Application Number: AWDM/1040/16 **Recommendation – Approve**

Site: **82 High Street, Shoreham-By-Sea**

Proposal: **Removal of existing first-floor and addition of new first and second floor extension to provide two-bedroom maisonette. Single-storey extension to rear (north) elevation to provide studio flat with shop unit to be retained to front of premises on ground floor.**

Date of site visit: Seen previously

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

The application relates to a two storey building on the north side of the High Street, close to the roundabout junction at its western end. It is a retail unit occupied by Showtec. The building has a hipped roof with a single storey flat roofed rear extension. It is attached to the side of 84 High Street, a three storey commercial premises. Its upper floor is separated from the side of 80 High Street to the east, a two storey property, although it is attached at ground floor. The site lies within the Shoreham Conservation Area.

The application is proposing to extend the building by forming a 2nd floor and a new pitched roof with rooms in the roofspace served by windows which break through the eaves. The building is to be increased in width to fill the gap to No.80. The shop on the ground floor will be reduced in area to 16sqm at the front with a studio flat at the rear, accessed by a new entrance at the front of the building recessed behind metal gates. A 2-bedroom flat will be provided on both the first and second floors. The ground floor flat will have a small courtyard amenity area at the rear.

The extended building will have a flat roofed first floor extension at the rear, 4.1m deep, with a second floor rear hipped roof extension, 0.4m deep with a higher eaves level than the main building.

The building will be stepped down in height by 0.4m from its attached neighbour to the west. It will be finished in white render with a natural slate roof. No off street parking is provided.

Relevant Planning History

AWDM/1516/14 - Extension and alterations to form 4 storey building to provide retail shop with studio flat at the rear on the ground floor; 1 no. one bedroom flat on first floor, 1 no. one bedroom flat on second floor and 1 no. studio flat on third floor within roof space. Upper floor flats to have rear balconies - refused.

AWDM/0625/15 - Alteration and extension of existing building to provide retail shop and studio flat on ground floor and 1 no. 1 bedroom flat on the first floor and 1 no. 1 bedroom flat on the second floor – refused and appeal dismissed

Consultations

West Sussex County Council: No objection from a transport/highways aspect subject to a condition requiring cycle parking. Comments that the dwellings will not be provided with any off street car parking provision. It would be anticipated that two dwellings of this size in this location would attract the demand for 1 on street car parking spaces. The site is located in a sustainable location within walking and cycling distance to public services and amenities within Shoreham by Sea. Bus and rail are realistic travel options for longer trips. While it is acknowledged that there is a shortfall of parking provision, given the small scale nature of the proposal and sustainable location of the site the Local Highways Authority does not consider that the proposal would have 'severe' impact on the operation of the highway network, therefore is not contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework (paragraph 32), and that there are no transport grounds to resist the proposal.

The ***Archaeologist*** recommends that a watching brief is carried out on the removal of the existing first floor structure and any below ground excavations for foundations and services.

Adur & Worthing Councils: The ***Environmental Health*** officer advises that any development will need a scheme to include acoustic glazing and mechanical ventilation, to protect habitable rooms facing the High Street from excessive noise. The scheme shall demonstrate good acoustic design and shall comply with the internal noise level guidelines set out in BS8233:2014. As the High Street is an Air Quality Management Area any air intake will have to be at roof level or from the rear of the building to ensure cleaner air is brought into the property.

The ***Engineer*** has no drainage concerns

Southern Water: Request informatives

Adur District Conservation Advisory Group: No comment received

Representations

2 letters of objection received from the occupier of 80A High Street and 5 West Street:

- Overlooking and loss of light
- Substantial and unreasonable overbearing effect
- Overlooking and loss of privacy
- Plans show building work over boundary
- Calculations used for daylight assessment are wrong
- Poor standard of accommodation

Relevant Planning Policies and Guidance

Adopted Adur District Local Plan 1993-2006 (ADC 1996) (saved policies): AG1, AH2, AB4 and Appendix 11 'Supplementary Planning Guidance' comprising: Development Control Standard No.2 'Space Around New Dwellings and Flats'
'Good Practice Guidance Note: Internal Space Standards for New Homes' (ADC 2010)
Shoreham-by-Sea Conservation Area Character Appraisal & Management Strategy (ADC 2008)
National Planning Policy Framework (CLG 2012)

Planning Assessment

Principle

The application proposes an extension to an existing building to provide additional residential accommodation and is acceptable in principle subject to consideration of the impact on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, the impact on residential amenity and consideration of the standard of accommodation to be provided.

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) suggests that "development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions" should be refused (para 64).

