Development Management - Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/1315/19 Recommendation – APPROVE

Site: 16 Myrtle Crescent, Lancing, West Sussex

Proposal: Retention of pergola in front garden (retrospective application)

Date of site visit: 16.09.19

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

The application site is a detached bungalow set back to the rear of properties on Myrtle Crescent. There is vehicular access to the side of no. 14 leading to the dwelling. The frontage of the property abuts the rear boundaries of properties 10, 12 and 14 Myrtle Crescent. Retrospective consent is required for an existing pergola which covers a raised fish pond to the front of the bungalow. Consent is required here due to the height of the pergola.

Lancing Parish Council: - No objection

Representations

None received

Relevant Planning Policies

Adur Local Plan 2017 Policy 15
'Supplementary Planning Guidance' comprising: Development Management Standard No.2 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings''
National Planning Policy Framework (February 2019)

Planning Assessment

Principle

The works are retrospective and have been added for the enjoyment of the occupier of the dwelling, the pergola has a roof and the applicant has advised that this is necessary to protect the fish in the pond. Within the built up area the principle of such development is acceptable. The main considerations here are the impact upon the visual and residential amenities of the area.

Visual amenity

Due to the position of the application dwelling to the rear of dwellings in Myrtle Crescent, despite the pond and pergola being to the front of the property they are not

clearly visible within the street scene. There is therefore no adverse impact with regards to the impact of the development upon the character and appearance of the surrounding locality and street scene.

Residential amenity

The pergola is clearly visible from the rear of nos. 10, 12 and 14 Myrtle Crescent the two storey terraced properties to the front of no. 16. The pergola is higher than the rear boundary fences and is positioned just beyond the boundary. On balance it is considered that despite the pergola being visible from neighbouring properties it does not result in any significant loss of light or overbearing impact. It therefore is not detrimental in this case. The structure is open and not enclosed on the sides and although there is a roof this is transparent and therefore a lightweight construction which is not in this case considered to over shadow the neighbouring properties. It is also positioned to the north of the adjacent dwellings.

Recommendation

APPROVE

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: 14th October 2019

Authorised by: Peter Barnett Date: 14 October 2019