Development Management - Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/2188/21 Recommendation – APPROVE

Site: 84 Harbour Way, Shoreham-By-Sea, West Sussex

Proposal: Proposed front porch, first floor side extension with rear dormer and front rooflights, single storey rear extension

Date of site visit: 17th January 2022

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

The application site is a two storey semi detached property with flat roof garage to the side and hipped roof, in a street of similar properties many of which have been extended and altered over time. Consent is sought for a first floor extension above the existing garage with a slight set in from the side boundary with a hipped roof with rear flat roof dormer and front roof lights. Also proposed is a pitched roof front porch and single storey flat roof rear extension.

Amended plans have been received which show the rear dormer reduced in width slightly in line with officer's advice to move it away from the edge of the hip/ridge.

Representations

None received

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 (July 2021)
WSCC Guidance on Parking at New Developments (Sept 2020).

Planning Assessment

Principle

The relevant issues are the effects on the amenities of neighbouring residential occupiers and the effect on the character and appearance of the area.

Visual amenity

The proposed porch will be visible within the street scene. There is a hipped roof porch adjacent at the attached property and the proposed porch appears

to be slightly deeper at 2.3 metres. The hipped roof design will match the adjacent property. There is much variation within the street scene and many different porches and storm shelters exist within the locality. The proposed design and scale will not be out of keeping here.

The first floor side extension will be clearly visible within the street scene, Being closer to the dwelling to the west up to first floor level reduces space between the dwellings and gives rise to a more cramped appearance within the street scene. This is contrary to Development Management Standard No. 2 which states that there should be at least 1 metre between the extension and the boundary to avoid a terracing effect. In this case there is some set in of 0.5 metres, but not the required 1 metre. 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 floor 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.

106 Harbour Way AWDM/1654/19 - Second floor side extension to east elevation.

78 Harbour Way AWDM/0452/19 – side extension has similar design to that proposed here. Slight set back from front, continued ridge.

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.

80 Harbour Way AWDM/1688/16 - 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

The proposal in this case utilises the existing ground floor garage which is built up to the boundary. There is no set back from the front at first floor and as mentioned above there is a 0.5 metres set in from the side, this is similar to that of the adjacent dwelling at No.82. In the light of the above a refusal could not be warranted here in relation to the Development Management Standards.

Materials will match existing with white render and tiles to match. The roof form respects that of existing matching the hipped roof.

The roof lights are visible within the street scene and are not visually harmful. The rear dormer has been amended and reduced in scale slightly, moved in away from the ridge, hip end. The dormer still remains large. It will not be visible within the street scene but is visible within the surrounding locality from neighbouring properties. There is other similar development adjacent and surrounding the site; many flat roof dormers are visible to the rear of the

property. This is not a feature that is out of keeping in this case and as reduced can be supported.

The single storey rear extension is not overly large; it is in character with the existing dwelling and surrounding locality and is subservient to the main dwelling.

Residential amenity

The front porch as stated above will abut the adjacent front porch at the attached property. It will not result in any loss of light, privacy or overbearing impact. It is set in from the boundary from the property to the west and due to its limited depth and scale there will also be no adverse impact.

The side first floor addition is over the existing garage and, partially, the ground floor extension to the rear of the garage. The first floor addition is inline with the rear elevation of the existing first floor. The adjacent property to the west has a blank side elevation and rear two storey projection. The proposed development will not have an overbearing impact upon the neighbouring property or result in any overlooking or loss of privacy. The proposed rear flat roof extension projects 4.2 metres and, due to the existing rear projection to the west, there will be no adverse impact.

The attached dwelling to the east has a ground floor rear extension up to the boundary and a conservatory adjacent to this set away from the boundary. There is a window adjacent to the boundary at the neighbouring property which will be in a recess as a result of the proposed extension. It is however considered that on balance this relationship is acceptable. The window faces south, the proposed extension is less than 1 metre beyond the existing extension and the conservatory as existing is fully glazed. The impact is not considered such to warrant a refusal in this case.

Recommendation

APPROVE

Subject to Conditions:-

1. Approved Plans
2. Standard 3 year time limit
3. Materials to match
4. No windows on the east or west side of the extensions unless shown on the approved drawings.

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

1. Proactive with amendments

Case Officer: Hannah Barker Date: 24th January 2022

Authorised by: Peter Barnett Date: 24 January 2022