ADUR
DISTRICT COUNCIL

Executive
Head of Service
James Appleton

Direct Dial : 01273 263216
Facsimile : 01273 263203
carlos.hone@adur.gov.uk
DX 59765, Shoreham-by-Sea

Planning, Regeneration and Wellbeing
Development Control
Adur District Council
Civic Centre, Ham Road
Shoreham-By-Sea, BN43 6PR

Contact: Carlos Hone

Mr A Rogers
40 Dawn Crescent
Upper Beeding
West Sussex
BN44 3WH

Our ref: ADC/0190/09

Your ref:

Date: 29 June 2009

Dear Mr Rogers,

Re: Proposed rear extension, 129 Old Shoreham Road, Shoreham.
Application: ADC/0190/09

In reference to the above planning application.

I have now had a chance to make a site visit to see the proposals in the context of the site, and I feel that in principle the extension would be acceptable with a couple of minor changes.

As you are aware an objection has been raised by the occupiers of No.127, who feel that the boundary line on the block and location plan are not where they should be, that the proposals is out of keeping in design, and that it will result in loss of light .

The proposed extension would be hard-up to the boundary as defined on site, (irrespective of how the OS Maps read), and it would project into the rear garden by 3.95m with a projecting roof form which would project an additional 0.8m to the rear. The Council's Development Control Standard No.3 entitled 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings' states that rear extensions within 1m of a side boundary with an attached property should be no more that 3.5m in length. This is to minimise the potential overbearing effect and loss of outlook to neighbouring dwellings.

Bearing this in mind it is my opinion that the two dwellings are effectively 'link' detached, rather than attached, and that there is an amount of separation provided by the neighbours garage. The attached garage is 2.5m wide and the rear facing window does not give a significant outlook to the occupier, consequently the effect of the depth of the extension on the rear outlook of the neighbour would be minimal. However due to the extension making up the boundary and due to the sloping site (which I feel is steeper than shown in your drawings) I feel that the resultant extension may be overbearing to the

neighbour, and that it should be reduced in depth to 4m, this would mean eliminating the projecting roof canopy or reducing the depth of the main part of the extension.

With regards to the materials to be used on the extension. The house has a front elevation of face brick work, yet the side elevation is of pebble dashed render, and the roof is slate tiled. It would be usual to have a materials to match condition placed on any permission, and this is what I feel would be necessary with your clients proposals. Given that the whole of the terrace has slate roofs and there are a number of slate roofs as original in the vicinity, can you confirm if the roof can have slate tiles.

I would be grateful if you could amend the 1:1250 location plan and 1:500 block plan to show No.127 without the rear projecting element as currently they are incorrect, and the elevations if the gradient is steeper. Additionally there is a vertical line drawn on the SE elevation, and I would be grateful if you could let me know what it describes.

I would be grateful if you could mention my comments to your client and if you are minded to amend the scheme please forward two copies of the revised plans to me no later than 6 July, after which time if none have been received the application will be determined on the basis of its current submission.

Yours sincerely,

Carlos Hone
Planning Officer