusive that it would warrant a refusal in this case.

The very large rear dormer is unsympathetic to the character of the bungalow and would dominate the building, however the erection of the dormer is subject to permitted development and in addition to the front gable would be only 39 cubic metres in volume, and thus would not exceed the 50 cubic metre limit allowed. Therefore the effect of the rear dormer is not a consideration for this application.

Residential amenity

The proposed rear extension would project past the existing extension of the attached bungalow (No.93) by 2m, and whilst the overall length of the extension (5m) would be longer than the Council's guidance would usually allow, the impact would be limited to the section which would project past that of the neighbours extension, which would be a total of 2m. Given the

consideration that the proposed extension would be to the north of the attached neighbour and would thus have no impact on daylight through overshadowing, it is considered that on balance, the proposed extension would not have an overbearing effect or adversely affect the outlook of the rear rooms of No.93.

The proposed pair of doors in the north elevation of the proposed extended lounge would have views directly towards the boundary of the site, the blank wall of the side of No.97's extension, and very obliquely towards the rear of their extension. There would be a separation of 5.6m between the proposed doors and the 1.8m high boundary fence, where the neighbouring dwelling sits on slightly higher ground. The views from the doors would be so oblique that there would be no loss of privacy to the rear window in the neighbours extension, which are inset by approximately 2m from the boundary, and given there are no other windows in the side elevation of No.97 it is considered that an obscure glazing condition in this instance is unwarranted.

Recommendation

APPROVE for reason that :-

1PPi

1. C1Ci
2. C12Eii (amended to read extensions)
3. C18Eiv – South
4. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved amended plans: Elevations, plans and 1:500 block plan date stamped received 08.06.10.
   Reason: *For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.*

Case Officer Carlos Hone Date 15.06.10 PB 17/6