Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/0050/14 Recommendation – APPROVE

Site: 2 Shirley Close Shoreham-By-Sea West Sussex BN43 6YH

Proposal: Conservatory to rear

Date of site visit: 5.2.2014

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

The application property comprises a semi-detached 2-storey house located within a residential cul-de-sac. The dwelling has been previously enlarged by a single-storey side and rear extension. Permission is sought for a rear conservatory attached to the rear extension, adjoining the boundary with the attached house No.1. It would be a maximum 4m deep with chamfered corners, and 3.9m wide with a pitched roof having a maximum height of 3.3m. It would consist of a uPVC frame and panels above a brick plinth.

Relevant Planning History

Single-storey side and rear extension permitted 2001 (SU/31/01/TP refers).

Consultations: None

Representations: None received.

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' National Planning Policy Framework (CLG 2012)

Planning Assessment

Principle

There is no objection in principle to the proposed development which constitutes up-grading of the existing housing stock.

Visual amenity

The size and design of the proposed rear conservatory is in keeping with the scale and proportions of the enlarged host dwelling. It would not be visible in

public views from the street. A garden depth of approximately 9.5m would be retained.

Residential amenity

The property most affected by the proposals is the attached house, No.1, which has also been enlarged by a single-storey rear extension to the same depth as that existing at No.2. The proposed conservatory would project approximately 2.8m further into the garden adjoining the common boundary before the chamfered corner angles inward to any overall depth of 4m. The side wall adjoining the boundary would consist of solid panels above the plinth.

Despite the overall depth of extensions to this property, the impact on No.1 is lessened by reason of the extension added to the latter. Although the depth and siting of the proposed conservatory would have some impact on daylight and outlook from nearest windows in the rear of No.1 the effect would not be so severe as to warrant refusal. The chamfered corner of the conservatory is shown to be clear-glazed enabling limited views across towards the neighbour's garden above the boundary fence. The effect of overlooking would not be unneighbourly in this suburban environment where a degree of inter-visibility between properties is inevitable, and in the absence of any objection from the neighbour, a requirement for the angled windows to be obscurely glazed is considered unnecessary.

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

Subject to Conditions:-

1. 3 year time limit
2. Approved plans
3. Plinth constructed in materials to match
4. West side wall of conservatory to consist of solid panels as shown on approved plan and thereafter retained.

Informative

The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by identifying matters of concern within the application (as originally submitted) and negotiating, with the Applicant, acceptable amendments to the proposal to address those concerns. As a result, the Local Planning Authority has been able to grant planning permission for an acceptable proposal, in accordance with the presumption in favour of sustainable development, as set out within the National Planning Policy Framework.

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

Case Officer: Jo Morin Date: 24.02.2014

Authorised by: Gary Peck Date: 25 February 2014