Development Management – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/1872/16 Recommendation – APPROVE

Site: 15 Firle Road, Lancing, West Sussex

Proposal: Replace existing attached garage with single storey side extension to east elevation, single storey rear extension to south elevation with further lower ground floor rear extension to south elevation. To include external stairs from side extension to rear garden with side privacy screen.

Date of site visit: 17.01.2017

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Site, Surroundings and Proposal

The application relates to a bungalow in north Lancing in a street of similar style dwellings many of which have been extended or altered over time. Many bungalows have rear dormers, including the application site. The ground level significantly reduces to the south with properties on the north side of the road at a much higher level. The application site is on the southern side with levels reducing from front to rear of the site. The rear of the bungalow is elevated with the garden at a much lower level. There are vast panoramic views towards the sea to the south/rear of the site.

As existing, there is a single, flat roof garage attached to the side of the bungalow. Consent is sought to replace this attached garage with a single storey side extension. The extension is also of flat roof design and forms the same footprint as the existing garage building yet it is shown on the plans as being higher at 2.6 metres including the front parapet roof. The existing garage is 2.1 metres high. Although the proposal description refers to a replacement building the applicant has advised that if the existing structure can be extended and modified without the need to fully demolish and rebuild then it will be. Yet for the purpose of this application consideration is given to the impact as a result of the replacement building which would form a study.

The original submission showed a lower ground floor extension attached to the rear of the proposed side extension with internal stairs leading into the extension. On the west side of the rear elevation a single storey rear addition is shown to link the lower ground floor extension to the main bungalow. 3.6 metres wide and 2.6 metres deep infilling the corner of the bungalow where, as existing there is a balcony. Amended plans have been sought and received after a request by the case officer to move the main bulk of the extension slightly to the west away from no. 13.

The current amended plans which form the basis of this recommendation show the main lower ground floor extension extending from the rear of the main part of the

bungalow, not connected to the side extension as the original scheme showed. The extension is 9.7 metres wide and 5.6 metres deep. It is shown with a very shallow monopitch roof with roof lights. The roof meets the rear elevation just under the ground floor windows. Due to the change in levels the extension will be at lower ground floor level and excavation works will be required. The proposed ground floor rear extension will provide space for an internal stair case between the ground floor and lower ground floor extension. An external stair case will lead from the rear of the proposed side, study extension with a small platform with privacy screen shown to the eastern side. The lower ground floor extension is shown to provide a family room with utility room and boot room.

Lancing Parish Council: - No objection.

Representations: None received.

Relevant Planning Policies

Saved Local Plan policies (ADC 1996): AG1, AH7
Development Control Standard No.3 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings'
Adur Submission Local Plan 2016 Policy 15
National Planning Policy Framework (CLG 2012)
National Planning Practice Guidance

Planning Assessment

There is no objection in principle to the proposed extension which would upgrade an existing property within an established residential area. The key concerns are the effects on the residential and visual amenities of the locality.

Visual Amenity

The main extensions are to the rear of the dwelling therefore not visible within the street scene. Despite its scale, due to the change in levels the extension will be set below existing ground level and therefore the roof will be the most prominent feature as levels reduce significantly to the rear. In these circumstances the proposals give rise to a subordinate development which is considered to not be out of keeping in scale, form or design with the existing bungalow. The extension is to be completed in brick to match existing with felt and zinc to the roof.

The side garage building is to be replaced with a slightly larger building which will be visible from the front of the dwelling within the street scene. The front garage door will also be removed and a window proposed in its place. This building is well set back from the main property frontage and therefore despite the increased height it is subservient to the main dwelling and will not be prominent within the street scene.

Residential Amenity

The main dwellings to be affected are those either side of the site, no. 13 to the east and no. 17 to the west. The revised scheme moves the extension away from the boundary with no. 13. As a result external steps are proposed from the study

extension to the garden. A 1.7 metre privacy screen is proposed here to limit any overlooking to the adjacent dwelling when entering and exiting the extension from the garden. There are French doors to the rear of the study facing south yet the access to the garden is only via the western most door. The eastern side will be fixed shut to limit the use of this space to access only and avoid use of this area as a raised platform and keep this access away from the boundary. The platform on the plans is shown as being 2 metres from the boundary with a further 2.5 metres between the boundary and the adjacent dwelling. No. 13 has a rear bay serving the lounge facing south, this room benefits from panoramic views to the south. The proposed extension and ancillary works will be visible when standing up to the neighbours bay window and looking directly west. Provided that the privacy screen remains in place the rear extension and access stairs will have no adverse impact upon the occupiers of no. 13 Firle Road. A condition is attached to ensure that this is the case and that the opening adjacent to the boundary remains fixed shut, to avoid an unneighbourly impact and creation of external activity as a raised level adjacent to the boundary.

At no. 13 as existing there is a dining room window facing onto the side elevation of the garage and the site of the replacement study extension. This outlook as existing is very limited and is onto a blank brick wall at a distance of approximately 2 metres. It is considered, on balance that the proposal to replace this building despite its increase in height, the loss of light or overbearing impact would not be such to result in a significant, additional impact that would warrant refusal here.

The owner/ occupiers of no. 17 to the west are at a distance of 3 metres from the adjacent extension. This extension as stated above is set low down and therefore will not be overly oppressive resulting in any loss of light, privacy or overbearing impact here. The existing balcony at the application site is to be replaced with a proposed rear infill extension which can be seen to improve the existing unneighbourly situation of a raised balcony area adjacent to the boundary. This extension will have a blank side wall to the west and a condition is attached to ensure that this remains the case to avoid any overlooking.

It should be noted here that the loss of a view is not a material planning consideration. Despite this it is not considered that the proposals here will interrupt or be detrimental to the existing southerly views currently enjoyed by the occupiers of the adjacent dwelling.

Recommendation

APPROVE

1. Standard time limit
2. Materials to match
3. Approved plans
4. Privacy screen and opening fixed shut.
5. No openings in the east or west elevations (including study)

Informative

1. Proactive with revisions

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

Case Officer: Hannah Barker Date: 28th February 2017

Authorised by: Jo Morin Date: 01.03.2017