Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/0096/13 Recommendation – Approve

Site: 42 Berriedale Drive, Sompting, Lancing

Proposal: Proposed single storey conservatory to rear.

Date of site visit: 20th March 2013

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

The application property comprises a semi detached bungalow within the built up area of Sompting. There is an existing shallow flat roof bedroom and kitchen extension to the rear. Permission is sought to add a conservatory extension to the rear of the bungalow the full width. The extension will have a glazed roof with solid sides and two sets of double doors and windows on the rear elevation onto the garden. Adjacent to the boundary with the attached bungalow to the south no. 40 the conservatory is to extend a maximum of 4.9 metres. Due to the existing flat roof rear addition and the boundary being angled this is reduced to 2.75 metres adjacent to the boundary with no. 44. The extension on this side is set at an angle which is parallel to the boundary. A distance of 0.85 metres is retained between the side wall of the extension and the boundary with no. 44. The extension has a maximum height of 2.85 metres where the existing flat roof is continued reducing the 2.35 metres where the glazed roof sloped down.

At the time of the site visit work had commenced on site and the foundations had been laid.

Representations: 1 letter has been received from the owner/occupier of no. 44 Berriedale Drive advising that they are happy for the application to proceed on the basis that the wedge above the brickwork facing no. 44 is infilled with brick as advised by the owners of no. 42 Berriedale Drive to retain privacy for both parties.

Sompting Parish Council: - Support for the planning application.

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’
South East Plan (GOSE 2009): CC1, CC6, BE1
National Planning Policy Framework (CLG 2012)

Planning Assessment

Principle

The proposal comprises upgrading 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 and the effect on the character and appearance of the dwelling and its surroundings.

Visual amenity

The proposed extension is not visible within the street scene it is to the rear of the bungalow. The extension is not considered to be overly large in the light of other similar extensions which are within this locality and the depth of the plot itself. It is not considered to be over development of the site.

The side and rear wall of the extension are proposed to be rendered to match the existing house. The roof is to be glazed. A condition is attached to ensure that the render will match existing.

Residential amenity

The main properties to be affected are no. 40 Berriedale Road attached to the south and no. 44 to the north. The extension will abut the extension at no. 40 which is a solid flat roof extension with a conservatory attached. The proposed conservatory extension will come part way along the neighbour's conservatory. It is not considered that the structure itself will have any adverse impact with regards to loss of light or overbearing impact. The plans show the side wall of the extension to be of solid construction with a wedge shown on the side of the sloping roof. It is considered that this wedge should be in solid uPVC to avoid and loss of privacy or light pollution to the adjacent conservatory.

The neighbour to the east, no. 44 has a single storey rear extension which is close to the boundary due to the angle of the boundary line. Adjacent to this boundary the conservatory will extend by 2.75 metres. This will bring it further out than the neighbouring extension however the application site is at a slightly lower level and due to its limited depth the extension is not considered to result in any significant loss of light or overbearing impact that would warrant a refusal in this case. It is considered that as with the southern side the side wedge of roof should be fitted with solid uPVC to avoid and loss of privacy or light pollution to the occupiers of no. 44.

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 policies of the South East Plan (CC1, CC6, BE1)

Subject to Conditions:-

1. Standard 3 year time limit
2. Materials to match existing dwelling
3. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: -
   Drawing no. 2 – received 29th January 2013.
4. The two side panels of roof on the south and north east side shall be fitted with solid white uPVC and shall remain in place at all times.

Informatives

1. If during development, any visible contaminated or odorous material, (for example asbestos containing material, stained soil, petrol/diesel/solvent odour, underground tanks or associated pipework) not previously identified, is found to be present at the site, then no further development (unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority) shall be carried out until it has been investigated by the developer. The Local Planning Authority must be informed immediately of the nature and degree of the contamination present and a method statement detailing how the unsuspected contamination shall be dealt with must be prepared and submitted to the Local Planning Authority for approval in writing before being implemented.

2. 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.

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

Case Officer: Hannah Barker Date: 20th March 2013

Authorised by: Jo Morin Date: 25.03.2013