Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/1139/20 Recommendation APPROVE

Site: 60 Holmbush Way, Southwick, BN42 4YD

Proposal: Proposed conservatory to south elevation

Date of site visit: Assessment has been assisted using the Applicants plan and photos; the Councils Earthlight mapping; and Google 3D mapping of the site.

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Site and Surroundings:

The property is a semi-detached chalet style, 1 ½ storey bungalow situated on the south side of Holmbush Way within Southwick.

The front (north) of the property is utilized as a convenience retail shop. The north side of Holmbush Way is on rising land and the south side is on falling land. The application site lies lower than the road, and has steps leading down from the pavement to the entrance of the store. A slope to the side of the property provides vehicular access to the neighbouring properties rear garage, and access to the garden area of the application site. Other than a tree within the south-east part of the land, the garden is devoid of planting and is laid to concrete.

The property has rooflights within the front (north) roofslope; windows in the side (west) elevation; and a rear dormer in the south roofslope.

The area is characterised by a mix of house types and sizes, with a range from bungalows to 1 ½ storey and 2 storey dwellings.

Proposal

The application seeks permission to provide a rear flat roof residential extension. The plans, as amended, indicate that the extension will measure 3.5m deep x 4.4m wide x 3.2m high, (3.3m high to the top of the rooflight), and will be constructed in brickwork to match the existing dwelling.

Relevant Planning History: None

Representations: Objections: 62 Holmbush Way; 23 Queens Road

- Loss of view
- Loss of light all year round
- Overshadowing

- Overbearing
- Longer than my existing garden decking
- Too close to the boundary and fencing
- Guttering could overflow onto my decking
- Devalue my property
- The use of the extension will result in noise and disturbance which is contrary to Human Rights Act
- Overlooking
- Loss of garden land
- The shops large bin may be moved close to our fence
- The shops safety light comes on all the time and shines into our bedroom
- The extension will result in cramming
- Unneighbourly
- It will have a detrimental effect on the tree & therefore loss of wildlife
- The plans have been amended by only a minimal amount
- The build is so close to my home and garden starting at my border on the other side of the fence
- Encroachment onto my personal space
- Change of appearance of the houses, as currently they are symmetrical
- The build will be noisy
- Will impact on my family and future families
- The extension will come out to between the edge of the outdoor sofa and the edge of my decking

Relevant Planning Policies

Adur Local Plan policies: 1, 15
DM Standard No.2 SPG - Extensions and alterations to dwellings
National Planning Policy Framework (2019)
National Planning Practice Guidance

Planning Assessment

There is no objection in principle to the proposed development to provide a rear extension.

The key concerns would be the effect onto the existing neighbouring residential amenities.

Visual & Residential Amenity

The land at the rear is sloping downwards, and therefore any extension will have to incorporate the change in level within the construction, and the plans identify the level changes. The land changes also relate to the neighbouring properties, including the adjoining property no. 62.

The mutual fence between no.62 and the application site is approx. 2m high, the base of the fence being higher than the natural ground level. This thereby will make any building constructed higher than the fence by some 1.2m. The

height of the proposal is 3.2m which is because the build has to contend with the lower land level within the rear garden, and the fact that the internal finished floor level would be higher than the ground level.

The length of the application has been amended from 4m down to 3.5m in order to accord with the guidance within “DM Standard No.2 - Extensions and alterations to dwellings”. The height of the application has also been amended, with the pitched roof element being omitted and replaced by a flat roof. This thereby will reduce the height from 3.7m down to 3.2m.

The extension will lie to the west of no. 62 and thereby some overshadowing in the afternoons would result, but the scale and degree of such overshadowing is not considered to be demonstrable. The height of the extension will be some 1.2m above the fence height, and will be in line with the existing flat-roofed rear extension on the site.

No. 62 has also constructed a raised decked platform of approx. 800mm in height and the height of the platform means that persons using it will be able to directly overlook the amenity area of no. 60. The proposed side elevation of the extension will be a blank wall which will offer some protection to the application site from overlooking, and will not be so high as to result in a material loss of existing residential amenities to the existing neighbouring dwelling no. 62.

As stated above, the length of the extension now conforms to the SPG guidance, and its length will come to approx. the end of the second fence panel from the back of the house, which appears to be as deep as the neighbours raised decked platform.

On balance therefore, it is considered that the amended proposed extension is of a reasonable length and height which will offer minimal effect onto the neighbouring property no. 62.

Other points raised within the objections relate to a mixture of items ranging from loss of view to that the use of the extension will result in noise. The majority of the points raised are not material planning considerations. Those points that are material are considered to have been responded to above.

Recommendation

APPROVE subject to the following condition(s)

1. Approved plans
2. Standard time limit
3. Materials
4. No window in east elevation facing no. 62

Informative

1. Approved following amendment

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

Case Officer: Eve Hearsey Date: 06.10.2020

Authorised by: Peter Barnett Date: 6 October 2020