Expiry Date

Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: **Recommendation – APPROVE**
AWDM/1101/12

Site: **Nova Villa 63 Old Fort Road Shoreham-by-Sea**

Proposal: **Single storey rear extension**

Neighbours checked: Y
Additional neighbour notifications: Y

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

The proposal is a single storey rear extension to measure (at max) 3.4 metres in height, 7.5 metres in length, and 2.6 metres in width

The application site is a new two-storey building built in a modernist style on Shoreham Beach, an outer residential suburb of the Shoreham town

Relevant Planning History

ADC/0156/08 - Demolition of bungalow and erection of pair of flat-roofed three/four-bedroom houses with integral garages – Approved May 2008

Consultations

Adur & Worthing Council: **The Environmental Health** contamination officer**:** *please impose precautionary contamination condition*

Representations

Objection from residents of No. 61 The Meadway, summarised:
Surely council considers overdevelopment? Small bungalow replaced with two large four bedroom properties completely out of keeping. My home is overlooked by property in question and a further extension would put their rear windows even closer to us. A frameless glazing makes avoiding eye contact even less likely. Both households can see straight into each other's properties, will have their ground floor looming over my home. Less of a problem if they had retained trees as per original permission but unfortunately they have ignored that and council have deemed to do nothing despite previous enquiry. Ask you to try to fully understand the difference in ground level in relation to my home bearing in mind location plans always show my house incorrectly.. The rear is north facing, it does not get any sun that they wish to extend. Most of properties in immediate are have reasonably sized gardens – level on an invisible build line. Appreciate owner is an architect and wants to try out and have new design, but a Zinc roof? How is this in keeping with the surround area? Not in keeping and materials will not blend in. Build extent on plot excessive and glazing and ground floor height causes a loss of privacy. Trees will obviously never be replaced.

Relevant Planning Policies and Guidance
Adur District Local Plan 1993-2006 (ADC 1996) (saved policies): AG1, AH7
South East Plan (GOSE 2009): CC1, CC6, BE1

Planning Assessment

Principle

Upgrading residential accommodation is acceptable in principle.

Visual amenity

The scale of the extension is subservient and sympathetic to the design of the existing building, which is modernist in its style. Its form and materials and finishes to be used are equally appropriate for a building of this style.

The extension is positioned at the rear of the building and not visible from public vantage point.

Residential amenity

It is the neighbours either side and to the rear of the application site which would be principally affected by this development (it is removed from the remainder)

Neighbour to rear

It is unfortunate the depth of the rear garden of the application property would be made shallower.

However the difference in ground level between the application site and this neighbour is slight, even taking into account the raised decking built off the rear of the neighbour's own property. The plot of Nova Villa would still provide for a rear garden size sufficient to cater for the needs of the building's occupiers. This proposal is, therefore, not overdevelopment.

Further there would still be retained a distance of some 8 metres between the extension and the shared rear boundary, with more distance still to the neighbouring building itself. Such distance would be sufficient to mitigate any harmful overbearing and overshadowing effect onto the neighbour.

Turning to privacy, a 2 metre high close boarded fence demarks the shared boundary. This effectively screens the extension from the neighbour's view and what small amount of it not to be hidden would only be consist of a marginal protrusion of built form, mostly the shallow zinc roof. Even if this fencing were removed, the distances involved mean views into neighbour's own private habitable rooms from the extension would not be invasive in its nature as to warrant withholding permission. This circumstance applies when taking account of the raised decking built off the rear of the neighbour's own property.

This is because the distances involved are not untypical of a suburban environment, where a degree of inter-visibility is not uncommon.

Neighbour to side (west)

The extension will be built close to the shared boundary with this neighbour. However it would have a shallow length and extremely shallow roof pitch, so the shadow cast by it onto the habitable rooms of the adjoining neighbour would not result in harmful overshadowing and/or loss of light.

Its height would only marginally protrude above the existing fence, so the extension would not overbear. Unacceptable overlooking is negated by the absence of windows in the flank facing the boundary.

Neighbour to side (east)

Sufficient distance would be retained between the flank of the extension and the shared boundary with this neighbour to avoid harmful overbearing and overshadowing effect.

Although the extension flank facing this neighbour is to be glazed, the extension would be set off from the shared boundary and the majority of views afforded onto this neighbour would be screened by the existing boundary fence.

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 development would take place with detriment to the local environment. It would not result in any detriment to the amenities of neighbouring properties and consequently does not conflict with Adur District Local Plan 1993-2006 (ADC 1996) (saved policies): AG1, AH7 and South East Plan (GOSE 2009): CC1, CC6, BE1

Subject to Conditions:-

1. Standard time limit
2. Approved plans
3. No windows in east flank without prior permission

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

Case Officer signed: Matthew Porter Date: 03 -10-2012

Authorised and signed by: Peter Barnett Date:16 -10-12