Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: **Recommendation – APPROVE**
AWDM/1588/14

Site: **1 Beach Road**

Proposal: **Construction of a first floor conservatory over existing attached garage to south east side and car port and store at north west side**

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: /N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

The proposal is for a first floor conservatory to measure (at max) 3.2 metres in height, 5.5 metres in length, and 2.9 metres in width, and a single-storey car port with rear store to measure (at max) 2.8 metres in height, 6.4 metres in length, and 2.9 metres in width.

The application property is a two-storey modern building with large picture windows, occupying a prominent bend in the road facing onto Beach Green.

The surrounding area is an outer residential suburb on the beach.

Relevant Planning History
None

Consultations
Worthing & Adur Councils Environmental Health: *requires addition of the precautionary condition and the PFA informative*

Representations (summarised)
Occupiers of No. 2 Beach Road: *2 concerns. One privacy and overlooking, the other was access to our outer boundary wall for maintenance. We spoke to our neighbours. We are assured higher level window facing our house will either be frosted glass or UPVC and that conservatory will be built back from boundary to enable access, i.e. not as on the plan submitted. We accept this assurance and hence have no objections.*

Relevant Planning Policies and Guidance
Saved Adur Local Plan policies: AG1, AH7

Planning Assessment

Principle

Upgrading of residential accommodation is acceptable in principle.

Visual amenity

The suggestion to place a conservatory atop the garage would have a somewhat odd appearance, as it is not designed as an integrated sunroom extension.

However its design would be very similar to a glazed structure at first floor on the neighbouring building No. 2 Beach Road.

Both buildings are finished in white with large picture windows, so the white plastic frame of the proposed conservatory would match in with this.

The eaves of the conservatory are lower than the main house and the front of it is set in from the building's frontage. It is therefore physically subservient.

The car port is single storey and its flat roof is in line with the fascia of the front wall overhang. It is set well back from the building's frontage.

On balance, there is insufficient reason to resist the proposal from a visual perspective.

Residential amenity – effect on existing dwellings

It is the neighbour to the south-east of the application site who is principally impacted upon (the development is physically removed from the remainder).

This neighbouring building has altered its own flat roof garage at its side. Its roof now functions as an outside terrace with horizontal timber cladding atop it.

The neighbour has raised the issue of access for maintenance, which is not a planning issue. The conservatory would be built close to the shared boundary. However despite its elevated position, it would not adversely overbear and overshadow as the conservatory at No.2 is set slightly off from the boundary. There is no justification to insist the conservatory be set back from the boundary as the resultant harm from the proposal as submitted, would not be adverse.

The glazing in the east flank of the proposed conservatory is high level and can be obscured to ensure invasive views onto the roof terrace are avoided.

Views from the rear windows of the neighbour's conservatory would be at an acute angle to their roof terrace.

Unacceptable direct overlooking into the private rooms of this neighbour would therefore be avoided, even if the rear glazing was clear rather than oblique (although there would a reduction in the expectation of privacy by this neighbour and some degree of view would be afforded onto their conservatory and terrace).

Contamination

The application site is over 450 metres away from any known land identified as contaminated.

Therefore no justification exists to impose a costly and prohibitive condition relating to contamination in this instance.

Recommendation

APPROVE

Subject to Conditions:-

1. Standard time limit
2. Approved plans
3. Materials and finishes to match
4. Glazing to east to be obscure glazed

Informative

1. 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.
2. PFA

Is recommendation contrary to any representations? Y

Case Officer signed: Matthew Porter Date: 19-01-2015

Authorised and signed by: Peter Barnett Date: 19 January 2015