DELEGATED APPLICATIONS

ASSESSMENT SHEET

APPLICATION NO/ADDRESS: 11/0066 – 3 Sunny Close

DATE OF SITE VISIT: 8/3

NEIGHBOURS CHECKED: Y

ADDITIONAL NEIGHBOUR NOTIFICATIONS (LIST ADDRESSES): None.

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS:

Semi detached house on the west side of Sunny Close. As originally built these properties have their front doors on the side off a shared drive and deep front gardens with short rear gardens. Many of these front gardens have been enclosed with high fences and hedges and are effectively used as you would expect a rear garden to be used. The front elevation also has the appearance of a rear elevation as it has no front door but does have a set of French doors or patio doors.

24 Sunny Close has a front conservatory with the benefit of a 1999 planning permission.

PROPOSAL

Permission is sought to erect a conservatory on the east, front, elevation. The proposed extension measures 4 metres in depth, 5 metres in width and has a mono pitched roof with an eaves height of 2.2. metres and a ridge height of 3.2 metres. Both side walls are to be obscurely glazed with fan light openings only. It has been revised and repositioned 500mm off the boundary with the property to the south, No. 2, to allow for the retention of a high hedge on this common boundary.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY:

03/00108 – Two storey rear. Refused 2.4.03

02/00998 – Two storey rear. Refused 23.10.02

No. 24 - 99/00789 – West elevation 'Front' conservatory. Granted.

RELEVANT PLANNING POLICIES:

RES7, BE1, H16 and H18 of the saved Local Plan.
BE1, CC1 and CC6 of the South East Plan
PPS1 Delivering Sustainable Development
Policy 16 Submission Core Strategy

REPRESENTATIONS AND RELEVANT CONSULTATION RESPONSES:

No letters from neighbours received.

HUMAN RIGHTS:

First Protocol (Protection of Property) of the Human Rights Act 1998 is relevant to this application. It is accepted that the proposal, if approved, would have some impact on the neighbouring properties. However, it is considered that the level of development proposed would not cause undue harm in terms of additional noise, disturbance and loss of privacy and that, on balance, existing residential quality of life would not be adversely affected as a result of the proposal. Accordingly it is considered that it is acceptable with regard to Article 8 and Article 1.

PLANNING ASSESSMENT:

These properties are set 17 metres back from the road. No. 3 has a high hedge on the front boundary and No. 2 has 1.8 metre high panel fencing all around its front garden. Many of the gardens are enclosed in a similar fashion.

The proposed conservatory, in white PVCu, set against the rendered property will only be glimpsed from the road. It has been pulled off the boundary with No. 2 to protect a high hedge on this boundary. However, in the event this hedge were to be removed it is not considered that the lightweight structure proposed would be harmful to the occupiers of No. 2 as it is due north of them and set 500mm off the boundary. No loss of light will occur and it is not considered it will be overbearing. Obscure glazing and fanlight openings only are proposed for either side wall. A shared drive separates the application site from the property to the north, No. 4.

The extension will not be harmful to neighbour amenity or the streetscene.

RECOMMENDATION

Grant subject to conditions.

1. 5 years
2. Revised Plans
3. Side windows obscure/non-opening below 1.7 metres – south side.

REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION:

The proposal complies with the relevant policies of the Development Plan.

IS RECOMMENDATION CONTRARY TO LETTER (S) OF REPRESENTATION?
No.

DELEGATED

Case Officer sign..... [redacted] ...Date..... 30/3/11....

Authorising Officer sign..... [redacted] 30.3.11