Development Management– Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/1025/16 Recommendation – APPROVE

Site: 20 Victoria Road, Shoreham-By-Sea, Wet Sussex

Proposal: Single storey rear extension to east elevation to replace existing conservatory.

Date of site visit: 6.09.16

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Site, Surroundings and Proposal

The application is a two storey terrace within Victoria Road near the town Centre in Shoreham-By-Sea. The southern end of Victoria Road is a densely developed residential area. There are many similar terrace buildings ether side and to the rear of the site.

This dwelling is an end of terrace with a narrow alley to the north of the site. There is an existing flat roof rear extension at the dwelling with side lean to. Consent is sought to remove the existing extension and to add a solid, rendered flat roof extension to the rear which is greater in width than the existing extension but not as deep. It will incorporate the area where the existing lean to is and extend to the rear beyond this bringing the extension up to the boundary to the north. The extension has a total width of 4.8 metres and depth of 6.8 metres. The design is of flat roof with three roof domes. The extension as originally submitted was 3.15 metres high. Amended plans have been submitted to show a reduction in overall external height to 2.85 metres. These were requested to limit the impact to the dwelling to the north.

The extension will provide an enlarged kitchen and bathroom.

Consultations: Southern Water: - It appears that the developer is intending to build close to a public foul sewer which is crossing the site. Measures must be agreed with Southern Water prior to commencement of works.

A formal connection to the public sewerage system is required in order to service this development.

West Sussex County Council – Archaeology – No objection on archaeological grounds. No mitigation measures required.

Representations: None received.

Relevant Planning Policies

Saved Local Plan policies (ADC 1996): AG1, AH7
Development Control Standard No.3 ‘Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings’
National Planning Policy Framework (CLG 2012)
National Planning Practice Guidance

Planning Assessment

There is no objection in principle to the proposed extension which would upgrade an existing property within an established residential area. The key concerns are the effects on the residential and visual amenities of the locality.

Visual Amenity

The extension is to the rear of the dwelling therefore it is not visible within the street scene. It will not impact upon surrounding public views. As existing the building has piecemeal additions to the rear as is common with properties such as this. The proposal will remove these additions and allow for a more holistic development to the rear. This will have a greater width, although the depth is reduced. The flat roof design is similar to that of the adjacent extension to the south and is not considered to be detrimental to the character and appearance of the existing dwelling or out of scale.

Residential Amenity

The main concern here is that of residential amenity. The addition will abut the existing extension attached to the south. It will extend slightly deeper than the adjacent extension. However the existing extension is 2.3 metres less than that proposed therefore any impact would be lessened as a result of the proposal. The extension is however higher, despite the reduction in height proposed in the amendments. The existing party wall is to be extended up and to the rear. There will be no impact with regards to loss of light, privacy or overbearing impact that would warrant a refusal to the dwelling to the south.

To the north is the adjacent end of terrace, no. 22. As existing the rear projection of no. 22 has side windows which face onto the side elevation of no. 20. These serve a kitchen and dining room and there is a patio door to the rear, also serving the kitchen. The proposed extension will come closer to this adjacent property and will be higher, than the existing extension. The request to lower the extension was an attempt to reduce any overbearing impact or loss of light to the side kitchen window. The reduction in height has mitigated some impact yet it is acknowledged that impact still remains. Yet it is considered, on balance, that this impact would not be such to warrant a refusal in this case. The building will be rendered and finished in white to match existing. The kitchen also gains light and aspect via the patio window to the rear which faces east. Also account must be given to the limited light and outlook currently received from this side window. On this basis a positive recommendation is made. Privacy will be protected by the attachment of a condition to ensure no openings are formed on the side elevation, which is an improvement to the existing situation.

Recommendation

APPROVE

1. time limit
2. materials to match
3. no openings on the north side elevation
4. approved plans

Informative

1. Proactive revisions
2. Southern Water connection to sewer
3. Southern Water building over/close to a sewer.

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

Case Officer: Hannah Barker Date: 27th September 2016

Authorised by: Jo Morin Date: 28.09.2016