Development Management - Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: **Recommendation – Approve**
AWDM/0935/12

Site: **34 Old Fort Road, Shoreham-by-Sea, BN43 5RJ**

Proposal: **Proposed first floor front extension, and formation of rear balcony on existing flat-roofed rear extension**

Date of site visit: 14.08.12

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings
The application relates to a detached 1950's house located on the south side of the road, with direct beach access from the rear. The house has a pitched tiled roof, with a ground floor of white painted render and a first floor of weathered timber shingles. The dwelling has previously been extended with a front projecting car-port/porch, and a rear flat-roofed single-storey extension across the entire rear elevation, and to the side.

Permission is sought for a first-floor extension 3.6m wide, by 1.8m deep to the front of the house, above the existing porch. The extension would be shingle clad, with a mono-pitched roof and would provide additional space for an ensuite bathroom. Permission is also sought for the formation of a rear facing balcony above the existing flat roofed extension. The balcony would be the width of the dwelling and would have a timber balustrade detail.

Consultations and Representations

Adur & Worthing Councils: Precautionary contamination condition requested by EHO.

Third parties: There has been one letter of objection from the neighbours directly to the east (No.36). They feel that the proposed balcony would overlook their garden and swimming pool. They suggest an obscured panel to offer some privacy to them.

Relevant Planning Policies
Adopted Adur District Local Plan 1993-2006 (ADC 1996) (saved policies): 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

Visual amenity
The proposed front extension is relatively modest in scale and has been designed in a sympathetic way so that it complements the appearance of the existing house. The shingle clad extension does not project too far beyond the front elevation and consequently it is considered that it would not have an adverse impact on the streetscene.

The rear balcony would be well set back from the road, and screened from view from the frontage by the bulk of the house itself. The balcony would be clearly visible from the public areas of the beach, however it is a common feature in this location that would not be out of place. The application has been amended to include a visibility screen to the east side which is proposed to also be shingle clad. Whilst this is a unique design it is not considered that it would detract particularly from the appearance of the dwelling or the street as a whole.

Residential amenity
The concern with the addition of the balcony would that its use could be more detrimental to the neighbouring sites through overlooking, and through the disturbance of the use by people standing and sitting for extended periods of time, where currently the impact is restricted to views from the rear facing windows.

The proposed balcony would enable the occupants to sit out across the majority of the rear of the property to make the best of views to the south, however this would be no different than from the use of the rear garden. The balcony would be inset from the eastern boundary with the objector by 1.8m, however there would be oblique views over their rear garden, from this elevated level. The addition of the obscured shingle screen would ensure that the level of overlooking would not be excessive.

To the west the balcony would be inset by 2.8m and there is less concern regarding overlooking owing to the separation, and high level timber slatted design.

On the basis that the gardens are currently not completely private, the balcony would not result in a loss of privacy that would be unacceptable.

Other matters
The Contaminated Land Officer has requested a precautionary condition for the proposals. The development would not result in the disturbance of undeveloped land and therefore it is considered the condition is not warranted.

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 South East Plan (CC1, CC6, BE1)

Subject to Conditions:-

1. Standard 3 year time limit
2. Materials to match existing dwelling etc
3. Proposed balcony not to be used unless and until the visibility screens hereby approved are installed. They shall thereafter be retained at all times, unless otherwise approved in writing by the LPA.
4. Permission relates to approved plans:

Drawing No:1224/1/A	Date Received: 14.09.12
Drawing No:1224/2/A	Date Received: 14.09.12
Drawing No:1224/4/D	Date Received: 20.09.12
Drawing No:1224/5/C	Date Received: 14.09.12

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

Case Officer: C. Hone Date: 21.09.12

Authorised by: Gary Peck Date: 25 September 2012