

App.No: 171438	Decision Due Date: 30 January 2018	Ward: Sovereign
Officer: William De Haviland-Reid	Site visit date: 08/01/2018	Type: Householder
Site Notice(s) Expiry date: 5 th January 2018 Neighbour Con Expiry: 5 th January 2018 Press Notice(s): N/A		
Over 8/13 week reason: Within time		
Location: 8 Auckland Quay, Eastbourne		
Proposal: Proposed rear extension, rear & front facing dormer alterations, front porch infill and stair window alterations. Internal alterations.		
Applicant: Mrs S Parker		
Recommendation: Approve Conditionally		

Executive Summary:

The application is brought to committee by request of an objector and Councillor Di Cara.

The proposed development provides an acceptable form of residential development that would not cause a significant loss of amenity to the neighbouring properties or the wider street scene.

Scheme is recommended for approval with conditions.

Planning Status:

A residential property located within a predominantly residential area of Eastbourne, Sovereign Harbour. The property is not a Listed Building and is not located within a Conservation Area.

Relevant Planning Policies:

National Planning Policy Framework 2012

- 7. Requiring good design
- 8. Promoting healthy communities

Core Strategy Local Plan 2013 Policies

B1 Spatial Development Strategy and Distribution Sustainable Centre

B2 Creating Sustainable Neighbourhoods
C14 Sovereign Harbour Neighbourhood Policy
D5 Housing High Value Neighbourhoods
D10a Design

Eastbourne Borough Plan Saved Policies 2007

NE16 Dev within 250m of former landfill site
US5 Tidal Flood Risk
HO2 Predominantly Residential Areas
HO20 Residential Amenity
UHT4 Visual Amenity

Site Description:

The detached host property is located within Sovereign Harbour with a direct marina frontage (from rear garden).

At the front of the property is white cladding on the first floor, with 2no. dormers on the front plane of the roof. The ground floor has a bay window and double doors which are slightly set back.

The rear of the property has a first storey balcony and two small rear dormers. The first floor also has cladding.

The rear garden is of two levels and leads down to the waterfront which has a jetty attached.

Relevant Planning History:

100443
7 Auckland Quay
Single storey extension at rear.
Householder
Approved conditionally
01/10/2010

110539
7 Auckland Quay
Single storey extension at rear (revised scheme to EB/2010/0481)
Householder
Approved conditionally
10/11/2011

140131
7 Auckland Quay
Single storey extension to garage to form garden store.
Householder
Approved conditionally
26/03/2014

170838

9 Auckland Quay

Single storey rear extension to existing house, along with extended terrace in rear garden with steps to the lower ground level (amended description)

Householder

Approved Conditionally

10/08/2017

171078

8 Auckland Quay

Proposed 2 storey rear extension, rear & front facing dormer alterations, front porch infill and stair window alterations and rear facing flat roof terrace.

Refused :- *It is considered that the proposal will adversely affect the amenity of the neighbouring properties by virtue of direct overlooking. As such the proposal fails to comply with Eastbourne Core Strategy Local Plan Policies 2013 B2 and also Eastbourne Borough Plan Saved Policies 2007 HO20.*

10/11/2017

171259

9 Auckland Quay

Erection of single storey ground floor full width rear extension internal alterations at first floor, and installation of 2 no. new roof lights at second floor.

Approved Conditionally

04/12/2018

Proposed development:

The application has been submitted to overcome the concerns raised with the previous refusal (171078 Reason for refusal outlined in history section above)

The application has a number of key elements to it namely:-

- Rear extension,
- Rear & front facing dormer alterations,
- Front porch infill and stair window alterations.
- Internal alterations.

The main changes to the scheme(from the previous refusal) relate to the reduction in the depth of the two storey rear extension and the insertion of privacy screens to the first floor balcony.

