Development Management - Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/1654/19 Recommendation – APPROVE

Site: 106 Harbour Way, Shoreham-By-Sea

Proposal: Second floor side extension to east elevation

Date of site visit: 5.11.19

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

The application site is a two storey semi detached dwelling with a single garage attached to the side which is built up to the boundary. Behind the garage is a flat roof extension which runs along the boundary to the rear with a study, utility and ensuite bedroom. There is also a rear ground floor extension.

Consent is sought to add a first floor addition above the existing side extension. This extension is the depth of the original main house with a slight set back to the front. The ridge is continuing from the main ridge with a hipped design.

Representations

None received.

Relevant Planning Policies

Adur Local Plan 2017 Policy 15
'Supplementary Planning Guidance' comprising: Development Management Standard No.2 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings''
National Planning Policy Framework (February 2019)

Planning Assessment

Principle

The proposal comprises upgrading 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 extension is clearly visible within the street scene. Being closer to the dwelling to the east up to first floor level reduces the space between the dwellings and gives rise to a more cramped appearance within the street scene. This is contrary to the

Development Management Standard which states that there should be at least 1 metre between the extension and the boundary to avoid a terracing affect. However within Harbour Way and close to the application site there are other examples of development up to and adjacent to the boundary both at ground and first floor. Harbour Way is a long street with varying character along it. The spacing between the buildings is irregular, with some examples of gaps infilled at first and ground floor. There are side extensions visible within the street scene of various styles and design.

There are some examples of similar extensions in close proximity to the side boundary, examples being: -

78 Harbour Way AWDM/0452/19 – side extension has similar design to that proposed here. Slight set back from front, continued ridge.

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.”

120 Harbour way AWDM/0948/17 - built up to the boundary.

116 Harbour Way AWDM/1449/17 - set in from side boundary of 0.3 metres.

80 Harbour Way AWDM/1688/16 - recently completed a similar side extension with the ground floor abutting the boundary and the first floor set in by only 0.2 metres therefore also not complying with the Council’s Development Management Standard

There is also some minor first floor set back in this case and spacing will exist between the properties at first floor level as the adjacent property has only a ground floor garage side extension currently. In the light of the above a refusal could not be warranted here in relation to the Development Management Standards.

Materials will match existing and the roof design follows that of the existing ridge, therefore a simplistic design within the context of the existing character of the street scene.

Residential amenity

The main property to be affected is no. 108 Harbour Way to the east of the site. This neighbouring property is a semi detached two storey dwelling with an existing side extension, a ground floor mono-pitched roof garage. The proposed side extension will be adjacent to the first floor side elevation at no. 108. There is a side secondary window at no. 108 which appears to be a bathroom or landing window. It is not considered that the closer proximity of the first floor of no. 106 will give rise to any loss of light or overbearing impact which would warrant a refusal in this case. Although the extension will bring the properties closer, the proposals will not result in any overlooking, loss of light or overbearing impact. There is a side bathroom window proposed, however this will be obscurely glazed and non openable except

above 1.7 metres above finished floor level. A condition is attached below to ensure that this is the case and to ensure that no further openings are added.

Recommendation

APPROVE

Subject to Conditions:-

1. Approved Plans
2. Standard 3 year time limit
3. Materials to match existing
4. No windows on the east elevation of the extension hereby approved.
5. The east facing bathroom window on the plans hereby approved shall be at all times fitted with obscure glazing and shall be non openable except 1.7 metres above finished floor level.

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

1. Proactive no amendments

Case Officer: Hannah Barker Date: 25th November 2019

Authorised by: Peter Barnett Date: 26 November 2019