Expiry Date - 13/05/2010

Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: ADC/0072/10 **Recommendation – Permit Application**

Site: **Waters Edge West Beach Shoreham-by-Sea West Sussex**

Proposal: **Conversion of garage to games room; construction of new garage at front with balcony above; first-floor front extension and new second floor with balcony**

The Application

The application relates to a detached mid 1960's flat roofed house, located on the north side of the road, directly adjacent to the junction with Kings Crescent. The house currently is of a red brick construction with a flat roof and deep projecting soffits and timber clad fascias. It has a projecting double garage which is in part integral, on the west side of the front elevation, with an angled, 2.8m deep balcony above it. The main living room has access to the front balcony at first floor level. The front of the dwelling has a vehicular access and parking for a number of cars. There is a 2m high brick wall to the west of the property.

The proposals are to convert the existing garage area into a games room, and attach a single storey projecting garage to the front. The garage as amended would be 6.2m in width, by 4m in depth, by 2.5m in height (a reduction of 1.6m in depth). Access to the garage would be from the existing driveway with the garage door located in the eastern elevation.

The existing first floor balcony is proposed to be fully internalised to enlarge the proposed living and dining room, and a new balcony is proposed above the new projecting garage. The first floor extension would be the same size as the existing balcony 8.5 – 9.8m in width, by 3m in depth (by 3m in height). The balcony above the proposed garage would be 6.4m wide, by 2.8m in depth.

In addition a whole new second floor is proposed. The additional storey would be asymmetrical with a dual pitched sloping roof with full height south facing glazing, and a south side balcony. The additional floor would be 12.5m wide, by 1.8m – 4.6m in height, by 9.3m in depth. The second floor would provide additional accommodation in the form of two bedrooms with ensuite bathroom and dressing room.

The proposed additional floor would be cedar clad with a black concrete tiled roof, and with some rendered panels.

To the west on the opposite side of the junction with Kings Crescent is Widewater Court an 'L' shaped, five storey block of 25 flats, which look out towards the sea to the south and the Widewater Lagoon to the west. The

rearmost windows of some flats look towards the parking compound and vehicular access, and to a lesser extent and properties in Kings Crescent and the site.

Directly to the north is No.37 Kings Crescent, a three-storey town house, to the east of the site is Thalassa, a detached pitched roof 1970's dwelling with side gables, and front balcony. Directly to the south is Shoreham Beach.

Site History:
SU/241/88/TP – Extension to form additional storey at second floor level. Approved 22.11.88
SU/124/93/TP - Extension to form additional storey at second floor level (renewal of SU/241/88). Approved 06.09.93

Consultations and Representations

Third Parties: There have been two letters of objection to the proposals from the owners of Flats 7 & 12 Widewater Court.

The owner of Flat 7 objects on the grounds that the proposed second floor and balcony will cause overlooking and loss of privacy to their property. The owner of No.12 objects to the proposals on the grounds of adverse appearance and character. They feel that the proposals will be higher than the house immediately to the rear, and that the front extension will jut out beyond the houses facing the sea. The appearance will look dark and oppressive, and will stick out like a sore thumb.

Relevant Planning Policies and Guidance

Adopted Adur District Local Plan 1993-2006 (ADC 1996) (saved policies): AG1, AH7 and Appendix II 'Supplementary Planning Guidance' comprising: Development Control Standard No.3 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings.'
PPS 1 'Delivering Sustainable Development' (ODPM 2005)

Planning Assessment

Policies
Policy AH7 of the Local Plan states that extensions and alterations should be designed so as not to result in an unacceptable degree of overlooking, a loss of natural light or an overbearing effect on neighbouring dwellings. They should be of sympathetic design and materials to the original dwelling and the area in general and accord with the Council's DC standards.

The Council's Development Control Standard No.3 entitled 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings' states that the most important basic principle is that any extension should be in keeping with the appearance, scale, design and

character of both the existing dwelling and the street scene generally. When specifically relating to front extensions it states, in the case of semi-detached or detached dwellings, front extensions will only be allowed where the extension can be successfully assimilated into the streetscene and not unduly affect neighbours.

