Development Management - Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/1651/15 Recommendation – Refuse

Site: 83 Victoria Road, Shoreham-By-Sea

Proposal: First-floor rear extension

Date of site visit: 24 November 2015

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

The application property is one half of a semi-detached pair of flat-roofed, art-deco style houses at the north end of Victoria Road. It sits within a run of three such pairs of houses. The house has a flat roofed ground floor extension at the rear.

It was originally proposed to construct a first floor flat-roofed extension over the ground floor addition measuring 3m deep. It will be rendered to match the existing house. Following concerns expressed by the Planning Officer, amended plans have been received reducing the depth of the extension to 2m, where it abuts the boundary with the attached house, but retaining a 3m depth to the extension at a distance of 2.6m from the boundary.

Relevant site history

None

Consultations

None

Representations

Letter of objection received from the occupier of 85 Victoria Road:

- Loss of light and overshadowing
- Increased demand for parking in already congested street

Relevant Planning Policies

Adur District Local Plan 1993-2006 (ADC 1996) (saved policies): AG1, AH7 and Appendix 11 ‘Supplementary Planning Guidance’ comprising: Development Control Standard No.3 ‘Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings’
National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012)

Planning Assessment

Principle

The proposal comprises upgrading of the existing housing stock located within the built up area and can be supported in principle. The relevant issues are the effects on the amenities of neighbouring residential occupiers and the effect on the character and appearance of the dwelling and its surroundings.

Visual amenity

The proposed extension is flat-roofed as is the host dwelling and neighbouring properties. Consequently, it would not appear unduly out of character. It would be visible from Overmead to the rear but would have an acceptable visual impact.

Residential amenity

The extension will be 2m deep and positioned immediately on the boundary with No. 85 to the north, increasing in depth to 3m at a distance of 2.6m from the boundary. The Council's supplementary planning guidance on residential extensions, DC Standard No.3, advises that:

"Whilst two-storey (or first-floor) rear extensions that are within 1m of a side boundary with an attached dwelling, should normally be no deeper than 2.0m, extensions abutting the boundary, will not normally be permitted."

In this case, the extension will be 2m deep abutting the boundary and will be contrary to the advice in DC Standard No.3. The 2m length of wall immediately on the boundary with No.85 would be overbearing and would reduce daylight and sunlight to the upper floor window of that property. The impact would be exacerbated by its position to the south of the affected property.

The applicant was advised to move the extension 1m off the boundary in accordance with the advice in the supplementary planning guidance but they wish the application to be determined as amended.

It is considered that the depth of the extension and its proximity to the boundary would have an unacceptably harmful impact on the light and outlook for the occupiers of No.85 and it cannot be supported for this reason.

Recommendation

REFUSE for the following reason:

The proposed extension, by reason of its depth and proximity to the shared boundary, would have an unacceptably harmful impact on the light and outlook for the occupiers of No.85 to the detriment of their residential amenities. The proposal is therefore contrary to saved policy AH7 of the Adur District Local Plan, Supplementary Planning Guidance comprising: Development Control Standard No.3 ‘Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings’ and the relevant policies of the National Planning Policy Framework relating to sustainable development and good design.

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

Case Officer: Peter Barnett Date: 3 May 2016

Authorised by: Gary Peck Date: 3 May 2016