Development Management – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/0790/16 Recommendation – APPROVE

Site: 10 The Meadway Shoreham-By-Sea West Sussex

Proposal: Addition of new first floor with higher roof ridge with rooflights to east, west and north elevations and two storey side extension to west elevation to include larger attached garage (re-submission of AWDM/0112/16)

Date of site visit: 8.03.16 and subsequent site meeting to discuss future proposals.

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Site and Surroundings

The site is located on the north side of The Meadway a residential street on Shoreham Beach. The street was originally made up of post-war bungalows and chalets but since that time a number of plots have been redeveloped giving rise to a mixture of building styles and use of building materials and finishes. Some examples of recently approved schemes include no. 14 The Meadway, AWDM/1616/15 replacement of detached bungalow with pair of semi detached chalet style dwellings,(yet to be implemented.) 7 The Meadway, opposite the site, Pair of flat roof semi detached houses, AWDM/0123/10 and 9 The Meadway, detached flat roofed four bedroom house. Adjacent to the west of the site no. 8 The Meadway has been redeveloped with a new chalet style dwelling which replaced a bungalow. There are other examples of further modifications to dwellings and redevelopment elsewhere within this street.

The application site is a modest hipped-roofed detached bungalow. There is off street parking to the frontage and a single detached garage to the western side. The main roof is of pyramid form with flat and hipped roof single storey rear additions. The building footprint is large relative to its plot and sprawls to the rear of the site leaving very little rear amenity space. The existing bungalow does not have any significant architectural merit.

Proposal

Originally permission was sought under application reference AWDM/0112/16 to add a new first floor to the bungalow which would increase the roof ridge. The height would increase from 5.6 metres to 7.2 metres. A two storey addition was also proposed to the west side in the form of a gable extension to include a larger attached garage. Following a site visit and full consideration of this proposal it was considered that this application could not be supported. The extensions resulted in a full gable to the front and rear with the addition of a further gable to the western side. The scale and bulk of the bungalow was to be significantly increased which due to

the limitations of the site and relative proportions of the front and side gable were considered unacceptable. The rear gable with balcony and windows also resulted in overlooking and loss of privacy. Following officer's advice this application was withdrawn and discussions took place with the applicant and agent to establish a suitable proposal that could address the concerns of the Council whilst allowing for the needs of the applicant. It was apparent that compromises were needed to be made to allow a positive recommendation and it is acknowledged that the revised proposals require more substantial redevelopment of the existing bungalow and cost incurred for the applicant, yet without this it was not considered that a supportable solution could be found. It was also advised by officers that significant improvements could be made in design, materials and finish terms to seek to achieve a development of significant aesthetic value. It was suggested that the front elevation should be improved with rebalance and added interest which could be achieved by improved fenestration detailing and use of materials, deviating from the original bungalow design.

As the proposal involves the remodelling of the existing bungalow and not complete redevelopment then there are limitations to the existing dwelling and its position, layout and proportions within the site. Also limiting the development is the proximity and layout of the dwelling(s) to the rear of the site. The addition of the side gable to incorporate the new garage and accommodation above originally did not appear subservient to the main gable frontage. It had a higher ridge and was flush with the property frontage. In addition the front gable did not dominate the dwelling in design terms being a combination of the original ground floor front elevation of the bungalow with new glazed, recessed first floor balcony at first floor. This design did not give rise to a strong main frontage and the large side gable was not a subservient feature, the building was not balanced in scale design or form.

The revised side gable extension is lower and has a set back of 0.9 metres. Due to its reposition the roof has a flat roof design. The main gable frontage has been fully redesigned with a proposal to rebuild the ground floor frontage to incorporate recessed glazing and a main entrance with windows of vertical proportions to balance the first floor contemporary design approach. The frontage will have a timber framed structure with a natural finish, with white power coated aluminium windows a timber garage and front door with natural finish and the walls of the building to be solid walling roughcast/pebbledash.

The rear elevation of the building has been altered from that originally proposed in that it is a hip rather than a full gable with rear balcony. The hip with roof lights to the sides and rear are proposed as a compromise to address the concerns with regards to overlooking to the dwelling to the rear. This is discussed in more detail below.

