# Development Management – Delegated Officer Report

**Application Number: AWDM/0324/24 Recommendation: APPROVE**

**Site: 3 King John Court, Emerald Quay, Shoreham-By-Sea, West Sussex**

**Proposal: Proposed conversion of the garage and glazed pergola to the rear**

**Date of Site Visit: 25th March 2024**

**Neighbours Checked: Y**

**Additional neighbour notification: N**

**Proposal, Site and Surroundings**

The application site is a three storey, terraced town house within the Emerald Quay development on Shoreham Beach. Dwellings are similar in design creating a cohesive development which has a unique character. The use of weather boarding and dark brown fenestration characterises the locality.

Consent is sought to add a grey, glazed pergola to the rear of the property at ground floor. There is an existing integral garage which is to be converted into a utility room, a replacement door and cedral cladding is proposed to the front.

**Consultations:**

**West Sussex County Council: The Highways Authority** state the following: -

The proposed garage conversion will result in the loss of one parking space for the dwelling. The garage will be converted into a utility room and garden room. The proposal will not result in additional bedrooms for the dwelling. There is currently space on the site frontage for one off-street parking space. The LPA may wish to consider the potential impacts of any overspill parking as result of the loss of garage on on-street parking from an amenity point of view.
The Local Highway Authority does not consider that this proposal would have an unacceptable impact on highway safety or result in 'severe' cumulative impacts on the operation of the highway network, therefore is not contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework (paragraph 115), and that there are no transport grounds to resist the proposal.

**Drainage Consultants WSP:** - We have no objection on surface water grounds. Due to the site, size, location and type of development we would recommend approval of the application.

**Representations: -** 2 representations received.

4 King John Court: - The boundary fence is the responsibility of no. 3 to maintain, repair or replace. This is a covenant. With the pergola built the owners will not be able to maintain the boundary fence. It is in a poor state and needs to be addressed. Provided this is the case I will not object to the proposal.

10 King John Court: - The plans are reasonable and in keeping with the character of Emerald Quay I am glad to see such improvements being made to property in my area.

**Relevant Planning Policies**

Adur Local Plan 2017 Policy 15, 28
'Supplementary Planning Guidance' comprising: Development Management Standard No.2 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings''
National Planning Policy Framework (December 2023)
WSCC Guidance on Parking at New Developments (Sept 2020).

**Planning Assessment**

**Principle**

The relevant issues are the effects on the amenities of neighbouring residential occupiers and the effect on the character and appearance of the area.

**Visual amenity**

The front and rear of the site are visible in public views and will impact upon the street scene. The rear of the site is visible across a shared parking area and is adjacent to a first floor balcony structure. The glazed pergola will be dark grey and contemporary in style however it will not have any adverse impact upon the character of the building or street scene. It is acceptable within the context of the surrounding area.

**Residential amenity**

The property is mid terrace, to the south is a first floor balcony with stilts at ground floor. The proposed pergola will be ground floor level, and adjacent to the boundary, at 3 metres in depth it appears to be slightly deeper than the existing structure. The adjacent windows underneath the balcony are overshadowed and with the adjacent boundary fence it is not considered that the pergola will have a significant impact in terms of light and outlook.

To the north is a similar property with no rear extensions. The pergola will be 3 metres in depth adjacent to the boundary and will be glazed, therefore it is not considered that there will be a significant loss of light or overbearing impact in this case and the development can be supported. Development Management Standards state that extensions up to 3.5 metres in depth can be supported adjacent to the boundary of an attached dwelling.

The objection relating to the maintenance of the boundary fence is noted. This is not a planning matter and should be resolved between the neighbours. However it is considered that access can still be made from the other side of the fence if maintenance or replacement were required.

The changes to the front will be visible from neighbouring properties however there will be no adverse impact as a result of the replacement door and cladding.

**Highway Matters**

The conversion of the garage results in the potential loss of a parking space, however it is unlikely that the garage was used for parking. WSCC Highways have no concerns with the proposal, a parking space remains to serve the property and on street parking is available. There would be no justification for a refusal here and the proposal can be supported.

**Recommendation**

APPROVE

**Subject to Conditions:**-

1. Approved Plans
2. Standard 3 year time limit
3. Materials to match existing grey pergola and rosewood cladding and door.

**Is recommendation contrary to letter(s) of representation Y**

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: 22nd April 2024

Authorised by: Peter Barnett Date: 22 April 2024