Development Management – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/1449/17 Recommendation – APPROVE

Site: 116 Harbour Way, Shoreham-By-Sea

Proposal: First-floor side extension to west elevation and conversion of roof space including rear dormer with cedral cladding and Juliet balcony and front rooflights plus cladding to the front elevation.

Date of site visit: 30/10/17

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

The site relates to a semi detached two storey dwelling within a row of similar dwellings along the southern side of Harbour Way on Shoreham Beach. The dwelling is set back from the highway with off street parking to the front, a flat roof front porch projection and a flat roof extension to the side which appears to have originally been a garage which has been converted and extended to the rear with glazing to the roof. The property adjoins the neighbour to the west, no.114 at ground floor level as the garage/single storey flat roof structures to the side are attached.

Consent is sought for a first floor addition above the flat roof to the side. The extension is to be set in slightly from the front and slightly down from the ridge. It is set in by 0.3 metres from the boundary to the side. The first floor addition is in line with the rear of the main house and therefore does not cover all of the single storey section.

Also proposed is a flat roof dormer with Juliet Balcony to the rear roof slope of the main house. This dormer is 3.6 metres wide, 2.4 metres high and 3.4 metres in depth. Velux windows are also proposed to the front elevation. The front elevation of the existing house is to be clad in weatherboarding.

Following the site visit the case officer requested amendments to the proposal. An increased set in from the side was requested of 1 metre. This was to comply with the Council's Development Control Standards, to allow a greater spacing between properties and to avoid a terracing affect. In addition a request was made to reduce the scale of the rear dormer and remove the Juliet balcony, to reduce the scale in relation to the roof and height of the dormer in relation to the ridge.

Despite these requests the applicant's agent advised that in the light of adjacent developments their view was that the need for the set in to the side was not justified. They also stated that the dormer only requires consent due to the cladding not matching materials already on the house. If it were tile hung then consent would not be required.

Consideration is therefore given below to the proposal as submitted in the light of the directly adjacent development and the works that could be carried out as permitted development is a material consideration here.

.

Representations:

Representation received from owner/occupier of no. 114 Harbour Way. No concerns with the development proposed however would not like the side addition to prejudice any future development at their property.

Representation received from owner/occupier of no. 118 Harbour Way. The proposed dormer will result in a view of the wall of the new extension and a loss of western light. The dormer will overlook the garden. Loss of privacy and impact upon use of the garden. The proposal would be ugly, oppressive and intrusive.

No objection if the dormer were to be moved back from the edge of the roof or more to the west.

Relevant Planning Policies

Adopted 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'
Submission Adur Local Plan as modified in accordance with the inspectors recommendations Policy 15 (2016)
National Planning Policy Framework (CLG 2012)
Manual for Streets (2007)

Planning Assessment

There is no objection in principle to the upgrading of a dwelling house within the built up area the main issues for consideration here are the impact of the proposed development upon the residential and visual amenities of the surrounding area.

Residential amenity

The main properties affected by the proposal are those either side. Attached no. 118 and adjacent (attached via single storey additions) no. 114. The first floor addition will bring the building closer to the side of no. 114. Although there is a side landing window facing onto the side of the site any loss of light to this window is not considered to justify any refusal in this case. The window serves a non habitable space and loss of light to this space would be insignificant in planning terms. There are no windows on the side of the proposed extension, a window to front and rear only. There will therefore as a result be no increased over looking than already

exists. The first floor addition is away from the boundary to such a degree that there would be no adverse impact upon the occupiers of the attached dwelling at no. 118. The rear dormer has a large glazed area with inward opening doors.

As set out above the occupier of no. 118 has objected to the scale of the dormer in relation to loss of light and privacy. Although these concerns are acknowledged it is considered that although a smaller scale dormer with a window and not inward opening doors would be preferable here from the point of view of the neighbour and in visual amenity terms it is not considered that there is justification for refusal on these grounds. As with all rear dormers there is some additional overlooking which result from such development to the adjacent dwelling particularly with attached dwellings. The main justification for approval here is that of the 'fall back' position - the dormer requires consent here only because of the use of materials. Cedral cladding is proposed and therefore consent is required as materials are not proposed to match existing. If the dormer were to be tile hung consent would not be required and the same impact of the development would result.

Visual amenity

In terms of visual amenity the same argument as above applied with regards to the rear dormer. A smaller scale development would have been preferable and more sympathetic to the existing building yet, this form of development could be constructed as permitted development. The use of Cedral cladding is considered to be acceptable in this case as it represents a modest, contemporary use of materials which add interest to the building without altering its character significantly. It is considered that a muted tone should be used in this case and the agent has advised that bit is likely to be grey, which would be acceptable.

With regards to the side addition, the Council's Development Control Standards refer to such extensions being set in by at least 1 metre from the boundary to avoid a terracing affect and allow for spacing between buildings. This impact would be increased further should the adjacent property be extended in a similar fashion, which has been indicated by the neighbour. The applicant's agent refers to adjacent development, which has taken place. The case officer has looked into these consents and it is considered that such development sets a precedent for the form of development proposed here.

118 Harbour Way AWDM/0666/11 – the delegated report refers to "other first floor side extensions which have been permitted up to the side boundary on nearby dwellings most recently no. 96 (ADC/0014/10) refusal would be difficult to substantiate on these grounds."

96 Harbour Way ADC/0014/10 – first floor addition on top of single storey extension up to the boundary.

120 Harbour Way AWDM/0948/17 – built up to the boundary.

It should be noted however that this only relates to development within the direct vicinity of this site. This consent and consents which preceded this permission do not set a precedent for this form of development within the wider vicinity. In future such

cases the Council's Development Control Standards shall be given weight as a material consideration and full justification must be given as to why this adopted guidance is not complied with.

Recommendation

Approve

Subject to Conditions:-

1. Standard time limit 3 years
2. Permission relates to approved plans
3. No windows on west side elevation of first floor addition.
4. Materials to match existing unless otherwise specified on the approved plans.
5. Cladding to be grey, final details to be agreed

Informatives:

1. Proactive without amendments

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

Case Officer: Hannah Barker Date: 14th November 2017

Authorised by: Peter Barnett Date: 15 November 2017