Development Management – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/1318/16 Recommendation – APPROVE

Site: 5 Downland Close, Southwick, Brighton, West Sussex

Proposal: Replacement rear conservatory to include raised patio to rear of extension (increased in width from that which is existing)

Date of site visit: 18.10.16 revisited – 8/11/16

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Site, Surroundings and Proposal

The application relates to a semi-detached house within a cul de sac of similar dwellings. There is an existing traditional style conservatory to the rear of the dwelling. Permission is sought to remodel and build the structure to form a new extension with solid roof, bifolding doors to the rear, dwarf brick walls with glazed sides. The dimensions of the extension will remain the same, although visually it will differ in appearance. Although still to be fitted with a significant amount of glazing, the extension will be of a more solid construction.

As existing there is a raised patio with steps down to the garden leading from the rear of the conservatory. Due to the design of the extension differing with a wider opening and bifold doors to allow access to and from the extension the raised platform and steps will need to be widened to allow safe and proper access when the bifolds are fully open. This was not clearly shown on the originally submitted plans. It was considered that as this raised platform was to be increased in width, brought closer to the boundary and did not constitute permitted development then it should form part of the proposal and amended plans should be sought to show the details of this element of the development.

Amended plans have been received and the decision relates to these amendments.

Consultations: Southern Water: - Standard informative regarding position of public sewer.

Representations: Occupier of 4 Upper Kingston Lane has written in stating that they find it ridiculous to be consulted regarding a single storey extension which will have no impact upon them but object to the loft conversion which violates privacy, with no neighbourhood consultation.

Relevant Planning Policies

Saved Local Plan policies (ADC 1996): AG1, AH7

Development Control Standard No.3 ‘Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings’
National Planning Policy Framework (CLG 2012)
Submission Adur Local Plan 2016 – Policy 15
National Planning Practice Guidance

Planning Assessment

There is no objection in principle to the proposed extension which would upgrade an existing property within an established residential area. The key concerns are the effects on the residential and visual amenities of the locality.

Visual Amenity

The extension is to the rear of the dwelling and is therefore not visible within the street scene. It varies in appearance to existing yet the tiles to the roof and bricks used will match the existing house. There will be no adverse impact in terms of visual amenity.

Residential Amenity

The extension is to form the same footprint as the existing conservatory. It will be built up to the boundary with the attached dwelling no. 3 to the south. The side elevation of the conservatory adjacent to no. 3 is currently glazed, this glazing abuts a single storey extension at no. 3. The proposed extension is shown to be glazed also on this elevation and as it is not increasing in depth the impact of the glazing will not differ. Similarly as a whole the extension is screened from no. 3 by the current extension. Therefore the alterations will not provide any different impact.

As stated above the raised platform to the rear of the proposed extension is to be widened and forms a part of the above consent. For consideration here is the impact of the close proximity of the raised platform to the boundary with no. 3 Downland Close. The fence on the boundary between no. 5 and no. 3 appears to be 1.8 metres high. It is considered that the raised area adjacent to the boundary could give rise to overlooking adjacent to the rear of the neighbouring dwelling. A condition is attached to require the boundary fence to be increased in height by 0.5 metres to screen the neighbouring property and eliminate potential mutual overlooking.

This requirement has been discussed on site with the applicant and the fence is within his ownership and to add height to the existing fence one panel deep would be acceptable. The case officer has also had email confirmation from the neighbour at no. 3 to confirm that they have no concerns with this condition being imposed and implemented and that the increase in fence height would have no adverse impact.

There is a deep rear garden therefore the dwellings to the rear will not be impacted. To the north the dwellings are separated by attached garages and adjacent driveways, therefore the extension will be at such a distance to avoid and loss of light or overbearing impact.

Following the reconsultation of neighbours in relation to the amended plans a resident to the rear of the site, no. 4 Upper Kingston Lane has written in stating that

they find it ridiculous to be consulted regarding a single storey extension which will have no impact upon them but object to the loft conversion which violates privacy, with no neighbourhood consultation. The letter refers to permitted development and states that Adur and Worthing Council's need to get their priorities right. Unfortunately due to permitted development rights neighbours were not notified for the loft conversion and planning matters such as overlooking and loss of privacy were not a consideration at this time. The neighbour was notified twice due to the submission of amended plans.

Recommendation

APPROVE
1. time limit
2. materials to match existing
3. Prior to the use of the rear extension and raised platform hereby permitted, the boundary fencing between the application site and no. 3 Downland Close shall be increased to the height of 2.3 metres measured from natural ground level at the application site the depth of one fence panel along the boundary. The fence shall remain in place at this height at all times.
Reason: - To avoid mutual overlooking and loss of privacy between the neighbouring properties as a result of the raised platform in close proximity to the boundary.

Informative

1. southern water informative
2. Proactive with amendments

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

Case Officer: Hannah Barker Date: 28th November 2016

Authorised by: Peter Barnett Date: 28 November 2016