Development Management - Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: **AWDM/0610/13** **Recommendation –** Approve

Site: 5 Willow Close, Lancing

Proposal: Single storey side and rear extension.

Date of site visit: 18 June 2013

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

The site relates to a semi detached bungalow located on the east side of Willow Close. Willow Close comprises seven similar bungalows arranged around a small cul-de-sac. There are flats to the rear in Abinger Lodge. The bungalow has a side entrance door on its north side, concealed behind a gate and a garage on its south side, connecting to the garage of No. 6. The bungalow has an existing conservatory on the side and there are two sheds at the southern end of the garden.

Permission is sought for a single storey side/rear extension to wrap-around the north east corner of the bungalow and replacing the existing side conservatory. Revised plan show that the extension would measure approximately 3.1 metres in depth from the rear wall (and extending 3.2 m in length along the side) and 8.1 metres in width, extending 4.2 metres beyond the original side wall. The extension would have a pitched roof at the southern end with gable on the east side measuring 3.9 metres to the ridge, and a flat roof with 3.35 m high false pitch to the northern end of the extension. Matching materials are proposed.

Relevant site history
None relevant

Consultations
Adur & Worthing Councils: The Environmental Health Officer has recommended a precautionary contamination condition.

Lancing Parish Council: Committee was concerned about the impact on the neighbouring properties and the visual amenity of the proposal.

Representations
Two letters of representation received objecting to the application on the following grounds:

- Loss of light to west facing windows in flats
- Increased noise

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

The site is not identified as being potentially contaminated therefore an informative is considered sufficient to advise the applicant of any potential contamination.

Residential amenity
The extension would be well separated from neighbouring bungalows at No.4 and No.6 and so given the scale of the proposals and relationship with these properties, it is considered that there would be no significant impact on the amenities of those occupiers.

The main impact would be to the flats in Abinger Lodge to the east, whose side windows (serving kitchens in Flats 1 and 2) face the application site. As originally proposed, the extension was designed to be sited approximately 1.75 metres from the side wall at Abinger Lodge and the window to flat 1 would face directly onto the side of the proposed extension. There is an existing 1.8m high approx) fence between the two properties, however due to the higher floor level of Abinger Lodge, there is a view over the fence at present from the kitchen window at Flat 1. This is the sole means of light and outlook to the kitchen. Following concerns raised over the impact on the neighbouring flats, the applicant has provided amended plans which reduce the depth of the extension by 1 metre, thereby increasing the separation distance. Given the reduction in depth and that the outlook from the kitchen window would be towards the lower roofed section of the extension, this relationship is considered to be acceptable.

Given the relationship with the neighbouring flats to the east, a condition is recommended to prevent windows being installed to the east elevation without permission in the interests of protecting privacy.

Visual amenity
The extension would be set at the rear of the bungalow and would not be readily visible in the streetscene in Willow Close. There would be views of the extension from the car park at the front of Abinger Lodge, however much of the bulk of the extension would be beyond the front wall of Abinger Lodge and so its full width would not be readily visible at this point, and having regard to the single storey subservient scale and that No.5 has extended with a conservatory to a similar depth, there would be no significant harm to the visual amenities of the site or surrounding area, subject to the use of matching materials.

Flood risk
The site lies within Flood risk Zone 3 where the Environment Agency's standing advice would apply.

The applicant has provided an assessment outlining flood proofing techniques to be incorporated and has confirmed that floor levels within the proposed development will be set no lower than existing levels

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) or the policies of the National Planning Policy Framework

Subject to Conditions:-

1. Standard time limit 3 years
2. Matching materials
3. No rear (east elevation) windows without permission
4. Permission relates to approved plans:
   Unnumbered site location plan deposited 20 May 2013
   Unnumbered block plan deposited 21 July 2013
   Drawing Number 13/837/01 Rev A entitled 'Proposed rear and side extension' deposited 21 July 2013

Informative:

- Contamination precaution
- 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: Rebekah Smith Date: 23 September 2013

Authorised by: Peter Barnett Date: 23 September 2013