The first floor addition with side gable provides the following additional accommodation; two bedrooms, a bathroom and dressing room/WC. A first floor front balcony is also provided accessed from the master bedroom.

Consultations: -

Southern Water: - Southern Water requires a formal application for any new connection to the public foul sewer to be made by the applicant or developer. Should consent be granted the following informative should be attached: -

" A formal application for connection to the public sewerage system is required in order to service this development, please contact Southern Water, Sparrowgrove House, Sparrowgrove, Otterbourne, Hampshire SO21 2SW"
Initial investigations indicate that there are no public surface water sewers in the area to serve this development. Alternative means of draining surface water from this development are required. Should any sewer be found during construction works, an investigation of the sewer will be required to ascertain its condition, the number of properties served, and potential means of access before any further works commence on site.

Adur District Council: - Environmental Health – Contaminated Land – The standard precautionary condition and PFA informative should be attached at any consent.

Representations: One email objection from the owner/occupier of no. 35 Cheal Close, Shoreham-By-Sea.

- Any balconies and windows to the south side will overlook first floor bedrooms and bathroom.
- The garden will be overlooked.
- No privacy in the kitchen or conservatory.

Relevant Planning Policies

Saved Local Plan policies (ADC 1996): AG1, AH7
Development Control Standard No.3 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings'
National Planning Policy Framework (CLG 2012)
National Planning Practice Guidance (2012)

Planning Assessment

There is no objection in principle to the proposed extensions and alterations which would upgrade an existing property within an established residential area. The key concerns are the effects on the residential and visual amenities of the locality.

Visual Amenity

As stated above the existing bungalow is a low key building with little design merit. Its loss would not be resisted in this case. However this proposal does not involve the demolition and rebuild it does result in substantial remodelling and the existing character of the building would be lost. It is however felt that the alterations and additions give the opportunity to improve this building in terms of its appearance and its standard of residential provision.

As stated above The Meadway is formed of a mixture of dwellings many of which have been redeveloped and altered with contrasting designs and use of materials.

There is varied and inconsistent spacing between dwellings. It is considered that when considering this development within the street scene the principle of the alterations and differing use of materials is welcomed. Here is the opportunity to provide a striking remodelled building with design value to improve and complement the street scene. The proposed footprint of the building remains relatively unchanged from the original apart from the linking and slight enlargement of the garage in the new side gable. Therefore the building is to be no closer to the highway. It will have increased dominance and scale due to the increased main ridge and side gable yet in the light of other developments in close proximity this increased scale is acceptable. This was provided that the side gable was amended as per the current scheme as discussed above to reduce its dominance and allow it to be subservient and not overly dominance and competing in design terms with the main front gable. The eaves of the building will also remain the same level as the existing bungalow giving rise to a chalet style development. In principle the same as the development adjacent at no. 8, yet not in form.

The proposals as amended, although resulting in a larger overall development on this site, it is considered, on balance, do not represent over-development. The full frontage of the site is to be developed and the side gable gives rise to visually a more tight form of development relative to the adjacent gable at no. 8 yet this is not uncommon in this location. The increased height again is relative to other buildings within the street, some of which are full two storeys and therefore higher than the application property. However it should be noted that no. 12 to the east is a small scale bungalow of original design here which will be significantly smaller than the application site as developed. Yet the precedent has been set here for such developments of this scale and any future considerations to development this dwelling would be decided in the light of surrounding development and judged on its own merits.

The amended scheme uses new materials to create interest within the street scene. The slates to be used on the roof will be similar to those adjacent at no. 8 so creating some consistency between the buildings, especially due to their close proximity this will help reduce the visual bulk and dominance of the side gable. The use of timber and glazing will give a new contemporary appearance, an opportunity has been taken to visually enhance the street scene and add to the character of this evolving street.

It is considered that the flat roof to the side gable whilst not ideal is acceptable in this case. It allows the height of the gable to be kept to a minimum which is considered essential in this case to balance the scale of the frontage. Due to the set back from the front gable and its proximity to the roof of no. 8 it will not be a dominant feature in views from the street.

