DELEGATED APPLICATIONS ASSESSMENT SHEET

Application Number: **Recommendation – Approve**
AWDM/0513/13

Site: **3 Beach Road Shoreham**

Proposal: **Single storey front and side extension (garage and car port demolished)**

NEIGHBOURS CHECKED: Yes

ADDITIONAL NEIGHBOUR NOTIFICATIONS (LIST ADDRESSES): No

PROPOSAL AND SITE AND SURROUNDINGS:

Permission sought for an L-shaped extension to the front and side of the existing house. This would measure (at max) some 2.95 metres in height and 10.5 metres in length, and 12.7 metres in width

The application property is a two-storey detached property with rendered white walls and front balcony atop an existing forward projection of built form. The building is in a somewhat dilapidated condition. There is a single storey garage built to its western side.

The area is an outer residential suburb of Shoreham consisting of detached residential properties in a variety of design and styles. The beach is to the south.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY:
None

RELEVANT PLANNING POLICIES:
Adur Local Plan: AG1, AH7
National Planning Policy Framework

CONSULTATIONS:
Worthing & Adur Councils: Environmental Health officer *request precautionary contamination condition*

REPRESENTATIONS
Objection received from occupiers of No. 2 Beach Road, summarised:

Received 9th May

We are adjacent to this property on western side. Plans not previously discussed with us. Gap between properties is extremely narrow – less than 1m (0.8m). Height of present wall is 2.2m and totally in front of our study window and kitchen door, partially in front of our side lounge window and not

in front of our kitchen window at all. The proposal blocks off all four spaces and also raises height of wall by 0.8m. Contrary to supporting statement submitted (claiming it would be an improvement), this worsens the light into our house very considerably. The study window, presently the only one that is totalled wall off, give us direct experience of how this would look. It would be much worse than at present because of higher wall proposed. Really would be like having all four glazed areas/light sources bricked up. The most acute problem is loss of light to kitchen. Our kitchen is very much a living space. Not used solely for food preparation. Our property has a very small rear garden as the planning officer has seen. We can not retreat to the bottom of the garden to get some private amenity space. Proposal brings front line of main house forward by the depth of the front extensions, thus altering the original design of the juxtaposition of these properties and reducing our amenity/views easterly along the coast. Very concerned about how this development would alter our ability to access our own for maintenance and repair. Because of the extremely narrow gap between houses we need to request access from 0.3. Houses on seafront need more than the average amount of maintenance. Concern is too mild a word. If this keyboard had a key marked 'teardrop' I would press it.

Received 12th May

Overbearing and oppressive, especially regarding effect within our kitchen, and as such, consider it un-neighbourly. Understand guideline that discouraged development within 1m of a boundary? Thought this was particularly so in regard to the building of living accommodation (a kitchen) up to the boundary. We get direct sunlight into a narrow shaft at the top of the study window up until about noon. It's not brilliant but it is sufficient to allow plants to flourish on the window still. Even this narrow shaft of light would go under this plan because of the increased height of the proposed wall (0.8m). Could we suggest an amendment that might include leaving a horizontal gap between a new build garage wall and the boundary along the length of the present wall? A calculation could be done to indicate what width might maintain luminosity. Something between 1 and 2m would seem a good guess. This would also allow us or any future owner to be able to access upper level of our house for window cleaning. Can we please re-iterate that our kitchen window gives essential light into a living area and any bricking up or fencing up this window is oppressive, un-neighbourly and unacceptable to use. At present, the kitchen window, though not the kitchen door, is only marginally restricted

Received 9th June

Seen amended plans on 4th June, same as previous. Only difference is removal of parapet wall. There would be a 30cm sliver of un-bricked window left that, it has transpired, is intended to be fenced up with a 2m high fence. On Sunday 2nd May we spoke to the people next door. They came round to our house. Described their intention to put up 2m high fence, so the amendment has made no difference to effect on us. They were doubtful we had planning permission for our kitchen window anyway! The window is on the original plans from 1960. Their garage was not built on the boundary. The coal bunker was not there either. On Tues 4th June requested to see plans

