Development Management - Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/1500/18 Recommendation – APPROVE

Site: 25 Harbour Way, Shoreham-By-Sea

Proposal: Retention of single storey rear extension to north elevation (retrospective)

Date of site visit: 5th November 2018

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

The application site is a three storey, terraced town house on the north side of Harbour Way. There is a pedestrian access to the side of the terrace leading to residential development to the rear. The rear of the building is therefore visible within public views within the surrounding area.

Retrospective consent is required for a single storey flat roof extension the full width of the dwelling, (encroaching slightly over the boundary as agreed by neighbours under the Party Wall Act.) Documents have been included within the application. The extension is 2.8 metres in depth and in this case requires planning permission as it is not completed in materials to match the existing building, it is rendered and the building is brick. Consent is also required due to the encroachment over the boundary. The extension was built in 2015.

Adur and Worthing Councils: Environmental Health – Contaminated Land – It is recommended that the full contaminated land condition is attached.

Representations

1 neighbour representation has been received from the current owner at no. 23 Harbour Way, neither objecting to or supporting the Planning Application. They confirm that the rear extension at no. 25 does encroach over the boundary and that they were not owners of the property when this work was under taken in 2015 and therefore do not have copies of the ownership certificate and Agricultural declaration.

Relevant Planning Policies

Adur Local Plan 2017 Policy 15
'Supplementary Planning Guidance' comprising: Development Management Standard No.2 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings''
National Planning Policy Framework (July 2018)

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 dwelling and its surroundings.

Visual amenity

The rear addition is not visible from the front of the terrace in Harbour Way to the south, yet due to the open nature of this residential development the extension is visible in views from public space, pedestrian pathways and adjacent properties. It is however considered that it is not overly large in scale or footprint in relation to the terrace and the use of render rather than matching brick does also not give rise to any justification for a refusal here. It is subservient to the main dwelling therefore acceptable. The encroachment over the boundary is a neighbour issue in this case and does not give rise to any detrimental visual impact.

Residential amenity

The main properties to be affected are those either side of the site within the terrace. Due to the depth being limited to 2.8 metres it is not considered that there is any significant loss of light or overbearing impact in this case. This complies with Development Management Standards which state that an extension of this nature should be limited to 3.5 metres in depth. Even with the slight encroachment there would not be any significant impact which would warrant a refusal in this case. The current owners at no. 23 have made representations as set out above. There are no planning reasons to not support this retrospective application.

Other Matters

In relation to the contaminated land consultation response this is not necessary as the work has been completed and this application is retrospective.

Recommendation

APPROVE

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

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.

Case Officer:	Hannah Barker	Date: 12th November 2018
Authorised by:	Peter Barnett	Date: 12 November 2018