# Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

**Application Number:** **Recommendation – APPROVE**
**AWDM/1667/14**

**Site:** **33A Old Fort Road Shoreham-By-Sea**

**Proposal:** **Two-storey rear extension to replace existing conservatory**

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

**Proposal, Site and Surroundings**

The proposal is for a two-storey rear extension to measure (at max) 7.9 metres in height, 3 metres in length, and 5.7 metres in width.

The application property is a detached chalet bungalow with a side extension and a rear conservatory.

The surrounding area is an outer suburb of Shoreham, residential in its character.

**Relevant Planning History**
None

**Consultations (summarised)**

**Worthing & Adur District Council Environmental Health** *Contamination officer requests precautionary contamination condition, PFA Informative, and relevant asbestos register*

**Representations (summarised)**
Objection received from Mr Matthew Kerr (address not given):-
*Overall plans are satisfactory. Object to introduction of second VELUX/roof window. The window overlooks my kitchen and conservatory further reducing privacy. Our conservatory has clear glass roof construction and is walkway between bedroom and bathroom thus our privacy will be gone if approval. At the very least window could be frosted to allow us to keep some privacy.*

**Relevant Planning Policies and Guidance**

Adur Local Plan (saved policies): AG1, AH7
National Planning Policy Framework

**Planning Assessment**

***Principle***

Upgrading of residential accommodation is acceptable in principle.

***Visual amenity***

The scale and form of the extension is domestic and is well integrated to the host dwelling.

The ridge line and exterior materials/finishes would match. The eaves at either side do not match, but the extension is to be at the rear of the building and would only be obliquely visible from public viewpoint.

There is insufficient reason to resist granting planning permission from a visual perspective.

***Residential amenity - neighbours***

The neighbours principally impacted upon by this development are those to either side (it is physically removed from the remainder)

*Neighbour to east*

The neighbouring building to the east has its own rear conservatory glazed roof, a side dormer window, and a roof light facing onto the application site.

The dormer and rooflight are secondary light sources, and the majority of glazing to the conservatory would be unaffected by the proposal. The length of the extension is relatively shallow, and the roof slope steeply angled away from the boundary. Adverse overbearing and overshadowing is therefore avoided.

The window in the roof slopes would only allow for angled views into the inside of the conservatory and rooflight in the opposite facing roof slope. It can be obscured to ensure intrusive overlooking and unacceptable loss of privacy is avoided.

*Neighbour to west*

The outlook and light received by the ground floor fenestration on this neighbouring building is already compromised by the existing side extension to No. 33a. Although this neighbour also has a side dormer window and a roof light facing the application site, both are secondary light sources. The length of the extension is relatively shallow, and the roof slope steeply angled away from the boundary. Adverse overbearing and overshadowing is therefore avoided.

The absence of windows/openings in the west elevation above eaves ensures views would be oblique onto the neighbour, with intrusive overlooking and unacceptable loss of privacy avoided.

***Flood Risk***

The application site falls within Flood Zone 3, the highest category for tidal flood risk.

However the floor levels of the extension will be set no lower than existing levels, and flood proofing measures in the construction are proposed.

In this circumstance, human health would not be put at greater risk and the proposal is acceptable.

***Contamination***

The application site is over 200 metres from any site identified by Council records as contaminated. There is no justification to impose a precautionary contamination condition or informative.

Adequate control already exists under the Health and Safety Executive for asbestos and/or fuel ash, without the need to impose informative or request register.

**Recommendation**

**APPROVE**

**Subject to the following conditions:-**

1. *Standard time limit*
2. *Approved Plans*
3. *Exterior materials to match*
4. *Flood proofing measures implemented*
5. *Window in east elevation be obscured*
6. *Notwithstanding "pd" no further windows above eaves in side elevations*

***Informative:***

*The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by assessing the proposal against all material considerations, including planning policies and any representations that may have been received and subsequently determining to grant planning permission in accordance with the presumption in favour of sustainable development, as set out within the National Planning Policy Framework.*

Is recommendation contrary to any representations? Y

Case Officer signed: Matthew Porter Date: 26-1-2015

Authorised and signed by: Peter Barnett Date: 26 January 2015