Consultations:

Neighbour Representations:

5 neighbours have written objecting to the scheme highlighting in the main the following issues:

- The glass panels on the balconies and the two 1.8 meter high screens on the first floor balconies are not in keeping with the original 'Millwood Homes Design' and does not do justice to the homes appearance.
- Overlooking/loss of privacy from balconies
- Disrupt building line
- If balconies are used would increase noise pollution
- Rear extensions often controlled to limit the use of as a balcony
- Given limited separation would dominate the amenities of the occupiers of the adjoining properties
- Given limited width of carriage way to the front of the property there may well be construction issues/problems including parking and storage/delivery of building materials.
- Scheme does little to overcome the concerns of previous refusal
- Loss of light and overshadowing from the scale of the development
- Other extensions in the area have been limited to single storey only
- Disproportionate to the host property
- Glass screens would dominate the neighbouring plots and increase perceived overlooking
- Would set an undesirable precedent which would damage the character of the area.

Appraisal:

Principle of development:

There is no objection in principle to the proposed development and making alterations to the building provided it would be designed to a high standard, respect the established character of the area and would not have an adverse effect on the amenity and is in accordance with the policies of the Core Strategy 2013, and saved policies of the Borough Plan 2007 and the National Planning Policy Framework (2012).

The main issues to consider for this application are the effects on the amenity of the neighbouring properties and the effects on the amenity of the surrounding area.

Impact of proposed development on amenity of adjoining occupiers and surrounding area:

The dormers on the front of the property are larger than the existing and measure broadly 2m in width and 3m height.. It is considered that the proposed dormers will offer no more a view than that of the existing dormers already existing within the property and as such do not affect the amenity of the neighbouring properties.

The first floor extension at the rear of the property has been reduced by 2m, while retaining the second floor terrace, however the terrace does not look into neighbouring properties as either side of the proposed terrace is a pitched roof which stands at 2.6m tall from the terrace floor level.

Since the original application the first floor terrace has seen the addition of 1.8m high obscure glass privacy screens on either side of the elevations, this mitigates direct overlooking into neighbouring plots/properties. Notwithstanding this it is acknowledged a number of properties along this stretch of the harbour-side have rear balconies as part of their original design concept. Given this and the desire to maximise harbour views it is considered that a refusal based on an in principle objection to balconies could not be justified.

The privacy glass is not considered to be overbearing to the neighbouring properties due to the position and location of the host property and separation in relation to the neighbouring properties being number 7 and 9 Auckland Quay.

The siting of the two storey part of the rear extension is such that it would not result in any material loss of light or overbearing impact upon the occupiers of the neighbouring properties.

Design issues:

The design of the dormers at the front albeit larger than those that currently exist are reflective of the scale of the host property and retain key features (pitched roof and tiled roof)

As with any extension the character and appearance of the host property will change and in this instance it is acknowledged that the proposed extension to some degree will be visible from public vantage point around the harbour. It is considered in this regard that the impacts of the proposal in design terms are insufficient to substantiate a refusal.

A number of respondents to the application have commented that the design would be contrary to the original design ethos of the properties in the stretch of the harbour; it is considered that the character of the wider area is not formed by any unified architectural character and as such the proposed extension would not be discordant.

Human Rights Implications:

The impacts of the proposal have been assessed as part of the application process. Consultation with the community has been undertaken and the impact on local people is set out above. The human rights considerations have been taken into account fully in balancing the planning issues; and furthermore the proposals will not result in any breach of the Equalities Act 2010.

Conclusion:

It is considered that the proposed development will not negatively impact the amenity of the occupiers of surrounding properties or be detrimental to the character and appearance of the area. Proposal therefore complies with local and national policies.

Recommendation: Approve Conditionally

Conditions:

- 1) Time limit
- 2) Approved Plans

Informatives:

This application relates to an extension to a single family dwelling house any other use of the property would require formal planning permission.

Appeal:

Should the applicant appeal the decision the appropriate course of action to be followed, taking into account the criteria set by the Planning Inspectorate, is considered to be written representations.