Development Management – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/1269/15 **Recommendation: APPROVE**

Site: **Houseboat Myrtle, 2 Riverbank, Shoreham-By-Sea**

Proposal: **Retrospective application to replace jetty and raising to present footpath level**

Date of Site Visit: 6 November for site meeting but site visited throughout the application

Neighbours Checked: Y

Additional neighbour notification: N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings:

Myrtle is the secondmost westerly houseboat with only the ancillary houseboat Kraken (formerly Redwood beyond). Other houseboats sit to the east with the nearest non houseboat residential dwellings clearly visible to the south.

Brighton Road is to the west from which the site is also clearly visible.

Planning History:

Application for a Lawful Development Certificate (LDC) for use of houseboat 'Redwood' as ancillary to houseboat 'Myrtle' – granted permission in 2014. LDC application for stationing of a separate houseboat refused.

Consultations:

Environmental Health – no adverse comments

Southern Water – no objection

Representations:

2 letters of objection received on the grounds that the proposal is anew structure, that there have been many previous breaches relating to the site and the raising of the footpath results in loss of privacy.

1 letter of support on the basis that the works represent a vast improvement on the previous situation

Relevant Planning Policies:

Adopted Adur District Local Plan 1993-2006 (ADC 1996) (saved policies): AG1, AH7, AB23 & AB25 and Appendix 11 'Supplementary Planning Guidance' comprising: Development Control Standard No.3 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings'

National Planning Policy Framework (CLG 2012)

Planning Practice Guidance (CLG 2014)

Planning Assessment

The application is accompanied by photographic evidence of the condition of the previous jetty which appeared to have been in situ for some time.

The visual appearance of the replacement jetty represents an improvement on the previous jetty. It has been pointed out that its raising to the same level as the footpath causes increased overlooking but given the footpath itself is the principal cause of overlooking to neighbouring properties, given that it used by the public rather than an individual houseboat owner, it is not considered that a refusal could be justified on such basis. In any event, given the current application for the Tidal Walls, which implies potential flood risk, it would also seem difficult on safety grounds to oppose the raising of a jetty to a level equivalent to the footpath.

The retrospective application is considered acceptable.

Recommendation

APPROVE subject to the following condition:

01 Development in accordance with approved plans

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

Case Officer: Gary Peck Date: 17 December 2015

Authorised by: Date: 21st December 2015