Application Number: ADC/0220/07 Recommendation – APPROVE

Site: 78 Wembley Avenue, Lancing

Proposal: Gabled rear and side extensions (with rooms in roof) including side garage

The Application

The application property is a detached bungalow on the west side of Wembley Avenue approximately 90m north of its junction with Sompting Way. The property backs onto dwellings in Freshfields Close to the west. It is located to the north of a two-storey detached Victorian house, one of three in a row to the south (No's 80-84). To the north is a two-storey house.
The bungalow has a hipped roof. A rear conservatory and a small porch on the north side were both added under 'permitted development rights'.

As submitted, the proposal is for gabled rear and side extensions (with rooms in the roof) including a side garage, but amended plans for the side extension/garage are awaited.

The rear gabled extension would be 4.2m deep and the full width (8.7m) and roof height (6.6m to ridge) of the existing bungalow. It would extend the ridge rearwards by 8.7m. It would comprise an extended kitchen/dining room and an extended family room on the ground floor with a fourth bedroom above. There would be a glazed porch on its north side, enclosing the side door to the kitchen.

The proposed side extension, on the submitted plans, is shown 15m deep and 2.5m wide, occupying the full width of the space between the bungalow and the side boundary with No.80 – it would comprise a garage on the groundfloor with a dressing room above. Amended plans are awaited.

Consultations and Representations

Lancing Parish Council: No comments received.

Third Parties: 2 two letters of objection have been received.

The owner of No.27 Freshfields Close to the rear (west) objects on grounds that the extension would overlook his property including his kitchen window. He feels that the seclusion and privacy afforded to his property at the time of purchase are being taken away by large extensions at the rear of properties in Wembley Avenue, notably No.84.

The owner of the adjacent house, No.80 Wembley Avenue, objects on grounds that the proposed development would take place 0.75m from their house wall and the same from their garden boundary wall, which would result

in the appearance of a 'link-detached' house and devalue it. They also feel that the dressing room above the garage would be a monstrosity as an immediate view above their garden wall. They are concerned that the proposal could affect their foundations and they feel that the proximity and position of the development is far too intrusive and that it is an overdevelopment having direct implications on their lifestyle. They feel that there are no such developments in Wembley Avenue and, if this one goes ahead, more houses, originally being detached or semi-detached, would have the right to change to more 'linked' properties - every semi-detached or detached property down this street has a walkway 0.9m or more down the side to separate it from the next.
***[NB. The resident at No.80 Wembley Avenue has requested to speak at the committee* meeting]**

Relevant Planning Policies and Guidance

Adopted West Sussex Structure Plan 2001-16 (WSCC 2005): DEV1, DEV4-5.
Adopted Adur District Local Plan 1993-2006 (ADC 1996): AG1, AH7 and Appendix 11 'Supplementary Planning Guidance' including:- .
Development Control Standard No.3 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings'
PPS1 "Delivering Sustainable Development" (ODPM 2004)

Planning Assessment

The relevant concerns are the effects on the residential and visual amenities of the locality.

Policies

Structure Plan policies seek to protect and, where possible, enhance the character and distinctiveness areas, requiring high standards of design, layout and construction (DEV1). Policy AH7 of the Local Plan, relating specifically to extensions and alterations to dwellings, states that they should be designed so as not to result in an unacceptable loss of light or privacy or have an overbearing effect on the neighbouring dwelling and be sympathetic to the original dwelling. Supplementary guidance in DC Standard No.3 'Extensions & Alterations to Dwellings' states that two-storey side extensions should retain, in most circumstances, at least a 1m gap between the boundary. It goes on to state that principal windows on the rear elevation of rear extensions should be 22m from principal windows of dwellings at the rear, that side extensions being clearly visible from the road should be designed to closely match the existing dwelling, in particular they should have a roof in keeping with the existing dwelling.

Residential amenity- overbearing effect

The property to the south is a detached house which has an attached garage abutting the boundary with the application property. A rear addition has been to this resulting in a side extension which is the full depth of the building, with a mono-pitched roof.

As originally submitted, it is considered that the proposed side extension would have been out of scale with the existing development resulting in a cramped appearance that would adversely affect the visual amenities of the locality and the residential amenity of the adjacent property (No.80).

As a result, the applicant has agreed to reduce the scheme. The first-floor gabled part of the proposed side extension would be deleted and the groundfloor part (the proposed 15m long garage) would be reduced in length to 9.7m. It would be shortened at both front and rear and set back by 1.5m to align with the front of the garage at No.80. It would no longer project past the building line of the rear of the existing bungalow. A dummy pitch roof would be added to make it appear more in keeping with the design of the original bungalow.

It is considered that the amended scheme would help assuage the objections of the neighbour to the south (No.80) on grounds of overbearing and unneighbourly effect. The side extension would now be no longer than that of the extension at No.80. Although the neighbour concerned still objects, on grounds that there would be no gap between the single-storey extensions, it is considered this would not warrant refusal.

Residential amenity – overlooking

The proposed gabled rear extension would introduce a window at first-floor level where currently there is none. The bungalows to the rear in Freshfields Close have small rear gardens but there would be a distance of 28m between the principal windows of the objector's bungalow and the rear window of the proposed extension. This exceeds the Council's minimum standard of 22m and is considered sufficient to avoid an unacceptable degree of loss of privacy.

Residential amenity – loss of light

The property to the north (No.76) is a two-storey house which has been extended with a conservatory across the rear elevation, partly infilling the recess in the rear elevation and protruding on the south side with a hexagonal design. The whole of the rear elevation of the extension at No.76 is glazed. The proposed gabled rear extension would project alongside the neighbouring conservatory and, with its full ridge height and location to the south, it would have an impact on sunlight reaching No.76 other than in the summer. The gap between the buildings would be approximately 3.5m. On balance, it is considered that the proposals would not have an adverse effect on the levels of natural daylight available in the rear west-facing rooms of No.76 as to warrant refusal.

Visual amenity

The elimination of the side gable originally proposed would reduce the visible mass and bulk of the development and would preserve enough separation

above groundfloor level to prevent an excessively cramped or overdeveloped appearance. The neighbour to the south still objects, on grounds that there would be no significant gap between the single-storey garages/extensions, effectively resulting in a 'linked' appearance. However, it is not considered that this reason would be sufficient to warrant refusal. It is commonplace for such a situation to exist and it does not detract from the character or appearance of the streetscene.

Recommendation

Subject to satisfactory amended plans being received, APPROVE for reason that :-

The proposed development as amended would not detract from the existing local urban environment and can take place without resulting in unacceptable detriment to the amenities of neighbouring properties and without detraction from highway safety. It would consequently not conflict with the relevant policies of the Adur District Local Plan (AG1 AH7, AT2) and the adopted West Sussex Structure Plan 2001-16 (LOC1, DEV1, DEV4-5).

Subject to:-

1. C1Ci (Standard time limit)
2. C14Ai (Permission relates to amended plans)
3. C12Ei (Materials to match existing)
4. C18Eii (No additional side windows or rooflights without planning permission)
5. C18Cii (Glazing in north side of north side porch to be obscured)

.....