Development Management - Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: **Recommendation – Approve**
AWDM/1513/15

Site: **9 Holmbush Way**

Proposal: **Demolition of existing conservatory and construction of single-storey extension**

Date of site visit:

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

The application relates to a semi-detached bungalow in an outer suburb of Southwick. A single storey rear conservatory has been built off it. The rear garden is terraced due to a change in site level.

The physically adjoining bungalow to the west is set higher than the application property. This has been extended by way of a rear flat roof extension. French doors exist close to the shared boundary.

The proposal is for a single storey gabled ended rear extension with bi-fold doors and circular glazed feature on its rear face. The full details, including its external parameters, are shown on the submitted drawings.

Relevant site history
None relevant

Consultations
None

Representations (summarised)
Objection received from occupier of 7 Holmbush Way: *significant loss of light to the rear of my property. Change the outlook and view from the rear of my property. We have a small rear garden and these plans would reduce light significantly. Lived here since 1988 and as a family we use part of the garden to enjoy breakfast, which we would no longer be able to go. The wall to the west side of the extension would come out into the driveway, level with the existing property built in 1956. Would mean extension would be built on the shared driveway to the property. This land has shared ownership legally and do not consent to it being built on land that I own jointly. Existing porch to rear and back of kitchen already extends onto joint land but prior to purchase. My solicitor has confirmed I don't own the land but do have rights of access which cannot be changed without my permission.*

Relevant Planning Policies
National Planning Policy Framework (CLG 2012)

Adur District Local Plan saved policies: AG1, AH7 and Appendix 11 'Supplementary Planning Guidance' Development Control Standard No.3 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings'

Planning Assessment

Principle

Upgrading of existing housing stock is supported in principle.

Visual amenity

The extension is domestic in its scale and proportionate to the rest of the building, with matching eaves and ridge.

The new fenestration is similar to that on the existing building. The circular glazed feature is different, but in proportion to the rest of the gable fenestration.

The extension would be built of matching exterior materials and finishes.

Residential amenity

It is neighbours to either side who are principally impacted upon by this development (it is physically removed from the remainder).

Physically adjoining neighbour to east (No. 11)

This neighbouring building is set higher than the application building due to a difference in site levels.

This height difference ensures the shadow cast by the extension would not result in adverse overshadowing and loss of light, nor would it adversely overbear. The angle of the pitched roof would also reduce potential for overbearing.

The absence of windows/openings in the extension flank negates the potential of unacceptable overlooking and loss of privacy. View from the rear fenestration of the extension would be oblique.

Adjacent neighbour to west (No.7)

The shared drive separates this neighbouring building from the proposed extension, which would negate the potential for adverse overshadowing.

This distance, together with the angle of the pitched roof, would avoid harmful overbearing (although some skyline would be lost as viewed from the garden).

The absence of windows/openings in the extension flank negates the potential of unacceptable overlooking and loss of privacy. View from the rear fenestration of the extension would be oblique.

Recommendation

APPROVE

Subject to Conditions:-

1. Standard 3 year time limit
2. Approved Plans
3. Exterior materials to match

Informative:

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? Y

Case Officer: Matthew Porter Date: 07-12-2015

Authorised by: Peter Barnett Date: 8 December 2015