Expiry Date - 29/11/2012

Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/1140/12 **Recommendation – Approve**

Site: **Lower Ground Floor Flat 27 High Street Shoreham-By-Sea West Sussex**

Proposal: **Single storey rear extension and part infill single storey extension on north and east side of back addition.**

Date of site visit: 25.9.12

Neighbours checked: Y/N

Additional neighbour notifications: Y/N

Site and Surroundings

The application property sits on the riverfront close to the pedestrian bridge and small park in the historic centre of Shoreham by Sea. It is within a terrace which faces the High St on its north side and the river on its south, all within the Conservation Area.

Immediately to the east is the Grade 2 listed 23-25 is 18th century two storeys (with accommodation in the roof) building in use as a solicitors. To the west of the application property is the unlisted terrace of Victorian properties, also two storeys (with accommodation in the roof) and used for retail on the ground floor but residential above.

The application property itself is a three storey distinguished early Victorian building. The ground floor is used as a hairdressers but the lower ground floor is a one bedroom flat, accessed through its separate door off the High St. It is rendered and features a single flying bay at the front. There are flats above.

The ground falls at the rear of the terrace in which the application property sits and the existing lower ground floor flat is formed here, the accommodation being accessed from internal stairs. At the back of the application property is a shallow terrace, apparently formerly used a garden but now the subject of preparatory site works. A two storey mono pitched rear extension has been added recently, the ground floor of which accommodation part of the existing lower ground floor flat.

The property at No 29 to the east also features a rear terrace and the common boundary is a low timber fence. This has been recently extended at

the rear in the form of single storey modest addition, windowless in the facing eastern elevation. The listed building to the west also has a landscaped rear terrace and the common boundary between the application property and this is a tall (staggered) brick wall.

Proposal

The rear extension is very similar to that approved in 2006 (ADC/0116/06) but not implemented, in that it is 3 ms deep and 4.2 ms wide ands extends an existing living area. However it flat roofed in this instance (following negotiations) and 3ms tall, rather than mono pitched. There are windows show on the south elevation as before but also new windows in the east elevation.

The boiler room is a very small addition to the north elevation of the recessed are between the existing addition and the original rear wall of the building. It is 1 meter wide and deep and 2.5 ms tall to its monopitched ridge.

The buildings are faced to match the existing as far as possible (white render and slate roof).

A modest rear terrace/garden would remain.

It is supported by a Design and Access Statement and self certificated Flood Risk Assessment.

Relevant site history

SU/230/81/TP/5312; Two-Storey Extension To Rear. Granted 1981

SU/129/86/TP/2051; Two-Storey Rear Extension.; Refused 1986

SU/47/95/TP/15895; Conversion Of Lower Ground floor Workshop To A One-Bedroom Flat 1995; Granted 1995

ADC/0116/06 Pitched-roof rear extension to basement flat. Granted 2006

ADC/0322/07; Conversion of existing first and second floor offices into two 1-bed self-contained flats Granted 2007

Expiry Date - 29/11/2012

Consultations

Environmental Health Officer

Precautionary condition for ground contamination.

Other than this I can confirm there are no adverse environmental health comments.

County Archaeologist

I have had a look at the plans and the early Ordnance Survey mapping for Shoreham. Although the address is right in the historic core of the town, I think that the scale of the proposal can be treated as 'de minimis' and the likelihood of encountering any historic/ archaeological deposits in preparing the foundations for the extension fairly slim. Having looked at the Ordnance Survey 25 inch series from the 1870s through to the 1930s it is possible that the rear yard/ garden of 27 High Street was created by building out on top of foreshore deposits and the material may prove to be 'made ground' in any event.

No action needed in terms of archaeology.

Representations

None.

Relevant Planning Policies

Adopted Adur District Local Plan 1993-2006 (ADC 1996) (saved policies): AB1; AB4;,AB6 and AB11, AG1, AH7 and Appendix 11 ‘Supplementary Planning Guidance’ comprising: Development Control Standard No.3 ‘Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings’ South East Plan (GOSE 2009): CC1, CC6, BE1 National Planning Policy Framework (CLG 2012)

Planning Assessment

Principle

The proposal comprises upgrading of the existing housing stock located within the built up area and can be supported in principle. A small but adequate garden is retained.

Effects on the intrinsic qualities of the building as a heritage asset, the setting of the adjacent Listed Building and the Conservation Area

The principle of such a rear extension was accepted in 2006. Its scale is modest and together with its siting ensure it is not unduly prominent. It will be visible from across the river, from the pedestrian bridge and obliquely from the adjacent park but would sit comfortably amongst the other modern, unassertive and simple styled rear extensions. The roof form has been amended to avoid an awkward guttering arrangement associated with the previous butterfly roof design. The boiler extension is very minor.

Materials would need to match the existing in both cases.

No harm to the setting of the adjacent Listed Building and the Conservation Area would result.

The impact on the amenities of neighbouring residential and commercial occupiers

The rear extension sits close to the boundary with No 29 but the closest part of the building at no 29 is 4 ms away and neither facing flank contains windows. The new extension includes widows on its east side but given the boundary treatment here, the set back from the boundary itself and the commercial use of the rear terrace of No 29, no unacceptable harm would arise.

The applicant confirms in respect of the boiler that *this will be a standard worchester bosch condensing boiler 98% efficient. there will be no significant noise and the surrounding buildings are all commercial.* It is very small and will not impact on neighbour amenity.

Flood risk

A Flood Risk Assessment has been submitted in line with the Environment Agency standing advice and the applicant confirms the floor levels will be no lower than existing and flood proofing have been incorporated into the scheme***.***

Accessibility and parking

The additional intensification of use is marginal.

Archaeology & Land Contamination

Land Contamination informative required. No archaeological interest identified.

Recommendation

APPROVE for the reason:-

The proposed development would not detract from the local environment, the Conservation Area or the setting of the adjacent Listed Building and can take place without resulting in unacceptable detriment to the amenities of neighbouring properties and is adequately flood proofed. It would consequently not conflict with the saved policies of the Adur District Local Plan (AB1; AB4, AG1, AH7) or the policies of the South East Plan (CC1, CC6, BE1)

Subject to Conditions:-

1. Standard 3 year time limit
2. Materials to match existing dwelling etc
3. The development shall not be carried out other than in full accordance with the Flood Risk Assessment and the floor levels of the domestic rear extension shall be no lower than existing and the flood proofing measures shall be incorporated into the scheme in accordance with "Improving the Flood performance of new buildings" DCLG 2007. These shall be retained thereafter.

4. No windows or other openings in west side wall of the rear extension
5. Permission relates to approved plans:
   Drawing No: 9784-1A Date Received: 4.10.12
   Drawing No: Un-numbered location and block plan Date Received: 4.10.12.

Is recommendation contrary to letter(s) of representation?

Case Officer: P Devonport Date: 21.11.12

Authorised by: Gary Peck Date: 22 November 2012

Expiry Date - 29/11/2012