Visual amenity
West Beach has an eclectic mix of dwellings varying greatly in height, scale, and design. The requirement of the Council's Development Control Standard that extensions should be in keeping with the appearance, scale, design and character of both the existing dwelling and streetscene generally, is not always applied in such mixed character areas, such as this.

Whilst the character of the buildings in West Beach varies between 1960's flat roof houses such as the application property to 1950's more traditional hipped roof houses, the general character is of large detached dwellings which are orientated with living accommodation at first floor level to make the most of the beach views, with most having balconies. Further to the east two modern 'eco' style houses have been erected recently in place of a former large detached house (ADC/0481/07). The dwellings at Chesil House are striking due to their very contemporary design, use of modern cladding materials, large quantities of glazing, and due to their siting close to the road, in particular comparison to the adjacent neighbour to the west.

The site property has had permission granted (and renewed) for an additional storey behind a high parapet shaped wall. The additional storey approved would have been, the full width of the existing dwelling 14m, by 9.8m in depth, by 2.6m in height with an angled mansard roof, the majority of which would have been a large expanse of flat roof.

The proposals in this case represent a change in the overall cosmetic appearance of the house, but with the retention of the basic form with the addition of the taller second floor. Whilst the new floor would result in a building which exceeds the height of the former permission it is considered that the mass and bulk of the building would be similar due to the additional storey proposed being inset by 0.6m from the flank walls (1.2m from the fascia), and 1.7m from the front of the existing building, plus the added benefit of the sloping roof form which minimises the overall visual effect of the roof.

The addition of timber cladding and rendered panels throughout the exterior of the existing building and garage extension will enable the proposed second floor to integrate fully with the existing building without it appear incongruous or unsympathetic.

The site property sits back from the building line with the properties to the east, and it is considered that a sympathetically sized front projection would not appear incongruous. The garage as originally proposed would have been a double garage with a 5.6m projection. The applicant was made aware of Officers and objectors concerns regarding the proposed front garage extension, and how prominent it would appear. The applicant has amended

the plans and reduced how far it would project by 1.6m which is considered to be adequate to ensure it does not appear too dominant.

Residential amenity
The proposed alterations would have very limited impact on the flats at Widewater Court to the west which are at their closest 22m away, and fully exposed to members of the public using the beach and highway, and the existing first floor balcony which has unobstructed views towards it and the front of Thalassa to the east.

The rear of the existing dwelling will be unchanged other than for the addition of the second floor full height window serving the stairs. This is proposed to be obscurely glazed.

The proposed balcony at second floor has been inset from the edges of the building, and the balcony above the garage has also been limited in depth, it is considered that these would not result in overlooking of private areas or habitable rooms of Thalassa (east) that would be any worse than the existing front balcony at the house. The proposed addition of a second floor would not result in a greater degree of overlooking than currently exists or than was previously approved.

To the east Thalassa has two windows in the west side elevation which are currently shadowed by the existing dwelling, the additional height will not change this to any degree that would warrant a refusal. No.37 Kings Crescent to the rear has no windows in the side elevation that would be affect more so that currently experience by the shadowing caused by the existing house.

Recommendation

APPROVE for reason that :-

1PPi

1. C1Ci
2. C12Aii (amended)
   ....to be used for the external cladding, and balcony balustrading for the proposed extensions has been...etc
3. C12F (amended)
   The windowframes in the proposed first and second floor extensions shall match all respects those of the existing building unless otherwise approved in writing ...etc
4. C18C3 (amended)
   The glazing in the north and east side elevation of the second floor extension shall at all times be glazed with obscured glass.
   Reason: *To prevent...etc*

5. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 466/01 date stamped received 12.05.10.
Reason: *For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.*

Case Officer: Carlos Hone Date: 19.05.10

Planning Services Manager: [redacted] Date: 19/5/10

Chairman of the Planning Committee [redacted] Date: 21/6/10