Expires 19/12/07

Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: ADC/0639/07 **Recommendation – Permit Application**

Site: **110 Harbour Way Shoreham-by-Sea West Sussex BN43 5HH**

Proposal: **Two-storey side extension (including garage) and single-storey rear extension**

The Application

The application site is a semi-detached house located on the south side of Harbour Way, Shoreham. The property sits within a uniform row of identical semi-detached houses and, like many of the others, has single storey side and rear extensions and large hardstandings to the front. The attached house is sited to the west with new development being constructed at Sussex Wharf opposite. To the rear is the long side/rear garden of No.13 Fowey Close.

This application seeks permission to demolish the existing extensions and rebuild with a two storey side addition and a single storey rear extension. The side extension will sit on the boundary and will incorporate a garage set 2.1 metres forward of the building line, level with the large front porch/wc. A pitched roof will sit above to a height of 6.3 metres with a front dormer serving a bedroom. To the rear the eaves level will be at mid first floor level with another dormer above and the single storey rear extension below across the width of the site to a depth of 4.1 metres. The extensions will add an additional bedroom to the property and a consolidated lounge/diner area. A Flood Risk Assessment as required by PPS25 has been submitted as the property straddles flood zones 2 and 3.

Consultations and Representations

Third Parties

No.112 Harbour Way raise No Objection.

Contributors

No representations have been received.

Relevant Planning Policies and Guidance

Adopted West Sussex Structure Plan 2001-2016 (WSCC 2005): LOC1, DEV1
Adopted Adur District Local Plan 1993-2006 (ADC 1996) (saved until adoption of the new Adur Development Plan): AG1, AH7 and Appendix 11
'Supplementary Planning Guidance' comprising: Development Control Standard No.3 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings'
PPS25 'Planning and Flood Risk' (ODPM 2006)

Planning Assessment

Policies

Structure Plan policies seek to protect, and where possible, enhance the character and distinctiveness of an area, requiring high standards of design, layout and construction (DEV1). Policy AH7 of the Local Plan states that extensions and alterations should be designed so as not to result in an unacceptable degree of overlooking, a loss of natural light or an overbearing effect on neighbouring dwellings. They should be of sympathetic design and materials to the original dwelling and the area in general.
Appendix 11 of the Local Plan, Development Control Standard No.3, provides supplementary planning guidance outlining appropriate design criteria that acceptable schemes should meet, including the impacts on visual and neighbouring amenity and the general appearance of extensions. In particular, with regard to side extensions, it states that they should be subordinate and designed to closely match the appearance of the main dwelling without being excessive in size or over-dominating of neighbouring properties. A distance of 1 metre should be retained to the side boundary since, if the adjacent neighbour also extended, a terracing effect would occur that would be detrimental to the character of the area.

Visual Amenity

The proposal would certainly upgrade the appearance of the house. The existing pebble dash walls would be replaced by weatherboard whilst the basic side garage and rear extensions will be removed. The side extension will sit to a height of 6.3 metres and set 1.2 metres down from the main ridge line. The garage will sit forward parallel with the existing porch/wc with the pitched roof and dormer above. This extension will clearly sit subordinate to the property and add a visual interest to its appearance. It is noted that the other properties in this section of Harbour Way are of a poor visual quality and all feature single storey side garages to the boundary. A couple of houses at No's 86 and 96 have added unsympathetic two storey additions within the last twenty years that do not enhance the visual quality of the street. This proposal is certainly an improvement on these schemes and relates well to its host building.
The main concern though is not with the general appearance of the proposal, but with the impact it will have on the streetscape due to its location directly on the boundary line. As stated above, the Council's DC standard for side

extensions requires a 1 metre separation to sit between any first floor extension and the side boundary of the plot. In this case the extension forms no separation to the boundary to a height of 6.3 metres and consequently appears cramped. Any approval of this scheme would set a precedent for further similar side extensions the product of which would be to terrace portions of the uniformly spaced streetscape.
The applicant has subsequently provided amended plans including a large hip to the extension and a separation of 0.15 metres to the boundary. On balance, although this still clearly does not conform with the recommended separation, the combined impact of the steadily reducing roof lines and the design of the extension is such that a terracing effect would be minimised should the neighbours at No.112 undertake a similar extension. The 0.15 metre separation ensures that the hip guttering sits within the site and allows the boundary fence to be retained, giving the impression that the extension is not as cramped onto the plot as before.
Whilst it is acknowledged that the extension does not fully accord with the DC standard, it retains an element of boundary separation and is clearly subordinate both in height and design to the host dwelling. It is considered that the strength of the design is sufficient to vastly improve the appearance of the property in the streetscape and acts as a suitable template for further two storey extensions on the surrounding houses.
The rear extension will sit 4 metres deep close to the boundaries with a flat roof. It will essentially tidy the poor quality existing structures and will be less dominant on the eastern boundary than as current. Its 4 metre depth will not overdominate the adjoining property as this house has an existing 2.4 metre deep rear conservatory of its own and recent planning approvals for a larger 3.3 metre deep structure (SU/203/04).

Residential Amenity
The side extension features front and rear dormers that offer limited overlooking of the neighbouring property, but to no degree that would warrant refusal on this ground. No windows are proposed in the side flanks of either extension. The hipped roof of the side extension is significantly lower than the main pitch and does not extend beyond the rear elevation. It will subsequently not overdominate any aspect of the neighbouring house at No.112, the owners of which have stated their satisfaction with the proposal.

Flood Risk
A Flood Risk Assessment as required by PPS25 has been submitted that proposes, amongst others, no change in floor levels and the protection of the extension with a non-porous insulation.

Parking
The property will retain a single garage space of greater quality than previous, as well as its large frontal hardstanding. This is more than adequate space to serve the enlarged property.

Recommendation

APPROVE for reason that :-

1PPi

Subject to:

1. C1Ci
2. C12Ei
3. C12Ai (amended) '...materials and finishes to be used for the external weatherboarding has been submitted....Reason:...policy AH7 of the ADLP...'
4. C14Ai: '...received on 27 November 2007...policy AH7 of the ADLP and DEV1 of the WSSP.'
5. C18Eiv: '...side walls of the extensions...'

plan (rev. C)

Case Officer:.....

Date: 28/11/07.