From: Carlos Hone
Sent: 10 March 2010 15:39
To: 'R Dean'
Subject: 227 Harbour Way, Shoreham
Attachments: ADC003810 227 Harbour Way AP1.doc

Dear Mr Dean,

RE: Proposed extensions to 227 Harbour Way. Application ADC/0038/10.

Please find attached my comments on the submission which represent Officer level opinion only and are made without prejudice to any future decision that the Council may make on this matter.

Yours sincerely

Carlos Hone

Carlos Hone - Planning Officer | Planning , Regeneration and Wellbeing, Adur District Council
Location: Civic Centre Rm 211
Internal: 63216 | External: 01273 263216 | E-mail: carlos.hone@adur.gov.uk

Please think before you print this and save paper

Adur District Council

Planning, Regeneration and Wellbeing

Robert Dean Architecture
4 Kingston Bay Road
Shoreham-by-Sea
West Sussex
BN43 5HP

Our Ref: ADC/0038/10
Your Ref: (10)201

Date: 10 March 2010

Dear Mr Dean,

RE: Proposed groundfloor extension on north side (including integral double garage) with further bedroom and roof terrace above and new gabled roofs with higher ridge line (to provide further bedroom and bathroom) and rear balcony, 227 Harbour Way, Shoreham.

In reference to the above planning application to which I am the Planning Officer.

I have now had the opportunity to visit the site to view the proposals in the context of the surrounding area, and it is my opinion that in principle the proposed raising of the ridge would appear acceptable, however there are a couple of aspects that will require addressing prior to me being able to make a positive recommendation.

Policy AH7 of the Adur District 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 and accord with the Council's DC standards.

The Council's Development Control Standard No.3 entitled 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings' states that 'the most important basic principle is that any extension should be in keeping with the appearance, scale, design and character of both the existing dwelling and the street scene generally. When specifically relating to side extensions it states, that they should be set back at least 1m from the side boundary. Side extensions being clearly visible from the road should be designed to closely match the existing dwelling. The extension should usually be set back from the main front wall of the dwelling to create a visual break and ensure the extension is subordinate to the main dwelling. Very wide side extensions should normally be avoided since they would usually be out of scale with the existing dwelling and spoil its proportions.'

Whilst the increase of the roof ridge mimics the developed dwelling to the south (No.229), I am of the opinion that the gabled side extension is too prominent in its siting and will overpower the resultant dwelling. I would advise you look at hipping the side extension and setting it back so that there is a gap between the front elevation of the dwelling and the front of the garage. This would have the effect of ensuring the extension remains subservient, and does not result in the house from appearing out of character within the street.

The other points that I must raise are that the proposed rear balcony (above the proposed kitchen), would be unneighbourly and would result in a pronounced loss of privacy to the rooms and garden of the neighbouring bungalow to the north (No. 225), and I think that it should be removed from the scheme. Also the addition of a double garage to the north, when the dwelling already has a south side garage, may look a little incongruous, and will spoil the proportions of the original dwelling. On this point I would recommend that you look into removing the southernmost attached garage, to create separation between the site and No.229, and create a more naturally proportioned front elevation.

Please can you mention my comments to your client and if you are minded to amend the scheme please can you do so by email directly to me no later than 14 days from the date of this letter, if nothing has been received by this date (24 March 2010) then the application will be determined on the basis of its current submission.

Yours sincerely,

Carlos Hone
Planning Officer

T. 01273 263216
Email. carlos.hone@adur.gov.uk