Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: **Recommendation – APPROVE**
AWDM/1815/16

Site: **17 Buckingham Road Shoreham**

Proposal: **Retrospective single storey rear extension**

Neighbours checked: Y
Additional neighbour notifications: /N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

The proposal is for a single storey L-shaped rear and side extension to measure (at max) 2.5 metres in height, 7.4 metres in length, and 5.6 metres in width. It has been built out without firstly seeking planning permission.

The application relates to a mid-terraced two-storey dwellinghouse in an inner residential neighbourhood of Shoreham. The rear of the site abuts the Shoreham Conservation Area.

Adjoining to the north is a take-away fish bar, which has a single storey rear extension. Adjoining to the south is a ground floor office with self-contained flat at first floor.

Relevant Planning History
AWDM/0251/16
Single storey rear extension
Permitted 13.04.2016

Consultations
None

Representations (summarised)
Occupier of 15 Buckingham Road: *from initial planning submission told categorically that second part of length of this extension would be glazed with plastic conservatory frame which would have a sloped forward roof. Planning was granted as it was stated in the approval recommendation document that it would 'lessen the sense of enclosure'. This will no longer be the case if this application is granted and will leave my property with the feeling of being in a dark, gloomy tunnel light reaching into my property compromised. The revised proposal by way of its size, depth, and height and massing would have an unacceptably adverse impact on the amenities of my property and have a visually overbearing impact. The mass of this build from the upstairs bedroom window is overpowering. Inclusion of large window directly overlooking my property is very intrusive sitting directly to the boundary wall. I don't believe that such windows are allowable at such close proximity opening over the boundary. Seems out of scale and character in its appearance compared with existing residential development in the vicinity. Mr & Mrs Reddi have worked extremely hard renovating this property and I am*

at a loss to understand why the glazed conservatory element has been declined. As I understand from Mr & Mrs Reddi, the original, approved, plan incorporating this glazing exceeded the limit allowed for glazed areas. I have no objection to the original conservatory element with obscure glass facing. The conservatory element will completely lessen the impact to my property by allowing light into the recess of my property thereby minimizing any overbearing effect. I hope a scheme can be accommodated that is less incongruous and acceptable to both parties.

Relevant Planning Policies and Guidance

National Planning Policy Framework
Saved Adur Local Plan policies: AG1, AH7
Adur Local Plan (submission) 2016 policies: 1, 15, 17

Planning Assessment

Principle

Upgrading of residential accommodation is acceptable in principle, subject to satisfying the statutory test related to the setting of a Conservation Area.

Visual amenity and Heritage Asset

The extension is subservient in its form and scale to the host dwelling. Once finished the eventual exterior finish would match the host dwelling. The fenestration is of similar design and style to the rest on the host dwelling.

The rear boundary backs onto the Shoreham Conservation Area but the modest size and scale of the extension means that it has had a very marginal impact upon the setting of the adjacent Conservation Area; its established character and appearance of which has been preserved.

Thereby the statutory test for new development and the setting of a Heritage Asset has been satisfied.

Residential amenity

It is the neighbours either side who would be principally impacted upon by this development.

Neighbour to north

The extension would not protrude beyond the neighbouring buildings own extension and is of equal height, so any potential overbearing/overshadowing and/or overlooking/loss of privacy is negated.

This part of the development is no different to the scheme approved in AWDM/0251/16

Neighbour to south

Being single storey the extension would be physically removed from the first floor to avoid overbearing/overshadowing of the flat occupier. Views from the roof lights and rear facing fenestration onto neighbours would be oblique.

The ground floor is occupied by an office. There may well be some reduction in light and outlook as a result of the extension. However the office fenestration principally affected (that closest to the shared boundary) does not serve a principal workspace.

In the previous scheme, a fair proportion of the length of the extension would have consisted of plastic conservatory frame with a pitch, which would have lessened the sense of 'enclosure'.

According to the planning agent, the builders on site have built an extension of a different design without instruction from the homeowner. What has been built is unacceptable as it has resulted in harmful loss of privacy by the insertion of a side window and further reduced light and outlook to the neighbour.

The home owner has agreed to make some marginal corrections to reduce this harm. The side window is to be blocked up. Part of the height of the flat roof extension is to be lowered (but will still be higher than the original glazed frame and now would be rendered wall rather than plastic frame with glazing). The glazed lantern is now to be a roof light flush with the flat roof of the extension.

The glazed frame would have resulted in a sense of enclosure. The neighbour would have benefited from little if any borrowed light from the extension is to the north and on the other side is another extension which blocked light. So the betterment of using glazed framing as a mechanism for reducing the severity of overbearing and overshadowing would have been limited. The silhouette of the extension is only marginally greater due to its 'squaring off'.

In such circumstance, although the extension length would exceed the Council's adopted Standards, the severity of harm in overbearing and overshadowing terms would still not be sufficiently adverse to warrant withholding permission in this instance. This is subject to the corrective works being completed in a timely manner, agreed at 3 calendar months from the date of this permission.

Recommendation

APPROVE

Subject to Conditions:-

1. Approved plans
2. Within 3 calendar months the development shall be completed out in accordance with the approved drawing
3. Exterior finishes to match

4. No windows/openings in side elevations

Informative

The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by identifying matters of concern within the application (as originally submitted) and negotiating, with the Applicant, acceptable amendments to the proposal to address those concerns. As a result, the Local Planning Authority has been able to grant planning permission for an acceptable proposal, 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? y

Case Officer signed: Matthew Porter Date: 29-03-2017

Authorised and signed by: Peter Barnett Date: 30 March 2017