Development Management – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/0415/17 Recommendation – APPROVE

Site: 57 Victoria Road, Shoreham-By-Sea, West Sussex

Proposal: Single storey rear and side extension to west and south elevations.

Date of site visit: 25.04.17

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Site, Surroundings and Proposal

The application relates to a substantial semi-detached, 2-storey Victorian dwelling with roof accommodation. It is on the western side of Victoria Road near Shoreham-By-Sea town centre. The street comprises of a mixture of dwelling styles. Along this southern part of the street semi-detached and terraced properties are prevalent.

The main part of the building is 2-storey with roof accommodation served by a small rear dormer. There is a two storey flat roof projection and a single storey lean to projection. The attached semi is matching in form.

Consent is sought to enlarge the dwelling at single storey level to the rear and southern side. To the rear the extension is to project by 1.5 metres and to be increased in width by 1.6 metres. The extension to the rear of the building will result in the ground floor being the same width as the main building, 5.1 metres.

The design of the extension will differ from existing with the existing lean to roof replaced with a slope then flat roof with parapet upstand edge to the rear. The side extension has a sloping roof. The flat roof is to a maximum height of 3.3 metres, the sloping side roof up to 3.6 metres. Glazed doors and windows are to the rear these are shown as aluminium finished in grey.

The proposed extension results in a new ground floor layout and family space.

The site is located within Flood Zone 2/3 and the application is accompanied by a FRA in accordance with EA Standing Advice.

Representations: 1 representation from no. 59 Objecting to the proposal - loss of light to the attached dwelling. The proposed structure will degrade the appearance of the back of our shared property.

Relevant Planning Policies

Saved Local Plan policies (ADC 1996): AG1, AH7

Development Control Standard No.3 ‘Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings’
Adur Submission Local Plan (2016) Policy 15
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 proposed side and rear extension will not be visible within the street scene they are screened by the building. It is considered that the extensions being at single storey level and limited in rear projection allow for it to be in keeping in scale and subservient to the main dwelling.

The neighbour is objecting on the grounds of the appearance of the attached pair of semis being degraded by the proposals. It is acknowledged that as existing the pair of semi detached dwellings when viewed from the rear do match and have symmetry and they are positive in character. The loss of such symmetry is regrettable however to the rear and not being visible within the street scene there would be no reason to resist such an alteration for this reason solely. The buildings are not listed and are not within a Conservation Area. Many dwellings when viewed from the rear are not in keeping with their neighbours. The flat roof design with parapet is a design solution chosen by the applicant and their architect. It includes the use of the crittall style windows which will be in grey. This building design and finish may not be appealing to all yet the alterations here are not considered to be such to warrant a refusal on the grounds of design, form and use of materials.

The bricks and tiles proposed are conditioned to match existing. The internal step within the existing ground floor will remain to allow for the roof height to be kept to a minimum.

Residential Amenity

The main properties affected are those either side. No 59, attached to the north and no. 55 to the south. No. 59 as existing is in-line to the rear with the application site and as stated above matches in form and scale. The proposed extension will project 1.5 metres beyond the rear of no. 59. The new roof form also results in an increased height of the roof of approximately 0.5 metres adjacent to the boundary. The occupier of the adjacent dwelling has objected on the grounds of loss of light to the rear of the dwelling. It is considered that the depth of the extension being limited to 1.5 metres beyond the rear elevation of no. 59 will result in no adverse impact in this case. There will be no loss of light which would be significant to warrant a refusal here. The Council’s Development Control Standards state that an extension up to 3.5 metres could be built adjacent to a boundary of an attached dwelling in cases such as this before it is considered that the extension would have such an impact to

justify refusal. The extension here being 1.5 metres beyond the adjacent dwelling is therefore acceptable on this basis.

No. 55 to the south is a similar dwelling to the application site paired with no. 53. The side infill section of the extension will bring the southern elevation of the building closer to no. 55 by 1.6 metres. Adjacent to the side boundary the extension will be 2.9 metres high increasing to 3.7 metres to the top of the sloping roof. The sloping roof is shown to have two rooflights and the side wall a high level window. Currently there are windows facing toward the neighbour to the south. The proposed extension will remove this overlooking by creating a blank elevation with high level window only. There is an existing low level wall between the dwellings with trellis above and climbing vegetation. There are also some small trees and shrubs to the side at the application site which offers screening between the dwellings. Much of this vegetation will be lost to make way for the extension. It is not considered that any form of screening is necessary here to justify consent as the overlooking would be lesser than existing. However in the light of the low level wall and potential loss of trellis it is advised that the applicant discusses possible boundary treatment with their neighbour to agree what could be planted/installed to soften the impact of the proposed extension being blank in appearance and slightly closer to the neighbour than existing. The applicant indicated to the case officer that such discussions would be forthcoming, an informative is attached to prompt this.

Recommendation

APPROVE

1. Standard time limit
2. Materials to match apart from grey aluminium windows.
3. No windows of openings on either side elevation.
4. Approved plans

Informative

1. Proactive no amendments
2. The applicant is advised that in the light of the potential loss of screening adjacent to the southern boundary that replacement planting and necessary boundary treatment is installed in discussion with the adjacent occupier.

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

Case Officer: Hannah Barker Date: 9th May 2017

Authorised by: Jo Morin Date: 09.05.2017