The rear hip will not be visible within the street scene and as well as addressing residential amenity issues to be discussed below it also reduces the overall bulk and scale of the roof of the building which has been significantly enlarged in this case. The side elevation of this expanse of new roof will be visible on approach form the east, yet from the west there is greater screening due to no. 8. On balance this bulk of roof as amended and subject to the use of slates is not considered to overly

dominate or represent an incongruous feature within the street scene which in the context of this street would warrant a refusal in this case.

Residential Amenity – effect on existing dwellings

The main properties to be affected by the proposed development are those either side, nos. 8 and 12 The Meadway and dwellings to the rear, the closest being no. 35 Cheal Close.

The scale of no. 8 has already been increased and the increased bulk and scale of no. 10 in close proximity to no 8 is not considered to have any adverse impact in this case. There are no side windows other than secondary windows that receive limited light at present that will be impacted in this case to such a degree to warrant a refusal. There is no overlooking created by any windows at the application site. Similarly there are side windows at no .12 yet these will not result in such loss of light or additional overlooking that would warrant a refusal in this case.

As stated above the rear amenity space at the application site is limited in depth and the bungalow sprawls back to the rear of the site. There is a minimum depth of 6 metres to the rear boundary. To the rear is the end of terrace, two storey dwelling no. 35 Cheal Close. This has first floor windows which currently overlook the rear garden of no. 10. No. 35 has a garden depth of 5 metres. Therefore there is a distance of approximately 12 metres between the dwellings. The original scheme showed a full rear gable with balcony facing north toward no. 35. It was considered that despite it being mutual overlooking and taking on board the current 'unneighbourly' circumstances that this was not a form of development that could be supported. The overlooking, loss of privacy and proximity of the balcony which would result would be detrimental to the residential amenities of the occupiers of no. 35 Cheal Close. The impact would be significantly worsened than that which exists. The overlooking is currently between a bedroom at no. 10 and a bedroom and bathroom at no. 35 between a first floor and a ground floor. The original proposal would result in first floor to first floor overlooking and further detriment to amenity with the addition of the balcony. (It should also be noted here that planning permission was granted in 2010 (ADC/0025/10 for an additional end of terrace adjacent to no. 35 Cheal Close but this permission has since lapsed)

The amendments were necessary to alleviate this unacceptable relationship with the removal of the gable to a hip also contributing to the reduction in bulk of the development compared to the earlier proposal. Notwithstanding its hipped form, the height and 'bulk' of the enlarged roof will have a greater presence in views from the rear of No.35 compared to the existing modest bungalow, but would not be unacceptably intrusive or overbearing in its effect. The introduction of rooflights on the rear and side roof slopes allow light to the room whilst avoiding overlooking (mutual in this case.) The rooflights are to be conditioned to be non-openable except for where they are above 1.7 metres above finished floor level. Despite the limited outlook to this room to the rear it was considered by officers that this was the only option of gaining a further room to the rear of the roof space whilst not being to the detriment of the amenities of the dwelling to the rear. It should be noted that the occupiers/owners of no. 35 Cheal Close have objected to the balcony and window

on the rear side of the building which would overlook their property and garden. It is considered that the revised proposals address these issues to an acceptable degree.

There are dwellings to the rear to the west, yet these do not directly back onto the application site. Their outlook, light and privacy are not considered to be impacted to such a degree to warrant a refusal in this case.

The balcony to the front, south elevation is to be recessed within the eaves, along with creating architectural interest to the building also allows for limited overlooking and loss of privacy to dwellings either side. However as this is to the front of the dwelling overlooking the street, privacy is not common in such areas and therefore the balcony is acceptable in this case and such features are common place within this street and Shoreham Beach as a whole.

Accessibility and parking

Off street parking is to remain to front of the site with the side garage to be rebuilt as part of the side extension.

Recommendation

APPROVE

1. standard time limit
2. approved plans
3. removal of permitted development rights.
4. materials to be used are detailed on the submitted planning application forms and listed on approved drawing REV 11/05/16 - received 20th May 2016.
5. rooflights to be non openable except for where they are 1.7 metres above finished floor level.

Informative

1. Proactive no amendments
2. southern water informative
3.PFA informatives
4. Land contamination precautionary

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

Case Officer: Hannah Barker Date: 21st June 2016

Authorised by: Jo Morin Date: 22.06.2016