The NPPF also suggests that in determining planning applications affecting the historic environment, "the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness" should be taken into account (Para 131).

There will be a considerable reduction in the amount of retail floorspace but the proposal will not result in the loss of a shop unit. The floor plan shows the provision of a small storage area and toilet for the shop and it is considered that it would continue to be a viable unit, similar to the smaller units on the corner of the High Street to the west facing the Ropetackle development.

Visual amenity and impact on Conservation Area

The existing building has a slightly incongruous appearance in the High Street with its size and roof form contrasting with the more substantial terrace to the west. From the High Street the proposed extension would increase the height of the building but would maintain a lower ridge and eaves height than its neighbour to the west. The closing of the gap to 80 High Street to the east is considered to be acceptable in principle and, while it will result in a marked step up in height from No.80, there is already a contrast in heights between Nos. 82 and 84 and the proposal will maintain the irregular roofscape identified in the Shoreham Conservation Area Appraisal. The proposed windows will be white UPVC period-style sash windows to match the style of other windows in the High Street. The existing windows are plastic and unsympathetic to the area and, while the use of UPVC is not to be encouraged within the Conservation Area, it is considered that the proposal will represent an enhancement in this case. The pitched roof form and use of slate will match the roofscape to the west.

It is considered that, when viewed from the High Street, the proposal will have an acceptable visual impact in the Conservation Area.

Residential amenity – effect on existing dwellings

The bulk of the proposed rear extension has been considerably reduced from that previously proposed. The flat roofed first floor extension replaces the existing first floor pitched roof projection and will be only slightly deeper. The proposed second floor extension will project only marginally beyond the line of 84 High Street to the west. It would therefore be a far less substantial and dominant presence than the appeal scheme.

The previous scheme was considered to have had an overbearing and harmful effect on the residential amenities of the occupiers of those properties in West Street, to the east, and the occupiers of the flat above 80 High Street. The height and depth of the extension would have caused an unacceptable increased sense of enclosure for those properties to the east and would represent unneighbourly and unsustainable development. The appeal Inspector did not consider, however, that the proposal would have caused a harmful loss of light or privacy. He considered that as there were no side windows, "*views from the proposed rear windows would only be available towards Nos 5 and 5a (West Street) at an oblique angle*." The current plans have reduced the depth of the extension but it is considered that any views from the proposed rear windows will continue to be sufficiently oblique to not cause serious harm.

With regard to light, the applicants previously submitted a daylight and sunlight assessment which the Inspector agreed with and he concluded that any reduction in light would not be significant. The current proposal is less bulky with reduced depth and will have less impact on light than the previous scheme. Consequently, it is not considered that the proposal will cause a loss of light to the adjoining occupiers, including to the balcony at the rear of the first floor flat above 80 High Street (80A).

It is considered that the current scheme successfully overcomes the previous objections in terms of loss of outlook and the proposal can now be supported.

Residential amenity – proposed occupiers

The proposed flats meet the Council's internal space standards. The ground floor studio flat has a very small amenity area at the rear served by patio doors which does not meet the Council's external space standards. The upper floor flat will have no external space. However, in this town centre location, it is not considered that this is a significant omission as there are many other properties in town centres which do not enjoy outdoor space due to the constrained and high density nature of development in such areas.

The ground floor flat will receive light from the French doors leading to the small courtyard with further light obtained through two new rooflights to be installed in the existing flat roofed rear extension. These will be obscure glazed and will be largely overshadowed by the proposed extension but they will help to increase the amount of daylight to this unit. On balance, it is considered that the living environment to be provided for both of the proposed flats is acceptable.

Accessibility and parking

No parking is to be provided on the site, in common with many other properties in the High Street. The site is in a sustainable location with good access to public transport and public car parks. There is no highway objection to the proposal.

It is not considered that cycle parking can be provided in this case due to the limited outdoor space available.

Recommendation

APPROVE

Subject to conditions:

1. Approved Plans
2. Standard time limit
3. Means of protecting dwellings from noise to include acoustic glazing and mechanical ventilation to be submitted and approved
4. External materials including windows and doors to be approved.
5. An archaeological investigation of the site shall be carried out at the expense of the developer in accordance with a specification (written scheme of investigation) to be submitted to and agreed by the Local Planning Authority in writing before the commencement of building works.
6. Construction Method Statement

Informatives

1. The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by assessing the proposal against all material considerations, including planning policies and any representations that may have been received and subsequently determining to grant planning permission in accordance with the presumption in favour of sustainable development, as set out within the National Planning Policy Framework.
2. Southern water
3. Southern water

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

Case Officer: Peter Barnett Date: 19 September 2016

Authorised by: Gary Peck Date: 20 September 2016