Development Management - Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: **Recommendation – APPROVE**
AWDM/0716/11

Site: **2 Rainbow Square, Shoreham-by-Sea West Sussex BN43 6AS**

Proposal: **Rear conservatory**

Date of site visit: 30.09.11

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Proposal
The application dwelling is an end of terrace house located on the south side of the road, within a newly completed part of the Southlands Hospital development known as Orchard Way. The dwellings were permitted subject to a condition removing normal 'permitted development rights' to prevent future outbuildings and extensions without permission from the LPA.

Permission is sought for a rear conservatory across the rear elevation of the property. It would be 4.6m in width, by 2.9m in depth, by 2.7m in height. The conservatory would be constructed with partially brick built side walls (east and west) and low side plinth walls either side of a pair of double doors (south).

Consultations and Representations

Third Parties: There have been no third party objections.

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'
PPS1 'Delivering Sustainable Development (ODPM 2005)

Planning Assessment

Policies
Policy AH7 of the Local Plan states that extensions and alterations should be designed so as not to result in an unacceptable degree of overlooking, loss of natural light or an overbearing effect on neighbouring dwellings; they should be of sympathetic design and materials to the original dwelling and the area in general; the proportion of garden area taken by the proposal should not be excessive having regard to the character of the area; and it should comply with the Council's adopted standards. In this case, DC Standard No.3 is the most relevant and it includes a requirement for an extension adjoining a side

boundary with an attached dwelling not to exceed 3.5m deep and a requirement for minimum rear garden sizes of 11m in length.

Visual amenity
The proposed conservatory is of typical design, with a shallow mono-pitched roof, and in this case with matching brick built side walls with high-level windows. The applicant has submitted a brick type for the proposed conservatory which matches the existing dwelling.

Residential amenity
The depth of the conservatory will result in the garden length being reduced to 8m, with the area being only 40sqm. The garden itself backs onto the side of an adjacent property which has no windows in its flank wall (north), and thus the privacy of the neighbouring house would not be affected.

The existing west side boundary is made up with a panelled fence 1.8m in height for the first 2m, which then drops to 1.4m with 0.4m of trellis above. The applicant's agent has stated that the existing panelled fence and trellis will be replaced with a full panelled fence to match existing, therefore preventing overlooking from the single full height window in the west elevation. A condition is proposed to ensure the fence is replaced.

The resultant garden area of 40sqm would be small, and the length of the garden would be below the 11m minimum as stated in the above DC standards. It is considered though, that the garden area would be no be so reduced that it would be an unusable space for this particular size of dwelling, bearing in mind the additional usable space to be provided by the conservatory itself.

Recommendation

APPROVE for the reason that: 1PPi

Subject to:

1. C1Ci (Standard time limit)
2. C12Eii (Amended)
   The external brick of the conservatory hereby approved shall be Ibstock Arundel Yellow multi-stock unless otherwise confirmed in writing by the LPA.
3. The conservatory hereby permitted shall not be occupied until a matching fence 1.8m in height has been erected adjacent to its west side, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the LPA.
   Reason: *In the interest of residential amenity and to comply with saved policy AH7 of the ADLP.*
4. C1E3
   Drawing No: 9575/1 Date Received: 11 October 2011

Is recommendation contrary to letter(s) of representation? No

Case Officer: Carlos Hone Date: 14.11.11
Authorised by: Jo Morin Date: 14.11.11