Development Management - Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/1591/17 Recommendation – APPROVE

Site: 15 Church Street, Shoreham-By-Sea, West Sussex

Proposal: Replacement of timber conservatory with larger uPVC conservatory to west elevation.

Date of site visit: 6.11.17

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

The application site is a mid terrace property within Shoreham Town Centre, north of the High Street close to the church. It is within the Conservation Area and area covered by the Article 4 Direction. Consent is sought to remove an existing timber porch style conservatory which is to the rear elevation and to replace it with a larger conservatory constructed of uPVC. The design is proposed to be the same to match existing, however there will be variation in appearance due to the nature of the replacement materials.

Representations

None received

Relevant Planning Policies

Adur Local Plan 2017 Policy 15 and Policy 17
Supplementary Planning Guidance' comprising: Development Management Standard No.3 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings'
National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012)

Planning Assessment

Principle

The proposal comprises upgrading the existing housing stock located within the built up area and can be supported in principle. The relevant issues are the effects on the amenities of neighbouring residential occupiers and the effect on the character and appearance of the dwelling and its surroundings particularly in this case its impact upon the Conservation Area.

Visual amenity and Impact on the Character and Appearance of the Conservation Area

The development is to the rear of the dwelling house, however Middle Street is to the rear with access from the rear garden to the west with the main front entrance to the property from Church Street. Although the proposed extension is to be larger than existing and constructed in uPVC it is not considered in this case to have any significant adverse impact with regards to visual amenity and impact upon the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. Although the use of timber as a natural material would be preferable here, on balance, taking into account the limited visibility of the proposed extension, it is considered in this case that the character and appearance of the Conservation Area will therefore be preserved with no harm resulting. It is also considered that, while the scale of the conservatory as existing is preferable to the proposed enlarged addition due to its relationship with the existing building where it currently sits in a recess, on balance the enlargement will not be significantly detrimental and will not be visible within the context of the main dwelling. The building in this case is also not listed.

Residential amenity

As stated above, the conservatory is currently set back in a recess between the attached dwelling, no. 17 and the adjacent rear projection at the application site. The proposed addition will project beyond this recess and would be visible in oblique views from both no.13 to the south and no. 17 to the north. No. 13 is at such a distance that this would not impact upon the residential amenities of the occupiers of this property, there would be no loss of light, privacy or overbearing impact. No. 17 to the north has a high parapet wall which forms the boundary between this property and the application site. The extension will abut the side of this wall. The vaulted roof will project higher than the parapet and there is a first floor window set back close to the boundary. It is possible that the roof of the proposed extension would be visible from this window. No significant loss of privacy would occur here, the applicants may consider the option of obscure glazing the roof of the extension is they wish to avoid any potential of overlooking through the roof yet this is not considered of such significance here to justify conditioning such works.

Recommendation

APPROVE

Subject to Conditions:-

1. Approved Plans
2. Standard 3 year time limit

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

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.

Case Officer: Hannah Barker Date: 19th December 2017

Authorised by: Peter Barnett Date: 19 December 2017