Expiry Date - 17/12/2010

Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: ADC/0416/10 **Recommendation – ~~Temporary~~ Permission**

Site: **26 Wilmot Road Shoreham-by-Sea West Sussex BN43 6BN**

Proposal: **Conservatory (facing Wilmot Road) and porch on east side**

The Application

The application property is a semi detached dwelling located on the south side of Wilmot Road. The front of the dwelling faces east, rather than towards the road, across a small green. The dwellings to the east are set some 7m further south while the dwellings to the west are positioned 5m further north. The front of the attached dwelling (No.24) is stepped back from the north side of No.26 by 1m.

It is proposed to construct a conservatory on the north side of No.26 facing Wilmot Road, measuring (as amended) 2.7m deep, 4.15m wide and 2.65m high with a pitched roof. A porch is proposed at the entrance door on the east side measuring 2m wide, 1.2m deep and 2.8m high with a pitched roof.

A previous proposal for a larger front/side extension in 2004 was refused (SU/141/04) on the grounds that it would be prominent, obtrusive and incongruous and would be overbearing and detrimental to the amenities of the adjoining property.

Consultations and Representations

Consultations/Comments

None

Third Parties

2 letters received from the occupiers of 24 and 27 Wilmot Road objecting to the original plans for the following reasons:

- Out of keeping and prominent
- Could be a distraction to drivers being located on a bend
- Will overlook front garden of neighbouring dwelling
- Increased noise pollution through light conservatory structure
- Increased light pollution through glazed roof of conservatory

not smart saved

Relevant Planning Policies and Guidance

Adopted Adur District Local Plan 1993 – 2006 (ADC 1996): AG1, AH7 and Appendix 11 'Supplementary Planning Guidance' comprising Development Control Standard No.3 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings'
PPS1 'Delivering Sustainable Development (ODPM 2005)

Planning Assessment

Policies

Policy AH7 refers to residential extensions but the principles are the same when considering extensions to non-residential buildings. It states that extensions and alterations should be designed so as not to result in an unacceptable degree of overlooking, a loss of natural light or an overbearing effect on neighbouring dwellings. They should be of sympathetic design and materials to the original dwelling and the area in general. The proportion of the garden area taken up by a proposal should not be excessive.

Government policy is set out in Planning Policy Statement PPS1 'Delivering Sustainable Development'. Relevant paragraphs are 17, which refers to the commitment to protecting and improving the environment; 18 which states that planning should seek to maintain and improve the local environment and help to mitigate the effects of declining environmental quality through positive policies on issues such as design; and 34 which states that good design is indivisible from good planning and that design which is inappropriate in its context, or which fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area, should not be accepted.

Visual amenity and character

The proposed porch will replace a smaller canopy roof over the front door and is not considered to have a significant visual impact, facing over the green to the east.

The proposed conservatory will be on the north side of the building in a prominent position facing the road. The Council's DC Standard states that "front extensions are particularly difficult to incorporate successfully with the existing house and streetscene. They should not usually extend significantly beyond the "building line", or abut side boundaries. In the case of semi-detached or detached dwellings, front extensions will only be allowed where the extension can be successfully assimilated into the streetscene and not unduly affect neighbours. Windows in side elevations of front extensions,

which are close to and overlook neighbouring properties, will not usually be allowed."

In this case, the dwellings in Wilmot Road do not have a uniform "building line" and are staggered both forward and behind the application property. Consequently, when viewed from the east, the conservatory will not be as prominent as it would otherwise be due to the forward position of the dwelling to the west. Its impact has been further mitigated during the course of the application by reducing its width, height and depth, so that it now projects only 2.7m from the north wall of No.26. It will be approximately 5m from the pavement. While there is only a low wall around the boundary of the property, on balance, the proposal is not considered to have harmful visual impact in the street scene.

Residential amenity

The extension has been set in 1m from the boundary with the attached dwelling to the north, No.24. It was originally to have a chamfered end but this has been amended to a straight edge following its reduction in depth from 3m to 2.7m. The impact from the front living room window of No.24 is not considered to be harmful due to the stepping in of the proposal and the set back position of No.24 by 1m from the side wall of No.26. A 45 degree line drawn from the midpoint of the living room window shows that the conservatory will be sufficiently distant from the boundary to not be harmful to neighbouring amenity.

Concerns have been raised about noise and light pollution and overlooking. For the reasons outlined above, the distance of the extension from the neighbouring living room window is considered to be sufficient to prevent any loss of amenity from light pollution or noise. A condition is to be imposed to ensure that the west elevation glazing is to be obscured.

Recommendation

APPROVE for reason that:-

1PPi

Subject to:

1. C1Ci
2. C12Ei
3. C18C3 "west side elevation of the conservatory"
4. This permission relates to the following approved plans date stamped received 13 December 2010:
   Dwg AA1-01B (Proposed Floor Plans and Elevations), Dwg AA1-02A (Site Plan and Block Plan)

Reason– For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning

Case Officer Peter Barnett Date 16 December 2010