Development Management - Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/0452/19 Recommendation – APPROVE

Site: 78 Harbour Way, Shoreham-By-Sea

Proposal: Demolition of existing garage and rear extension and construction of two-storey pitched roof side extension with rear juliette balcony and single-storey rear extension.

Date of site visit: 16th April 2019

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

The application site is a two storey end of terrace property with a flat roof garage attached to the side which is built up to the boundary. The property is set forward slightly of the adjacent semi detached dwelling no. 80 which has a two storey side extension built up to the boundary at ground floor and set in by 0.2 metres at first floor (AWDM/1688/16). There is also a flat roof conservatory extension to the rear of the dwelling built up to the boundary with the attached dwelling.

Consent is sought to remove the side garage and rear conservatory and erect a two storey side extension with ground floor rear extension. The extension will provide open plan living space at ground floor and an additional bedroom and ensuite at first floor.

In the light of the close proximity to the boundary to the east the case officer sought amended plans to request an additional set in from the boundary to allow some spacing between the proposed first floor eaves and the adjacent eaves at no. 80. Amended plans have been received showing 0.46 metres between the extension and the boundary. Also included on the amended plans is a rear first floor Juliette balcony which replaces the rear master bedroom window shown on the original submission.

The two storey side extension is 2.5 metres wide and follows the ridge of the existing building, there is a slight set in to the front behind the main front wall of the original building. The rear first floor projection has a Juliette balcony and side west facing window. The ground floor extension is to be the full width of the property as extended and 3.3 metres in depth.

Representations

Emails from owner/occupiers of no. 80 Harbour Way: -

Original Plans: - Plans contravene Adur District Council's Development Management Policy with regards to extensions and alterations to dwellings. Impact of terracing

affect, lack of set back, destroy the character of the area. The gap between the row of terraced properties and the semi detached dwellings will be lost. Terracing affect from 24 to 82 detrimental to the street scene and character. No. 82 and 80 both has a recess. Impact upon light to side of property. Overlooking to number 76. The boundary is not shown correctly. Overhang has not been taken into account.

Amended Plans: - The plans still contravene the Development Management Standards and impact upon the character of the locality. Loss of light to the front of the house. Juliette balcony will over look the rear neighbouring gardens. Still strongly object to the proposed side extension.

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, (in this case there is 0.45 metres) 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: -

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.

It should also be noted that no. 80 Harbour Way directly adjacent to the site 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 (AWDM/1688/16.)

There is also some minor first floor set back in this case and spacing will exist between the properties at first floor level. In the light of the above a refusal could not be warranted here in relation to the Development Management Standards.

Materials will be used to match existing and the roof design follows that of the existing ridge, therefore a simplistic design. The rear first floor projection with Juliette balcony is in keeping in scale with the existing house. The single storey rear addition is limited to 3.3 metres therefore not overly deep in this case, therefore a subservient addition also.

Residential amenity

The main property to be affected is no. 80 Harbour Way to the east of the site. This neighbouring property is a semi detached two storey dwelling with an existing side extension, first floor addition, rear dormer and single storey rear extension. The side extension will be adjacent to the blank side elevation at no. 80 and the side elevation of the single storey addition will abut the side blank elevation of the existing single storey addition at no. 80. Although the extension will bring the properties closer the proposals will not result in any overlooking, loss of light or overbearing impact. The extensions will be further forward than the front elevation of no. 80 by 1.5 metres in close proximity to the boundary yet it is not considered that this will result in any significant loss of light or overbearing impact which would warrant a refusal in this case. The rear Juliette balcony will look toward the south and will overlook rear gardens to the south and either side of the site. It is not considered that such a development would give rise to any significantly greater levels of overlooking than would occur with a standard window. It should also be noted that such a feature could be constructed under the property's permitted development rights should it not form part of this development.

The side west facing first floor window will look toward the boundary with no. 76. It is considered therefore that this window should be fitted with obscure glazing to avoid any loss of privacy. The single storey extension will abut the attached terraced property, this is at a depth of 3.3 metres and will not therefore result in any loss of light, privacy or overbearing impact. The extension is flat roofed and therefore limited in height. This is below the 3.5 metres in depth suggested in the Council's Development Management Standards which state that an extension up to the boundary of an attached property can extend at single storey level up to 3.5 metres. A condition is attached to ensure that no additional openings are to be inserted in the east or west elevations.

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 or west elevation of the extensions.
5. The extension hereby permitted shall be completed in accordance with the detailed dimensions shown on drawing no. SS 002 – received 7th May 2019
6. The west facing bedroom window on the plans hereby approved shall be at all times fitted with obscure glazing.

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

1. Proactive with amendments

Case Officer: Hannah Barker Date: 21st May 2019

Authorised by: Peter Barnett Date: 21 May 2019