Development Management - Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/0856/16 Recommendation – APPROVE

Site: 83 Victoria Road, Shoreham-By-Sea

Proposal: First floor rear extension (Revision to AWDM/1651/15).

Date of site visit: Seen previously

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

The application property is one half of a semi-detached pair of flat-roofed, art-deco style houses at the north end of Victoria Road. It sits within a run of three such pairs of houses. The house has a flat roofed ground floor extension at the rear.

Planning permission was refused for a first floor flat-roofed extension over the ground floor addition (AWDM/1651/15). The depth of the extension was 2m, where it abuts the boundary with the attached house, and 3m at a distance of 2.6m from the boundary. The application was refused since, by reason of its depth and proximity to the shared boundary, it would have an unacceptably harmful impact on the light and outlook for the occupiers of No.85 to the detriment of their residential amenities.

The current application seeks consent for a revised design. The extension will be 2m deep at a distance of 1m from the boundary before increasing to 3m deep at a distance of 2.5m from the boundary.

Relevant site history

As above

Consultations

None

Representations

Letter of objection received from the occupier of 85 Victoria Road:

- Because of the angle of the house in relation to the path of the sun through the day, any second storey extension will cast our house into shadow for more of the time than is currently the case, making the property darker.
- Although the revised plan shows an extension that is not as wide as previously, it is still as deep (at its deepest point) so our property will be

shaded by it for as almost long as would have been the case with the previously planned extension.

- It is difficult to be sure without knowing the exact size and position, but the new proposed bedroom window, close to the boundary between the properties, may permit a view of our living room through the Velux windows we have in the roof of our ground floor extension.
- As we have previously commented, increasing the size of the property is likely to increase the need for parking, exacerbating the already difficult parking situation in Victoria Road.

Relevant Planning Policies

Adur District Local Plan 1993-2006 (ADC 1996) (saved policies): AG1, AH7 and Appendix 11 'Supplementary Planning Guidance' comprising: Development Control Standard No.3 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings' National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012)

Planning Assessment

Principle

The proposal comprises upgrading of 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 proposed extension is flat-roofed as is the host dwelling and neighbouring properties. Consequently, it would not appear unduly out of character. It would be visible from Overmead to the rear but would have an acceptable visual impact.

Residential amenity

The extension will be 2m deep but positioned 1m from the boundary with No. 85 to the north. The Council's supplementary planning guidance on residential extensions, DC Standard No.3, advises that:

"Whilst two-storey (or first-floor) rear extensions that are within 1m of a side boundary with an attached dwelling, should normally be no deeper than 2.0m, extensions abutting the boundary, will not normally be permitted."

In this case, the extension will be 2m deep and 1m from the boundary in compliance with the above guidance. The 2m length of wall will be less overbearing and would have a less harmful impact on daylight and sunlight to the upper floor window of No.85 than previously proposed. The deeper length of the extension (3m) will be 2.5m from the boundary and therefore a sufficient distance to not cause adverse loss of light or outlook. The extension now meets the '45 degree rule of thumb' for extensions and assessing their impact on light.

While it is south of the neighbouring dwelling, it is considered that, on balance, the revised depth of the extension and its proximity to the boundary would not have an unacceptably harmful impact on the light and outlook for the occupiers of No.85.

New windows are proposed in the rear walls of the extension and in the existing rear wall of the house. The neighbour is concerned at possible overlooking through his rooflights on his rear extension. However, there is an existing large window on the rear wall of the application property and it is not considered that overlooking will increase significantly. It should also be noted that a new window in the rear elevation of the existing building does not require planning permission.

Parking and Access

The neighbour is concerned at the possible impact on demand for on street parking space in Victoria Road as a result of the proposed increase in the size of the property. However, it is increasing from a 3 bed to 4 bed property and it is not considered that any impact on parking demand will be negligible.

Recommendation

APPROVE subject to:

1. Approved Plans
2. Time limit
3. Matching materials
4. No side windows

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

The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by identifying matters of concern within the application (as originally submitted) and negotiating, with the Applicant, acceptable amendments to the proposal to address those concerns. As a result, the Local Planning Authority has been able to grant planning permission for an acceptable proposal, in accordance with the presumption in favour of sustainable development, as set out within the National Planning Policy Framework.

Case Officer: Peter Barnett Date: 20 July 2016

Authorised by: Gary Peck Date: 20 July 2016