Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/0242/12 Recommendation – APPROVE

Site: 14 Springate Road Southwick Brighton West Sussex

Proposal: Retrospective application for replacement detached garage with pitched roof in rear garden and replacement fence and wall on east boundary

Neighbours Checked: Y

Proposal, site and Surroundings

The application property comprises a semi-detached bungalow occupying a corner plot on the north and west side of Springate Road, a narrow residential road predominantly made up of pairs of hipped roof, semi-detached bungalows. It has previously been enlarged by a modest lean-to at the rear and rear conservatory.

Permission is sought retrospectively for a detached pitched roof garage located in the rear garden adjacent to the boundary with No.12 (to the north) and a 20m long section of dwarf wall with fencing above (overall height 1.8m measured externally) on the eastern boundary.

The garage replaces an earlier garage building in a similar location and is served by an existing access onto Springate Road. The wall/fence replaces earlier fencing apparently of a similar height.

The ground level of the application site is approximately 0.5m higher than the adjacent public highway so that the fence is only 1.3m above garden level.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

Planning permission for side and rear extensions with rooms in the roof including rear dormer with Juliet balcony was allowed on appeal on 3 May 2012 (AWDM/0825/11 refers).

RELEVANT PLANNING POLICIES

Saved Local Plan policies: AG1, AH7
Development Control Standard 3 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings'
South East Plan: CC1, CC6, BE1

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

Adur and Worthing Councils: The Environmental Health Officer recommends a condition in respect of potential contamination.

REPRESENTATIONS:

None. [An anonymous note has been received drawing attention to the fact that the fence and garage have already been erected.]

PLANNING ASSESSMENT:

The development comprises up-grading of the existing housing stock located within the built-up area and can be supported in principle. [The development is retrospective and the requirement for a condition relating to possible contamination is considered unnecessary,]

The relevant issues are the effects of the replacement garage building on the amenities of neighbouring residential occupiers, and the effects of both the garage and wall/fencing as built on the visual amenities of the area.

The impact on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers

The garage building is 9m long and 3.6m wide with a ridged roof 4.3m high. It is located 0.6m from the site boundary with No.12 to the north, and a minimum 2m from the site boundary with No.16 to the west. A window in the south side of the garage faces onto the garden. The submitted drawing indicates that the garage building is longer and extends deeper into the plot than the previous garage, although positioned slightly further from the common boundary with No.12. The external walls consist of smooth render above a brick plinth with a plain, concrete tiled roof (as yet unfinished).

The most affected property is No.12. There are 2 windows located in the flank wall of this bungalow which appear to serve a WC and kitchen. The increased size and 'bulk' of the garage building compared to the previous structure will have resulted in a greater impact on daylight to, and outlook from these windows. However, having regard to the overall separation distance of 2.5 metres and the fact that the rooms in question are not considered to comprise 'habitable accommodation' it is considered the severity of the impact is not so severe as to warrant refusal. No objection to the development has been received from the neighbour.

Design and the effect on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

The garage building is of a satisfactory pitched-roof design, similar in appearance to the previous garage on this plot [as viewed on Google Maps]. Whilst larger than the previous garage, it is of a satisfactory scale consistent with the amount of garden space without appearing overcrowded.

Images on Google Maps dating from 2009 show an earlier fence on the eastern boundary. The site at that time was well-planted with mature shrubbery within the site perimeters, which softened the appearance of the fencing (shown to be in a poor state of repair). The applicants have recently purchased the property and make reference to the valuation undertaken in connection with their purchase that refers to "defective boundary walls/fencing

should be repaired or replaced". Since 2009 all the former boundary planting has been removed. Consequently the wall/fence as built has a somewhat stark appearance within the streetscene.

The applicants have indicated that fencing is required at the height built in order to provide a degree of privacy within the rear garden. Had some of the former boundary planting been retained it would have provided the occupiers with more effective screening than the existing fence. However, the extension that has been allowed on appeal (AWDM/0825/11) would be sited only 1.4m from the eastern site boundary and therefore it is unlikely that the retention of the former screen planting would have been compatible with this development. In the circumstances, the visual prominence of the extension that has been allowed, sited well forward of the established building line on this side of the road, will have far greater implications in streetscene terms than the existing unauthorised fence.

The wall/fence is of a robust construction and its 'new' appearance will weather in time.

It is noted that fences of a similar height exist in similar circumstances on the opposite corner to the south and west (enclosing the side garden of 33 Springate Road). Thus, despite is current 'stark' appearance it is considered the visual impact of the fence is not sufficiently harmful as to justify refusal.

RECOMMENDATION APPROVE for the reason:-

The development does not detract from the local environment and has taken place without resulting in unacceptable detriment to the amenities of neighbouring properties. It consequently does not conflict with the saved policies of the Adur District Local Plan (AG1, AH7) or the policies of the South East Plan (CC1, CC6, BE1)

Subject to:-

1. Permission relates to approved Drawing No:437/01/A Date Valid: 4 April 2012

IS RECOMMENDATION CONTRARY TO LETTER (S) OF REPRESENTATION?

No

Delegated Decision

Case Officer Jo Morin Date 8 May 2012

Authorising Officer Peter Barnett Date 9 May 2012