Development Management - Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/0808/21 Recommendation – APPROVE

Site: 297 Albion Street, Southwick, BN42 4AT

Proposal: Part two storey/part single storey rear extension

Date of site visit: 24.06.2021: Assessment has been assisted using the Applicants plan; Earthlight mapping; and Google 3D of the site

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Site and Surroundings:

The site is located on the north side of Albion Street within Southwick, and lies within a cul-de-sac situated behind larger two storey dwellings which front onto Albion Street. The dwelling itself is a small two storey, middle of terrace dwelling with a pitched roof and an existing rear single storey extension. The group forming the terrace looks likely to have been constructed in the very early 1900's. The rear amenity area is also very small but neighbours and the application site have undertaken rear extensions.

Albion Street frontage is the main A259 Worthing to Brighton road, and dwellings are largely positioned on the north side of the road. There are a variety of sizes and ages to the dwellings within the street.

Although not listed, the terrace have history to them, dating back to the early 20th century, with them being known as Coastguards Cottages; with the building to the front west of the access to the cottages being known as the Coastguard Station (no's 279, 281).

The site is not in a Conservation Area nor is it a Listed Building.

Proposal:

The application seeks permission to provide:-

- A single storey, flat roof, rear extension between the existing rear extension and the boundary to no. 299, measuring some 2.3m deep x 2.9m wide x 3m high
- A first floor, hipped roof extension over the existing ground floor extension to the boundary with no. 295, measure some 2.3m deep x 2.9m wide x 6.5m high

Representations: Objection 299 Albion Street

- The 2 storey extension would ruin the aesthetics of the historical buildings in the small row of cottages
- Will also contradict the building itself
- Overlook & block natural light into my bedroom, kitchen & bathroom
- Large extension at the back of the house will block all sunlight out of my garden which would affect the value of my house
- I give no permission to gain access to the party wall for this extension as it will affect the structural integrity of my house
- Plans show an additional bathroom, where will the sewerage go
- Shared drains – may become overloaded
- Due to age of properties they are already sensitive and have had problems
- Drains would be overwhelmed and may cause blockages

Consultations: None

Relevant History: None

Relevant Planning Policies and Guidance

Adur Local Plan 2017 Policy 1, 15
Supplementary Planning Guidance' comprising: Development Management Standard No.2 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings'
National Planning Policy Framework 2019

Planning Assessment

Principle

The proposal comprises upgrading 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 surrounding area.

Visual Amenity

The terrace was constructed in the early 1900's and as such it's age and original build reasons are historical in time, the terrace are not listed nor are they in a conservation area, therefore the works will be acceptable in principle.

All of the properties within the terrace had rear extensions containing a w.c. back in 1927, and the proposed flat roof rear extension will not be any deeper than the existing extension; the first floor extension will have the eaves at the same level as the existing eaves; the built structures will also repeat the existing quoins and head arches around the doors and windows. Therefore although the first floor extension in particular is a new feature being introduced to this property, indeed to the terrace, the design and reflected detailing will tie in successfully to the original structure details.

The height of the first floor extension is lower than the main roof, thereby producing a subservient structure that is in keeping with being a later addition to its host.

Like all of the properties within the terrace, the rear amenity area is quite limited, made worse by the rear alley/covered way, this section travels the length of the terrace and measures some 1.6m in depth. Excluding the existing extensions on all of the terrace which measure on average some 2.3m in depth, the amenity area depth is only some 6.3. However no.'s 303 & 305 appear to have removed this alley/covered way and in consequence have an amenity area depth of some 8m

The proposed extensions are shown not to be deeper than the existing extension, and therefore as such, the rear amenity area will not be significantly compromised.

It is considered that on balance, the size and design of the proposal, both for the ground and the first floor extension, by utilizing the detailing of the existing dwelling, and not protruding further into the rear amenity area than the existing 1927 extension, will not result in any materially unacceptable loss of visual amenity and is considered to complement the host dwelling, and thereby be an acceptable addition to the rear.

Residential Amenity

The flat roof single storey extension at a height of approx. 3m in height would be some 1m higher than a standard boundary of 2m. The w.c. extension relating to the neighbouring property no. 299 is onto the boundary with no. 301, thereby the proposed additional 1m of the extension at the boundary with no. 299 has the ability to put the rear window of no. 299 in shade. But it is considered that due to the window likely relating to a kitchen area and because of the rear window being on a north elevation, the amount of overshadowing caused will not be detrimental to the existing residential amenities of that property. The extension is single storey and only 2.3m deep at this point too.

The hipped roof first floor extension will be to the boundary with no. 295, which will be to the side where the existing w.c. extension is positioned, and as the proposed first floor extension will be no deeper than the existing extension, it is purely the effects at first floor that is being considered.

The first floor will be to the east of no. 295, and thereby it will be the potential loss of the morning light that is being considered. No. 295 also has a long conservatory type extension with a glazed roof, and thereby the light lost in the mornings could take some light from the part of the conservatory adjoin the dwelling. Due to the movement of the light it is considered that largely by midday the orientation from the sun would have traversed to be to the front of the dwellings thereby any shadowing that had occurred would be now corrected.

No. 295 does have a small window close to the edge of the dwelling which could suffer loss of light, but due to its size, it is not considered that it relates to a principal room and therefore is not a material consideration. It is thereby considered that on balance, the first floor extension will not result in any material loss of existing residential amenities to no. 295

No. 299 could have some loss of light to their property from the first floor extension, but as they are a greater distance than no. 295, it is considered that any loss will be

diminished, and again because of orientation, the loss of the movement of light to the south will then potentially reoccur from the west with the afternoon light but again because the extension will only be some 2.3m deep, it is not considered to be so demonstrable as to justify the withholding of the planning permission.

The first floor extension will of course be viewed from no. 299, but the fact that it can be viewed does not make it unacceptable, which is considered to be the case in this instance.

The first floor extension does not have any windows proposed in the side elevations, and in order to prevent overlooking to its neighbouring properties, a condition restricting windows in these elevations would be reasonable.

3rd Party Representations

It is considered that the 3rd party representations have largely been responded to within the text of the report. Other matters raised such as selling property; party wall; structural integrity; sewerage; shared drains; access to man hole covers, are not material planning matters and thereby will not be considered here.

Recommendation:

Approve:
Subject to Condition(s):-

1. Approved plans
2. Standard time limit
3. Materials
4. Windows

Informatives:-

1. Approved without amendment

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

Case Officer: Eve Hearsey Date: 30.06.2021

Authorised by: Peter Barnett Date: 30 June 2021