Expires 27/8/07

Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: ADC/0397/07 **Recommendation – Permit Application**

Site: **9A Havenside Shoreham-by-Sea West Sussex BN43 5LN**

Proposal: **Rear conservatory erection**

The Application

The application site is a semi-detached chalet style house located on the north side of Havenside, Shoreham Beach. The property features an east side rear garage, front and rear dormers, and a recent ground floor infill. It is bounded to the east by a detached chalet house and to the west by the adjoining neighbour, No.9. To the rear is a large garden backing onto No.49 Beach Green beyond. The proposal is to add a large conservatory off the rear elevation that is to be 6 metres in length, 3.3 metres wide with a height of 3.4 metres to the ridge line. It will extend from the dining room infill along the boundary with the adjoining neighbour with a brick base and east facing external doors.

Consultations and Representations

Third Parties

No representations have been received.

Contributors

No representations have been received.

Relevant Planning Policies and Guidance

Adur District Local Plan: AG1, AH7
West Sussex Structure Plan: DEV1
Development Control Standard No.3: 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings'

Planning Assessment

The main planning concern with this application is the extent of the conservatory in relation to the adjoining property.

The conservatory is to be pitch roofed and will sit alongside the common boundary with the adjoining property. The Council's DC standard for rear extension/additions states that, when sited within 1 metre of a common side boundary with an attached dwelling, such additions should not exceed 3.5 metres in length. The proposed conservatory sits at 6 metres in depth, clearly exceeding this recommendation.

On visiting the site it is clear that the conservatory will not adversely impact on the amenity of No.9. The proposed eaves height of 2.3 metres is 0.5 metres higher than the boundary fencing however there is further significant planting beyond the fencing that shields the majority of the conservatory from view. As this planting is most prominent towards where the end of the conservatory is proposed to be, any reduction in depth to 3.5 metres will be of no consequence to the amenity of No.9.

Should the boundary planting be removed in the future the low height of the conservatory in relation to the fencing will not appear significantly overdominant and cause loss of daylight/privacy to No.9. The departure from the DC standard recommended depth is thus deemed to be acceptable.

The boundary side of the proposal is to be brick built up to the fence height, beyond which is obscured glazing and then the pitched roof sloping away. It is not considered that this 0.5 metres of obscured glazing causes any overbearing effect or privacy issues however it should be conditioned to remain obscured and shut.

A large rear garden will remain whilst the east facing windows will sit 5.8 metres from the west boundary and cause no amenity concerns for No.11 beyond.

Recommendation

APPROVE for reason that :-

1PPi

Subject to:

1. C1Ci: (standard time limit)
2. C18C3: 'The windows in the west side elevation...' (Glazing in side windows to be obscured and fixed shut)

Case Officer:.....

CJ 16.8.07

Date: 8/8/07.....