**Date of site visit:** 11 December 2013

# Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

**Application Number: AWDM/1520/13 Recommendation – APPROVE**

**Site: 69 The Avenue Shoreham-By-Sea West Sussex BN43 5GJ**

**Proposal: Conservatory on south side**

**Neighbours checked:** Y

**Additional neighbour notifications:** N

## Proposal, Site and Surroundings

The site relates to a two-storey end of terrace house in a foot accessible cul-de-sac wherein the dwellings are arranged in a three-sided courtyard with their frontages facing a central landscaped area. The house has gardens to three sides. The wider area is residential in character.

Permission is sought for the construction of a conservatory with a mono-pitched lean-to roof and comprising glazed panels recessed from the frontage of the house on its south flank and measuring 6.6m long x 2.7m where it adjoins the house x 2.2m in width. The conservatory would be positioned on a very low brick plinth and its materials will be upvc frames and glass panels. In addition, the application initially proposed the erection of a 1.8m high close-boarded timber fence to the frontage boundary and to extend and adjoin the existing fence along the roadside boundary of the plot. This element of the application was deleted following discussion with the applicant's agent.

## Relevant site history

SU/101/83/TP/3742 Two-Storey Extension To Side (Bedrooms And Kitchen)And Screen Wall. Permitted

SU/92/94/TP/15480 Screen Wall (2 M.High) At Side (Adj. The Avenue) Permitted

ADC/0177/06 Two-storey extension on south side to create attached 3-bedroom dwelling plus parking. Permitted

SU/55B/62 Condition 3 removes 'permitted development' entitlements for any wall, fence and means of enclosure other than the screen walls and posts and chains shown on the deposited plan.

## Consultations

None

## Representations

Representations against the application have been received from five addresses. The objections relate only to the proposed fence as follows:

- position,
- design,
- disruption to the open character of the quadrangle,
- size is excessive and out of proportion,
- detrimental impact on the character of the road,
- loss of light,
- restriction of views,
- breach of a covenant,
- loss of vegetation,
- inaccurate drawings,
- lack of consultation,
- setting of a precedent.

**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**

**Residential amenity**

By virtue of the modest size and composition of the conservatory, together with its position to the south of the building, it is considered that there would result no significant loss of light, privacy or outlook for the purposes of the surrounding dwellings.

**Visual amenity**

The conservatory would be to the flank of the house and would be of a scale and size wholly subordinate to the dwelling. Notwithstanding its length which will occupy most of the ground floor side elevation, its modest projection and predominantly glazed form of construction would mean that it would not appear as an obtrusive form of development in terms of the impression of the house or within the wider street scene.

In reaching these views, regard has been had to the past grants of permission for developments for this same house.

The various objections raised in representations relate principally to the section of fence proposed for the plot frontage and as this element of the application was deleted they should be afforded only moderate weight.

One objection raised lack of consultation, although adjoining addresses were notified by letters dated 10 December 2013 and a formal notice was printed in the Lancing and Shoreham Herald on 12 December 2012.

An objection also cited the absence of an extension on the submitted drawings although this is shown in plan, is referred to in the foregoing history and is otherwise not considered material or critical in the consideration of the proposal.

**Recommendation**

**Approved**:-

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

**Conditions**

1 Time Limit
2. Approved Plans

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

Case Officer: Lawrence Simmons Date: 29 January 2014

Authorised by: Jo Morin Date: 30 Jan 2014