Development Management – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/1105/16 Recommendation – REFUSE

Site: 12 Orchard Close, Southwick, Brighton

Proposal: Replacement conservatory to rear (west) elevation.

Date of site visit: 6.09.16

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Site, Surroundings and Proposals

The application site is a two storey semi-detached property within a cul-de-sac of similar dwellings. There is an existing lean-to conservatory style extension to the rear of the dwelling with parapet walls forming the side elevations.

Permission is sought to remove the existing extension and to replace it with a new conservatory 5.5 metres in depth, 6.1 metres wide (slightly set in from the boundary with the attached semi.) It has a full glazed, hipped roof to the centre of the extension, to a maximum height of 3.7 metres. The existing side parapet walls are to be modified and extended to form the side elevation of the proposed extension.

Consultations: Southern Water – No objections

Representations: None received.

Relevant Planning Policies

Saved Local Plan policies (ADC 1996): AG1, AH7
Development Control Standard No.3 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings'
National Planning Policy Framework (CLG 2012)
National Planning Practice Guidance

Planning Assessment

There is no objection in principle to the proposed extension which would upgrade an existing property within an established residential area. The key concerns are the effects on the residential and visual amenities of the locality.

Visual Amenity

The proposed extension is large at 5.5 metres and in relation to this dwelling which is of standard size and being a semi-detached dwelling this could be considered to be out of scale within the main dwelling. Despite this the extension is positioned to the rear of the dwelling and will not be visible within the street scene, therefore on

balance there will be no adverse impact with regards to the visual amenities of the locality.

Residential Amenity

To the south of the site is no. 14 Orchard Close. Adjacent to the boundary with the site this property has a flat roof outbuilding which appears to be attached to the dwelling via an extension. This development acts as a screen from the site for the occupiers of no. 14. There is also a space between the proposed extension and the mutual boundary with no. 14 of approximately 1.5 metres. These factors combined mitigate any adverse impact.

The attached dwelling to the north has a rear conservatory extension similar to that existing at the application site. It is however slightly deeper and has a glazed side panel onto the boundary. The proposed extension, although slightly set in will run adjacent to the boundary with no. 10. The parapet wall is to be adapted and continued adjacent to the neighbouring extension, the proposed extension being 5.5 metres would extend far beyond the existing extension at no. 10. A solid brick wall 5.5 metres in depth adjacent to the boundary at 2.4 metres high would be an oppressive and overbearing feature. It would result in some loss of light yet the main concern here is the unneighbourly and oppressive impact at such an excessive depth and in such close proximity to the boundary.

It should be noted here that officer's advised the applicant's agent that a reduction to a maximum depth of 4.5 metres could, on balance be supported here. Whilst still being a significant addition the impact could be justified taking into account the existing additions at both the application site and the extension at no. 10. The agent advised that the applicant wished to have the application determined as submitted and was not willing to amend the plans.

As it stands, the proposal cannot be supported and is recommended for refusal for the following reason.

Recommendation

REFUSAL

The proposed conservatory extension, by reason of its height, depth and proximity to the boundary would have an unneighbourly impact on the amenities of the attached dwelling to the north, resulting in an unacceptably oppressive and overbearing effect, contrary to saved policy AH7 of the Adur District Local Plan, the Council's SPG 'Development Control Standard No.3 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings' and the NPPF.

Informative

1. Proactive statement refused with discussion

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

Case Officer: Hannah Barker Date: 26th September 2016

Authorised by: Jo Morin Date: 29.09.2016