Expiry Date - 30/04/2012

Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/0289/12 **Recommendation – APPROVE**

Site: **29 Hammy Close Shoreham-By-Sea West Sussex BN43 6BL**

Proposal: **Rear conservatory**

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

The application relates to a semi-detached bungalow on the south side of Hammy Close. It has a single storey rear extension 3.8m deep on the eastern side and a detached garage positioned 1m beyond the end of the extension. The application is proposing to construct a conservatory on the end of the existing extension, measuring 3.8m deep and 4.2m wide, with a glazed roof 3.3m high. The overall depth of the rear extension will be 7.6m beyond the original rear wall of the dwelling.

Relevant Planning History

ADC/0583/07 – Retrospective planning permission was refused for a rear conservatory which had been unlawfully erected between the extension and boundary fence. The conservatory was the subject of enforcement action and appeals which were dismissed. The conservatory has since been removed.

Consultations

None

Representations

Relevant Planning Policies and Guidance

Adur District Local Plan (saved policies): AG1, AH7 and Appendix 11 'Supplementary Planning Guidance' comprising Development Control Standard No.3 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings'.
South East Plan: CC1, CC6, BE1

Planning Assessment

Principle

The proposal comprises up-grading 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, the design and size of the extension and the effect on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Visual amenity

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, a 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 the garden area taken up by a proposal should not be excessive. Rear extensions which abut or are within 1m of a common side boundary with an attached dwelling should normally be no deeper than 3.5m.

In this case the extension is 1.7m from the western boundary. However, the combined depth of the two extensions would be considerably in excess of what would normally be considered acceptable. However, the existing garage projects a further 3.3m to the rear and the dwelling enjoys a garden of some 25m depth. The extension would not therefore project further into the garden than the garage and this helps to reduce the impact on the character of the area.

Many of the neighbouring properties have extensions and outbuildings which project further into the garden than the 3.5m recommended by the DC Standard, including at no's 28, 31 and 32. It is not considered therefore that this proposal would be out of character or harmful to the area.

Residential amenity

The depth of the combined extensions has the potential to harm light and outlook to neighbouring properties. However, to the east No.28 is screened from the extension by the existing garage at the application property and will not be adversely affected.

To the west, No.30 has a rear dining room extension which is not considered to be adversely affected by this proposal. However, it also has a living room window in the original rear wall which would be left in a deep recess. The impact upon that window is lessened somewhat by the position of the extension 1.7m off the boundary and by its glazed appearance and lower roof. There is an existing boundary fence which partly obscures outlook for the affected window and, on balance, it is not considered that the proposed extension would cause serious harm to the amenities of the occupiers of No.30, unlike the previously refused extension which was immediately on the boundary and adjacent to their window. The side of the conservatory is also considered to sufficiently distant from the neighbour's extension to not cause

any overlooking and it is therefore not necessary to obscure glaze the windows.

Accessibility and parking

This proposal does not affect existing parking and access at the property.

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 policies of the Adur District Local Plan (AG1, AH7).

Subject to Conditions:-
1. Standard 3 year time limit
2. Wall finish of conservatory to match existing dwelling
3. Approved Plans

Is recommendation contrary to any representations? N

Case Officer signed: [redacted] Date: 29/3/12

Authorised and signed by: [redacted] Date: 29/3/12