ADUR
DISTRICT COUNCIL

Executive
Head of Service
James Appleton

Direct Dial : 01273 263216
Facsimile : 01273 263203
carlos.hone@adur.gov.uk
DX 59765, Shoreham-by-Sea

Planning, Regeneration and Wellbeing
Development Control
Adur District Council
Civic Centre, Ham Road
Shoreham-By-Sea, BN43 6PR

Contact: Carlos Hone

R.J. Reynolds
82 Greenacres
Shoreham-by-Sea
West Sussex
BN43 5XL

Our ref: ADC/0177/09

Your ref: 1676

Date: 26.05.09

Dear Mr Reynolds,

Re: Proposed two-storey front extension, 82 Old Fort Road, Shoreham.

With regards to the above planning application. I have now had an opportunity to consider the proposals with respect to the site conditions and surrounding dwellings, and I feel that in principle they are unacceptable in their current form.

The proposed scheme is considered to be tantamount to an additional dwelling (split into two self-contained flats) which would be separated from the main dwelling by an already existing attached annex. No attempt appears to have been made to integrate the proposed extension into the built form of the original house, either in terms of its physical appearance or use of the habitable rooms within it.

I have concern regarding the use of the proposed extension, and that it may be used to rent out independently as is the case with the existing annexe. The proposed extension would be entirely separate, with two independent front doors, and the means to be separate units of accommodation. I appreciate that your client has needs which currently exceed their present living accommodation, but it does appear at face value that three separate annexes would be excessive for the dwellinghouse.

In terms of the physical appearance of the proposals. The extension would be 5.5m in width, by 14.5m in depth, by 6.5m in height. It would (due to the existing flat roofed annex) project in front of the existing dwelling by 16.4m. As a consequence of the proposal having two stories the eaves level of the extension would not match that of the original house, the Juliette balconies would be built off of the flank wall and add to the visual bulk of the extension as would the north side gable end. The timber boarding at first floor is a common material in the surrounding beach area, however this property appears to have no cladding, uPVC cladding would be inappropriate for this development as it would not match the original dwelling.

The overall height and depth of the proposal will appear to overwhelm the existing house, and it is considered that the lack of suitable transition between the existing house and the proposal only adds to the detached appearance. I consider that by reason of its excessive size and bulk, the proposal would form an obtrusive and incongruous feature that would be visually out of keeping and detrimental to the existing environment.

In terms of the effect on the amenity of the adjacent dwellings, there is a slight concern regarding the effect on the neighbour to the west (No.70) and that an extension of such a height could be overbearing. It is clear that there is some built form on the west side boundary already in the form of the applicants garage and the garage at No.70, so on balance this may be acceptable.

Subsequent to my site visit your client has pointed out some other examples of extensions within the surrounding area, however I feel that they are not comparable. The extension at No.120 is not as long as this proposal and not as high. In addition the very small amount of dormer ensures that the roof appears as a roof rather than an additional storey. The extension at No's 24 and 20 are indeed two-storey however they are integrated into the design of the existing dwelling and less that half the depth. The other point to mention regarding these examples is that they only provide additional living accommodation for the occupiers in the form of bedrooms or hobby rooms, dining room etc, and all form integral parts which are connect to the existing house.

I feel that the current application does not comply with policy AG1, AH2 and AH7 of the Adur district Local Plan for the above reasons.

I would be grateful if you could talk through my comments to your client, and if as a result you are minded to withdraw the application so further negotiation on the design can take place I would appreciate it if you do so no later than 16 June 2009, after which time the application will be determined on its current submission.

Please note that I will be on annual leave from 1 June and will be back in the office on Monday 15 June.

Yours sincerely,

Carlos Hone
Planning Officer

cc. Mr Garland & Ms McCarthy via email.