Expiry Date -

Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: **Recommendation – APPROVE**
AWDM/0204/14

Site: **231 Harbour Way**

Proposal: **Rooms in roof with rear extension and increase to ridge height**

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

The proposal is for an increase in ridge height by 1.3 metres to the original bungalow to create an upper floor, along with a chimney and gabled rear extension with balcony to measure (at max) 6 metres in height, 3.7 metres in length, and 8.7 metres in width.

The application property is a detached gable ended bungalow occupying a plot which backs onto Shoreham Sailing Club.

The site is on Shoreham Beach, an outer residential suburb of Shoreham town.

Relevant Planning History
None

Consultations
None

Representations
Support received from occupier of 109 Old Fort Road, summarized:-

Although not directly affected I felt I had to comment as it looks like it will enhance the area. Also more in keeping with neighbours to the north, both of whom have extended. Strongly support this design as it will improve this part of the beach, something not always successfully achieved.

Relevant Planning Policies and Guidance
Adur Local Plan: AG1, AH7
National Planning Policy Framework

Planning Assessment

Principle

Upgrading of residential accommodation is acceptable in principle

Visual amenity

The application property is at the end of a row of four bungalows. Of these, the middle two bungalows have been extended, so these are now larger buildings with higher ridges – and the design consistency to all four bungalows is now somewhat lacking.

The proposal would equally raise the ridge so that the application building would be of similar height to the two middle bungalows. This would mean the resultant building would not be of an insensitive scale. The introduction of a chimney and a front first floor window would both be different features not evident on the other bungalows, but these would not be insensitive as the original character and silhouette of the bungalow would still be recognised.

The remaining proposed alterations at the rear and side would closely resemble the design of the middle two bungalows, and would not be uncharacteristic of the immediate area where there are a lot of balconies.

Residential amenity

It is the neighbours either side who are principally impacted upon by this development (which is physically removed from the remainder)

Neighbour to the north

This neighbouring property has roof lights in its own roof slope facing onto the application property. One serves a bathroom, the other a secondary source to the bedroom, so the reduction in light and outlook experienced by the proposal onto these sources of light would not be adverse.

The proposed gabled extension would end in line with the rear of the neighbouring building, with the open balcony element of the extension being single-storey beyond this. This would ensure adverse overbearing and overshadowing onto this neighbour is avoided.

The introduction of the open balcony and lights to the roof slopes would introduce a degree of overlooking, and noise and disturbance. This would reduce this neighbour's privacy. However because the neighbour's garden backs onto the sailing club, there is already an open aspect to their garden which lacks any real sense of privacy. There would be an element of mutual overlooking between users of each of the balconies but this will be mitigated to some extent by use of privacy screens to the side, as have been installed at No. 129. The roof lights would result in only acute views onto the neighbour.

It is noted this neighbour has not objected to the proposal.

Neighbours to the south

There is sufficient distance between the extension and those neighbouring buildings to the south so as to avoid harm onto their amenities by way of overbearing and overshadowing.

Intrusive views and overlooking onto neighbours would be avoided due to existing boundary screening, with their level of privacy not materially diminished.

This is even with the introduction of the open balcony at the rear – because the distance involved (some 25 metres) avoids intrusive views into the private rooms of those properties (although there may well be some reduction in privacy to the rear most parts of their gardens).

Recommendation

APPROVE for the reason:-

The proposed development would not detract from the local environment and can take place without resulting in unacceptable detriment to the amenities of neighbouring properties. It would consequently not conflict with the saved policies of the Adur District Local Plan (AG1, AH7) or the policies of the National Planning Policy Framework

Subject to Conditions:-

1. Standard time limit
2. Approved plans
3. Exterior materials to match
4. Privacy screen to sides of balcony to be erected prior to use

Informative

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.

Is recommendation contrary to any representations? N

Case Officer signed: Matthew Porter Date: 25-3-2014

Authorised and signed by: Peter Barnett Date: 26 March 2014