

Development Management – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/1572/25 Recommendation: APPROVE

Site: 167 Old Fort Road, Shoreham-By-Sea, West Sussex

Proposal: New entrance porch to west elevation. First floor extension over part of existing front terrace. Second floor timber clad extension to form access to new front roof terrace

Date of Site Visit: 3rd February 2026

Neighbours Checked: Y

Additional neighbour notification: N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

The application site is a two storey flat roof dwelling with a first floor front terrace, rear amenity space and off street parking to the front. It is on the north side of Old Fort Road in between two more traditional style properties. Old Fort Road is generally a street of many different property designs and styles with much contemporary redevelopment. The south side of the street is more larger scale development many of which are three storey. The north side is mainly two storey with many chalet bungalows and more modest contemporary development.

The site is also to the eastern end of Old Fort Road with Harbour Way following round the curve in the street to the north moving into a more traditional character of development.

Consent is sought to add a single storey flat roof extension on the west side. Set back from the front of the property, set in by 1.8 metres from the boundary, this will provide an entrance porch. At first floor to the front is a terrace, an extension is proposed to the front of the first floor into this existing terrace area. Increasing in width following the line of the terrace. This will provide an open plan living/dining space opening onto the remainder of the terrace. The front balustrade of the terrace will remain in the same position as existing.

A second floor addition is proposed, a rectangular flat roof 'pod' which is set in from the sides, front and rear of the first floor development. This will provide a staircase and access to a new front roof terrace. The plans have been amended, originally this extension was larger than shown in footprint with glazed doors and appeared more as a third storey. As amended it is smaller, more subservient and the terrace has been altered to not extend further to the side than the side elevations. The terrace is deeper to the front than originally proposed to compensate.

The majority of the building will be rendered with the second floor addition in vertical timber cladding.

Representations: - 2 representations have been received from no. 5 Falcon Close and no. 169 Old Fort Road.

5 Falcon Close – Objects to the proposal. Received in relation to the original scheme.

- The addition of the second floor is of concern.
- Loss of light during winter months in the garden.
- Otherwise generally in support of the application.

169 Old Fort Road – recently moved in and was not informed of the development, officer has discussed proposals with the neighbour.

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 (December 2024)

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 second floor extension is similar to that found on many recent developments on the north side of Old Fort Road, including development at 111 Old Fort Road, AWDM/0213/22. The north side of the road is more characterised by two storey dwellings. Although there are many traditional dwelling houses there are also many examples of contemporary development here. The character of the north side of the road is smaller scale with full three storey development dominating the south side only.

In this case the addition of the second floor is for access to the roof only and, as amended, it does not appear as an additional floor, being set back and set in from the sides of the existing building. It only provides space for the staircase with a small window with no living space. The terrace balustrades are glazed and will not give rise to a prominent development at second floor. This remains subservient and in keeping with the existing character where no second floor living space is provided. It will therefore not set a harmful precedent in this case. The timber cladding will complement the existing development here. It will be an acceptable height when compared with the houses on either side, both of which currently have higher roofs than No. 167, and it will not appear unduly tall or out of scale as a result.

The first floor extension will increase the depth of development and bring it forward closer to the highway. This will be a prominent feature and will be clearly visible within the street scene. Yet there will still be set back from the front, the front terrace will remain to the front elevation and come no further forward.

The side, single storey extension is set back and in from the boundary it is a modest addition which is subservient and will have no adverse impact in this case upon the character and appearance of the street scene of existing building.

Residential amenity

The main properties to be affected are those either side and to the rear of the site. The changes to the building including the addition of the second floor extension will be visible from the properties opposite however there will not be any significant impact with regards to loss of light, privacy or overbearing impact that would warrant a refusal in this case. There is separation due to the highway and any front facing windows overlook public space.

To the rear there are properties in Falcon Close, the nearest dwelling is in excess of 30 metres from the second floor addition. Although the building is to the south it is not considered that the addition to the top of the building and increased width at first floor will lead to a significant loss of light in this case. There are no new openings proposed on the rear of the building that will overlook to the north, just the rear of the proposed extension at ground floor. The development in this case is not considered to warrant a refusal on this ground.

To the east is a detached, two storey dwelling. There is a blank side elevation facing onto the application site. The second floor addition is set in from the boundaries, as is the proposed terrace. It is set back so therefore will be adjacent to the rear extension at the adjacent dwelling. However due to the set in and the separation distance to the neighbouring house (No. 169) there is not likely to be any significant harm to light and outlook for the rear windows of the adjacent dwelling.

The proposed terrace is to the front therefore not overlooking private amenity space. The single storey extension is screened from this side by the existing building. Although the development will be visible from the rear of this neighbouring building due to the increased height and bulk it is not considered to be such to warrant a refusal in this case. The building as existing is lower than those either side.

To the west is a chalet bungalow with side facing dormer, this is fitted with obscured glazing. The relationship currently exists between this window and the adjacent front terrace. There is however a set in from the boundary. The front, first floor extension will bring the building closer to this window however this is a blank side elevation. This combined with the second floor addition and terrace will not give rise to any harm to the adjacent chalet bungalow. The ground floor extension is adjacent to the boundary with this neighbouring property, there is vegetation screening and spacing between the buildings. This being ground floor and having no side openings will not give rise to any harmful impact.

Due to the terraces being to the front, side privacy screens are not deemed necessary in this case.

Recommendation

APPROVE

Subject to Conditions:-

1. Approved Plans
2. Standard 3 year time limit
3. Materials to match existing with render and vertical cladding as shown on approved plans.
4. No windows on the east or west elevations of the extensions or the north elevation of the second floor addition.

Is recommendation contrary to letter(s) of representation Y

1. Proactive with amendments

Case Officer: Hannah Barker

Date: 9th March 2026

Authorised by: Peter Barnett

Date: 9 March 2026