Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/0891/13 Recommendation – Approve

Site: 29 Rectory Walk, Sompting, Lancing, West Sussex

Proposal: Single storey extension

Date of site visit: 1st May 2013 (when considering former application AWDM/0361/13)

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

The application site is an end of terrace bungalow within a row of 6 bungalows of matching original design and appearance. There are other matching style bungalows to the north in Maple Walk. The bungalows are characterised by their gabled roof design and recessed front doors.

An application was submitted in May 2013 AWDM/0361/13 for a similar extension to that proposed here. The applicant proposed to increase the width of the kitchen whilst narrowing the recessed access to the front door. The extension was to have an additional pitched roof added. This application was withdrawn following advice from officers that the application could not be supported. It was considered that the proposal would detrimentally affect the uniform character of the row of bungalows and would lead to the enclosing of the recess leading to the main front entrance to the bungalow which would give rise to a dark and narrow space which would be unacceptable.

The current application seeks to address these concerns whilst still allowing the applicant to increase the size of the kitchen. A single storey infill extension is proposed 1.8 metres wide it is very slightly recessed by 0.6 metres. It allows the kitchen extension and main entrance to be combined. The extension is of flat roof design infilling the two gables either side at a height of 2.8 metres.

Representations: Letter submitted with application from owner of 27 Rectory Walk. They state that they are happy for works to go ahead and that the applicant has assured that any damage caused will be paid for.

Relevant Planning Policies
Adopted Adur District Local Plan 1993-2006 (ADC 1996) (saved policies): AG1, AH7 and Appendix 11 ‘Supplementary Planning Guidance’ comprising: Development Control Standard No.3 ‘Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings’
National Planning Policy Framework (CLG 2012)

Planning Assessment

Principle

The proposal comprises upgrading of the existing housing stock located within the built up area and can be supported in principle. The relevant issues are the effects on the amenities of neighbouring residential occupiers and the effect on the character and appearance of the dwelling and its surroundings.

Visual amenity

The proposed extension is considered to be subservient to the main dwelling. The flat roof design and slight recess reduce its prominence when viewed from the front and allow the main gables to remain the dominant feature within the row of bungalows. Although the main entrance is narrower than existing it is only slightly recessed and therefore the concerns expressed previously relating to the enclosed, narrow access to the front entrance are no longer valid.

Residential amenity

The proposed extension is an infill addition between the application property, no. 29 and the adjacent bungalow no. 27. The extension will attach to the side wall of no. 27 for which notice has been served and consent given by the owner. This is a blank wall and the extension will not be visible or have any adverse impact on the residential amenities of the occupiers of the adjacent dwelling. It will also not affect any other neighbouring dwellings.

Recommendation

APPROVE for the reason:-

The proposed development would not detract from the local environment and can take place without resulting in unacceptable detriment to the amenities of neighbouring properties. It would consequently not conflict with the saved policies of the Adur District Local Plan (AG1, AH7)

Subject to Conditions:-

1. Standard 3 year time limit
2. Materials to match existing dwelling
3. Approved plans

Informatives

1. The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by assessing the proposal against all material considerations, including planning policies and any representations that may have been received and subsequently determining to grant planning permission 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? N

Case Officer: Hannah Barker Date: 22nd August 2013

Authorised by: Jo Morin Date: 23 Aug 2013