From: **Paula Cadogan** [redacted]
Date: Thu, 17 Jul 2025 at 13:57
Subject: Rear Extension at 16 Albert Road
To: planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk <planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk>

Dear Marie O'Keeffe,

Ref: AWDM/0816/25

We refer to your letter of 25/6/25. Firstly, we returned from an extended holiday at 11.30pm yesterday and tried to look online at the plans submitted for the house next door to us in order to make comments but to no avail . We therefore called in at the Pond Rd Shoreham Centre this morning but again the system was not functioning. Fortunately a member of staff was able to access the plans on her computer.

Whilst not objecting primarily to our neighbours planning application for a rear side extension, we wish to make the following comments. We would like their application to be assessed in the same, equal manner as ours Ref:AWDM/1644/23 and that of 32 Albert Rd Ref: AWDM/014622 as defined in the Delegated Officer Report of 3/1/24, a copy of which is attached. We wished to extend level with the rear of our property but were denied, even under appeal, for the reasons you gave on page 2 under Principle, Visual & Residential amenity and that we live in a conservation area.

Should the application be passed in its current form we would be perplexed. Therefore, if this is the case we would like you to provide us with reasons to support such a decision and that the criteria is now varied. The construction would be attached to the dividing wall between the two properties and therefore we cannot see any difference.

We look forward to your reply.
Kind regards,

Andy and Paula Cadogan Butler

Development Management – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/1644/23 Recommendation: REFUSE

Site: 17 Albert Road, Southwick, West Sussex

Proposal: Proposed single storey rear/side extension. Application to Vary Conditions 1 (Approved Plans) of previously approved AWDM/0299/23. Amendment: Depth of extension increased.

Date of Site Visit: Applicant submitted photos.

Neighbours Checked: Y

Additional neighbour notification N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

The application site is a terraced, two storey period property within a street of similar properties, within the Conservation Area. There is an existing two storey rear projection. Consent was originally sought under AWDM/0299/23 to add a single storey side extension infilling the area between the boundary and the two storey projection, extended to the same depth, this was to be of solid construction with roof lights. Officers advised they could not support the proposal due to the impact upon the light and outlook to the adjacent windows which would be in a recess in close proximity and facing the extension. Amended plans were then submitted and approved. The extension was limited in depth at 3 metres only. The height of the side wall was limited to 2 metres and the roof was glazed. This design is in line with a similar proposal which was approved at 32 Albert Road AWDM/0146/22, this showed a matching design and scale. This extension was considered to not have any significant adverse impact in terms of light and overbearing impact and on balance was considered acceptable.

As stated in the previous delegated report the key components here (as with no. 32) are the 3 metre limited depth, height limited to 2 metres on the boundary and the transparent roof material. All give rise to a more acceptable, less oppressive development.

The current application seeks consent to increase the depth of the infill extension from 3 metres to 4.23 metres in depth adjacent to the boundary. The height of the extension and materials remain the same as previously approved.

Adur District Conservation Advisory Group: - APPROVE

Representations

None received

Relevant Planning Policies

Adur Local Plan 2017 Policy 15, 17
'Supplementary Planning Guidance' comprising: Development Management Standard No.2 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings"
National Planning Policy Framework (Dec 2023)
WSCC Guidance on Parking at New Developments (Sept 2020).

Planning Assessment

Principle

The relevant issues are the effects on the amenities of neighbouring residential occupiers and the effect on the character and appearance of the area and Conservation Area.

Visual amenity

The extension is modest in scale and subservient to the main dwelling. It will not be visible within the Conservation Area and therefore will preserve the character and appearance of the locality.

Residential amenity

The main concerns here are residential amenity and impact upon no. 16 Albert Road. As stated above it was considered that the approval under AWDM/0299/23 gave rise to a balanced impact due to the limited depth, height and transparent materials. It replicated a similar development at no. 32 Albert Road where the same approach was taken to limit impact in terms of loss of light and overbearing impact. The proposal here is to extend the depth of the extension by a further 1.2 metres. Although the side wall remains the same height and the light weight roof is proposed this increased depth is considered to be harmful and inconsistent with the approval at no. 32 and the former approval at this site. The increased depth will result in an enclosed impact being overbearing and resulting in a loss of light to the recessed and adjacent windows. The approved depth at 3 metres would be considered to result in impact however at 3 metres, (that which could be built under permitted development in other cases) this was balanced. In excess of this would be unacceptable and could not be supported in this case. It is considered that a refusal can be warranted here.

Recommendation

REFUSE

1. By reason of its depth and relationship with the adjacent neighbouring property to the east the proposed single storey infill extension would give rise to an unneighbourly impact resulting in loss of light and overbearing impact to the detriment of the adjacent occupiers. Contrary to Policy 15 of the Adur Local Plan and Development Management Standard No. 2 Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings.

Is recommendation contrary to letter(s) of representation N

1. Refusal proactive

Case Officer: Hannah Barker Date: 3rd January 2024

Authorised by: Peter Barnett Date: 3 January 2024