and application for 1985 project on 3 Beach Road. Have not been told when I can see these. Could you respond time be extended to allow us to look at these plans? People next door left us with strong impression we would hear something more from them. Is it possible for you to check please? Transpired mistakenly assumed for 20 years that boundary wall was our responsibility. It is not, it is theirs. We innocently attached a post to it and this seems to have annoyed them. We have offered to buy a slice of their land but they're not interested. We feel very much squeezed in this plot. No 3 is a much bigger site. Something is being done to us that we don't like; it hurts and seemingly we can do nothing about it. That's a pretty good definition of bullying. It is wrong, whatever the rules are. We don't know what we've done to deserve being treated in this way. Our kitchen would be in the dark and we would need lights on even when sun is shining. We have spent 20 years with a kitchen with a very unsatisfactory outlook. But at least there has been an outlook. We did not imagine at any point that anyone would think it acceptable to brick us in. Refrained from using words neighbour or neighbourly. They imply a sense of equality, mutual co-existence and respect that seem lacking here. Please can you let us know? We can't ask people who are on holiday. I was brought up in a back-to-back Coronation street type of house in north where the kitchen looked out onto a brick wall. If you allow this to go ahead you would be recreating those conditions in a detached house on the south coast for all future residents not just us. It just doesn't fit with this area and it's wrong.

PLANNING ASSESSMENT:

Principle
Upgrading of residential accommodation is acceptable in principle.

Visual Amenity

The extension is of a contemporary style which is evident elsewhere along Beach Road. Its scale would not be unsympathetic as it is single storey and its roof would sit at the same level as the top of the existing front protrusion.

The external surfaces of the extension would either match that of the main house or be sympathetic to them, and its fenestration would resemble that of the main house. So it would appear sufficiently integrated to the main house visually.

Although the extension footprint means it would come forward of the existing house, this extent of projection would be only be marginal. There is sufficient variation in the building line along Beach Road to avoid it appearing intrusive or overly prominent.

For all the reasons set out above there would be insufficient reason to warrant refusal of the proposal in terms of its visual impact.

Neighbours

The neighbour principally impacted by this development is the one to the immediate west (the proposal is physically removed from the remainder).

This neighbour has three ground floor windows which look directly out onto the application site. These serve a living room, a study, and a kitchen.

The living room and study are different functional areas of the same single open plan living space. None of these windows serve as the principal light source and/or outlook to this habitable space. The study serves only a small section of the living space and the living room windows facing east are high level secondary light sources. This habitable space is well served by light and outlook received from the large windows facing directly south.

The affected kitchen window is positioned over the sink. However it is not the sole means of light to the kitchen area. A larger window faces north in the rear elevation. This serves as the principal light source and outlook for the kitchen space.

As a result of this proposal both forward open plan living and the rear kitchen space would experience a degree of overshadowing and overbearing, with the latter experiencing this to a greater severity than the former. This is inevitable as the extension would be built close up to the shared boundary to a height above standard close boarded garden fencing (2 metres).

Nonetheless the fact is that given the fenestration arrangement to both rooms, the principal means of light and outlook to both these habitable spaces would not be affected. As such both areas would continue to receive substantial light and outlook. The consequence is that the severity of harm that would occur, by reason of the rooms being cast in greater shadow for longer periods of the day with a reduction view of the skyline, would not be so adverse as to justify withholding planning permission on this basis alone.

No windows/openings are proposed in the flank of the extension facing onto this neighbour so direct invasive overlooking would be avoided. There would be some greater propensity of mutual oblique overlooking of the rear gardens but this would be only marginally more than the present situation where both gardens are open to view due to the low rise boundary wall between the properties. The potential for invasive and unacceptable loss of privacy is therefore negated.

To avoid potential direct window-to-window overlooking it is recommended permitted development rights for additional windows/openings in the western flank are removed by planning condition.

Contaminated Land

The site is not contaminated so an informative would suffice to raise the applicant's awareness of this risk

RECOMMENDATION:

APPROVE for the reason:-

The proposed development can take place without detriment to the local environment and would not detract from the established character or appearance of the area. 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.

Subject to Conditions:

1) Standard time limit
2) Approved Plans
3) External painted render and masonry to match
4) Notwithstanding "pd" no windows/openings in west flank of extension

Informative:

If during development, any visible contaminated or odorous material, (for example asbestos containing material, stained soil, petrol/diesel/solvent odour, underground tanks or associated pipework) not previously identified, is found to be present at the site, then no further development (unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority) shall be carried out until it has been investigated by the developer. The Local Planning Authority must be informed immediately of the nature and degree of the contamination present and a method statement detailing how the unsuspected contamination shall be dealt with must be prepared and submitted to the Local Planning Authority for approval in writing before being implemented

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 LETTER (S) OF REPRESENTATION?
Yes

DELEGATED

Case Officer
Sign Matthew Porter Date 20-6-2013

Authorising Officer
Sign: Peter Barnett Date: 20 June 2013