Development Management - Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/0041/18 Recommendation – APPROVE

Site: 15 Burrell Avenue, Lancing, West Sussex

Proposal: Retention of Rear Conservatory (Retrospective)

Date of site visit: 19th February 2018

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

The application site is a gable roof bungalow within a cul de sac of similar properties. AWDM/1126/13 was submitted but not determined for a Lawful Development Certificate for a similar conservatory extension which was permitted development. Due to technicalities this was not proceeded with and was withdrawn. Since this time the existing conservatory extension has been constructed at the property. It is a clad structure with eaves higher than the existing bungalow, it therefore requires retrospective consent.

It is 2.4 metres in depth, it is the full width of the bungalow and is 2.9 metres up to the flat roof and 3.3 metres including the roof lantern.

There are existing wooden structures within the rear garden one to the rear boundary and one to the side, north boundary. Elm Grove is directly to the rear of the site, to the west.

Lancing Parish Council: - No objection

Environmental Health - Contaminated Land: - Full condition recommended

Representations

None received

Relevant Planning Policies

Adur Local Plan 2017 Policy 15
Supplementary Planning Guidance' comprising: Development Management Standard No.2 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings'
National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012)

Planning Assessment

Principle

The proposal comprises upgrading 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. The proposal here is retrospective.

Visual amenity

The extension is to the rear of the property, despite the highway to the rear of the dwelling the extension is not overly visible or dominant within the street scene. The eaves are higher than the existing bungalow, the extension has a flat roof with roof lantern, it is fully clad. Despite materials and design not matching in detail the existing bungalow it is not unusual in residential, built up area such as this to have flat roof additions or use of different materials that would be the case with a uPVC conservatory or similar. The extension is not significantly out of keeping here and its impact is not such to warrant a refusal here. It is 2.4 metres in depth and modest in scale in relation to the host dwelling.

Residential amenity

The main properties to be affected are those either side of the site, no 14 to the south and no. 16 to the north, both are detached bungalows similar to the application site.

No. 14 to the south as a garage to the side which is adjacent to the boundary with the site, the extension is alongside the adjacent garage at no. 14. This is a blank side elevation, there is therefore no adverse impact here.

To the north no. 16 is sited closer to the highway than the application site, therefore with the rear addition no. 15 is set much further into the site. Yet there is separation here as the application site has a side attached garage and so does no. 16, both are adjacent to the boundary. There is therefore separation of the extension from the adjacent bungalow. No overlooking, loss of light or privacy occurs here.

A condition is attached to restrict any windows or opens to the side elevations to ensure the amenities of the adjacent occupiers are protected in the future.

Other Matters

As stated above a contaminated land condition is recommended however as this is a retrospective application, this is not relevant here.

Recommendation

APPROVE

Subject to Conditions:-

1. Approved Plans
2. No openings in the north and south elevations of the extension hereby approved.

Is recommendation contrary to letter(s) of representation? N

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.

Case Officer: Hannah Barker Date: 6th March 2018

Authorised by: Peter Barnett Date: 6 March 2018