

Recommendation: Wrong Application type for recommendation code

Number of representations received: 1

- 5.1 **Summary:** Concerned the proposal will cause a very substantial loss of light to lounge should it be of solid wall construction.

6 Planning Considerations

- 6.1 Having regard to the relevant policies of the development plan it is considered that the main issues arising from this application are:

- (i) Principle of development
- (ii) Effect on neighbouring amenity

- (i) Principle of development

- 6.2 The 2015 amendments to the GPDO enabled the provision of rear extensions of this size and location subject only to a prior approval assessment of neighbour amenity and only in circumstances where the principle of development is acceptable. The impact upon neighbouring amenity is assessed below.

- (ii) Effect on neighbouring amenity

6.3 An objection has been received from the property to the east. The GPDO still allows for the construction of extensions up to the previously permitted size without the need to enter into the prior approval process. This means that in this case, an extension could be built of the same width and 0.4m higher without prior approval, should it have been 1m less in depth. The erection of fencing of 1.8m in height would also be permitted under the GPDO. This, in effect, means that the This is a material consideration in assessing the impact of the proposal on the neighbouring property.

6.4 The objectors have a conservatory to the rear of their property with a depth of approximately 3m. There is currently a trellis running from the rear wall of the original dwellinghouse, to the rear of the conservatory which offers minimal screening. From the rear of the conservatory (No. 19) there is a hedge of approximately 1.6m which offers natural screening.

6.5 It is important to consider that, under Permitted Development rulings, the applicants could build an extension of 3m in depth with a height of 4m, and then could erect a fence of 2m in height. The difference between this and the proposal would be 0.6 sq m. It is therefore considered there would be a negligible difference.

6.6 Whilst it is recognised that there would be an small impact on the amount of light to the rear garden in the late afternoon, the garden is in excess of 15 metres and it is therefore considered that the majority of the amenity space would be unaffected. For these reasons it is considered the impact on neighbouring amenities is not significant to the degree that prior approval should not be granted in this case.

7 Conclusion

- 7.1 Having concluded the above and determined that the development will not have a detrimental impact upon neighbouring amenity, this application is recommended for approval.
-

9 RECOMMENDATION:

That the Executive Head of Planning and Built Environment be authorised to Wrong
Application type for recommendation code for application APP/15/00629

(A) subject to the following conditions