Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/1233/19 Recommendation – APPROVE

Site: 23 Orchard Close, Southwick, BN42 4NJ

Proposal: Proposed single storey rear extension.

Date of site visit: 22.08.2019

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Site and Surroundings

The property is a semi-detached, two storey dwelling, with a brick plinth and painted render above. The dwelling also has an existing rear glazed conservatory.

The Close comprises predominantly two storey dwellings mainly brick but some have a render finish.

The neighbouring property no. 26, has a triple door to the rear, closest to the boundary with the application site, which is fully glazed.

Proposal

The proposal seeks permission to replace the existing conservatory with a larger conservatory measuring 4m deep x 4m wide x approx. 3.3m high (excluding finial). The proposed extension will be approx. 500mm from the boundary with the neighbouring property no. 26 Orchard Close.

Planning History*:* None

Representations: None received

Relevant Planning Policies

Adur Local Plan: Policy 15
DM Standard No.2 SPG - Extensions and alterations to dwellings
Planning Policy Framework (2019)
National Planning Practice Guidance

Planning Assessment

The proposal is acceptable in principle, subject to its effect on the visual and residential amenity of the neighbouring properties and the character of the street scene in general.

The proposal seeks to replace the existing fully glazed conservatory with a half glazed conservatory. The length of the proposal will be 1020mm deeper and 365mm wider than the existing conservatory. The height will be the same as the existing conservatory.

The west elevation will be partially bricked with the end section bricked to approx. 1m in height by 1m in depth, whereas the remaining part of the west elevation will be bricked up to a height of some 1.8m

Above the brickwork on the west elevation will be glazed with obscure glass. There is no indication on the plans than any of the west side windows will be opening, and a condition restricting the ability to open would be reasonable.

The brickwork on the remaining elevations will be approx. 1m up from the ground floor.

There is an existing rear extension section to the dwelling which appears to be original feature, and the current proposal will overlap this section at the rear by approx. 300mm x 900mm, which because it is at the rear of the dwelling will not result in material harm to the visual amenities or the character of the locality.

The Development Management Standard No. 2 on Extending and Alterations to dwellings is a supplementary planning document, gives guidance on rear extensions and states that on semi-detached dwellings, single storey rear extensions which abut, or are within 1m of a common side boundary with an attached dwelling should normally be no deeper than 3.5m.

In this instance the proposed extension is approx. 500mm from the boundary but is 4m in depth (being 1m deeper than the existing extension). The direct neighbour, no. 26, has a triple rear window closest to the boundary and using the 45 degree rule (i.e. measuring a 45 degree line from the mid-point of the window, and if that line dissects the proposal, that part of the proposal could result in harm to the neighbour), there is a small section of the proposal some 400mm from the end of the extension that the line crosses.

The small section equates to approx. 0.08 square metres which could cause harm to no. 26. It is considered that this amount would be too small to result in material harm onto that property. The extension is set of the boundary and has a glazed roof. The properties face south and will enjoy light for much of the day. It is also noted that the adjoining occupier has not written in to object to the proposal. Taking all of the above into account, it is considered that an exception can be made in this case and the application can be approved.

Recommendation APPROVE, subject to the following conditions

1. Approved plans
2. Standard time limit
3. Brickwork to match the existing brickwork plinth
4. The windows on the west elevation to be obscure glazed and be permanently non-opening

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

1. Approved without amendment

Case Officer: Eve Hearsey Date: 07.10.2019

Authorised by: Peter Barnett Date: 7 October 2019