Expiry Date -

Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: **Recommendation – APPROVE**
AWDM/1213/13

Site: **5 Eastbank**

Proposal: **Replacement rear decking (partial retrospective)**

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: /N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

The proposal is to seek approval for the physical alterations to the existing decking in the rear garden. These alterations are to install a privacy screen and remove the staircase on the west side of the decking and reduce the length of the decking by some 1.9 metres.

The application property is a bungalow with rooms in the roof. The gradient of the land drops north-south and, less significantly, east-to-west.

Relevant Planning History
None

Consultations
None

Representations
None

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

Planning Assessment

Principle

Upgrading of residential accommodation is acceptable in principle.

Visual amenity

The decking is at the rear of the property and not visible to the public. Although large its design would not be out of keeping with its domestic garden setting.

Its materials are sympathetic to a garden setting, and its scale is not out of keeping with when viewed against the backdrop of the rest of the building.

Residential amenity – effect on existing dwellings

It is the neighbours to either side who are principally impacted upon (the development is removed from the remainder).

In its present form the decking is harmful because it allows for extensive overlooking of the garden and intrusive views into the private rooms of the neighbour to the west, and there is additional overlooking of the glazing of the conservatory to the neighbour to the east.

To resolve this harm it is intended to physically alter the decking. Reducing the length of the decking platform by nearly half means the views that presently penetrate deep into the garden of the neighbour to the west would no longer occur, and overlooking onto the neighbour to the east would be limited to the side glazing of the conservatory. Views into the habitable rooms of the neighbouring building to the west would be negated by the new privacy screen. Noise and disturbance onto this neighbour would be reduced, with the relocation of the staircase off the from west boundary.

Given these alterations, the severity of the present overlooking would be sufficiently reduced to an extent where it would no longer be intrusive and unacceptable. Views onto neighbours would still occur but these would be oblique in their nature and not intrusive in the context of a suburban environment, where reduced privacy is only to be expected.

Equally resultant noise and disturbance from the use and access of the decking platform would not be untypical of that experienced in a domestic setting.

The decking structure is large and built close the shared boundaries. However it is relatively light weight in its design so allows for sufficient light to continue to be received by either neighbour and would not overshadow, neither would it overbear.

Recommendation

APPROVE for the reason:-

The development has taken place without detriment to the local environment. Subject to the decking structure being altered as shown on the approved plans in a timely manner, it would not result in any detriment to the amenities of neighbouring properties and consequently does not conflict with saved Adur Local Plan policies AG1, AH7 and the National Planning Policy Framework

Subject to Conditions:-

1. Approved plans

2. Within 2 months of the date of this permission the decking shall be physically altered on the site to accord with the approved plans.
3. The decking shall not be used unless and until the balcony screen has been installed. The screen shall be retained thereafter

Informative

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.

Is recommendation contrary to any representations? N

Case Officer signed: Matthew Porter Date: 19-11-2013

Authorised and signed by: Peter Barnett Date: 19 November 2013