Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/0543/12 **Recommendation – Approve**

Site: **90 Old Fort Road Shoreham-By-Sea West Sussex BN43 5HB**

Proposal: **Demolition of existing house and construction of new three storey house and garage with annexe**

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: Y – No.88 (Amended Plan)

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

The application property comprises a 2-storey detached, pitched-roof house located on the south side of Old Fort Road. It is set well back in its plot by some 25 metres and has been altered at the rear to provide a first-floor balcony. The existing dwelling is of a traditional design, having a front-projecting element on the east side incorporating a front dormer within a cat-slide roof. The main walls are rendered walls with a distinctive green pantiled-roof.

The adjoining house to the west, No.88, consists of a 2-storey detached house with a pitched and gabled-ended roof. It has rendered walls and profiled-concrete roof tiles. It sits further forward in its plot than No.90 and has been enlarged at the rear by single-storey flat-roofed extensions including a first-floor balcony on the west side of the rear elevation.

The adjoining house to the east, No.92 consists of a 2-storey dwelling, made up of a series of cube-like elements in a very contemporary form. The dwelling extends further forward in its plot than No.90, including a single-storey front-projecting element adjoining the common boundary, comprising an annexe. The external walls of the dwelling are finished in render, with distinctive wood panelling on the first floor front element.

Permission is sought to demolish the existing dwelling and erect a 3-storey replacement, with link-attached garage/annex at the front. The main dwelling would consist of three progressively smaller flat-roofed volumes in the form of a ziggurat. The volumes would step back from the front and the east side, with the west elevation consisting of a 3-storey wall on a single vertical plane. The rear elevation, incorporating first and second-floor terraces, would have an inverted ‘V’ form with timber canopies and splayed screens on either side, intended to maximise sea views whilst not intruding into the privacy of neighbours. The garage/annex would be a separate volume linked to the main dwelling by a covered walkway which would extend alongside the west side of the latter. The external finish of the main dwelling would be white render with grey-coloured metal windows. It is proposed to timber-clad the garage/annex building.

The proposed main dwelling would be a maximum 14.7m deep and 13.2m wide, set back (south) 22.5m from the front boundary. A gap of 0.9m would be retained between the flank wall of the dwelling and the eastern side boundary, and a slightly narrower gap of 0.75m between the western flank and the site boundary. The first-floor element (10.3m wide and a maximum 12.1m deep) would be set back (south) 1.55m from the ground floor, and set in 2.85m on the east side. The second floor element (7.5m wide and 8.8m deep) would be set back (south) 2.5m from the first-floor and set in 2.8m on the east side. The submitted drawings show 3 banks of solar panels positioned on the flat roof. The overall height of the building would be 8m.

The proposed link-attached garage/annex would be 8.2m wide, varying in depth between 11m and 8.2m. It would abut the eastern boundary. There would be a distance of between 2.2m and 4.6m between the rear of the garage/annex and the front of the main house, providing a small courtyard. The garage/annex would have a flat roof 2.8m high.

There would be no alteration to the existing access arrangement.

Relevant site history

The contemporary re-modelling of the adjoining house at No.92 was granted planning permission under ADC/0773/07 in February 2008.

Planning permission was granted in November 2011 under AWDM/0583/11 for extensions and alterations to remodel No.88 as a three-bedroom flat-roofed house (including ground-floor front wing with double garage). The permission has not been implemented to date.

Consultations

Highway Authority:

"The proposed dwelling is to replace the existing dwelling. Whilst minor alterations may be proposed to the car parking and on-site turning, the access onto the public highway is to remain as it is. In terms of vehicular movements, the proposed dwelling is unlikely to result in any material increase or any detrimental impact. Providing the proposed car parking does not exceed the WSCC Maximum Standards, no highway concerns would be raised."

Adur & Worthing Councils: The EHO recommends an informative advising the developer on the need to apply for a Demolition Notice.

Representations

2 letters of support have been received from 88 and 113 Old Fort Road commenting:-

- Design is beautiful, it isn't too imposing, feels well formed, very light and isn't boxy, great beach house, it will be a Shoreham landmark;
- Current house if of poor design and sits uncomfortably on plot;
- In full support of the design;

It is requested that restrictions are imposed on hours of working to normal weekday hours, as suffered noise and disturbance when similar works were undertaken at No.92.

One objection has been received from the resident of 116 Old Fort Road for Shoreham Beach Resident's Association commenting that the application is out of keeping with the existing street scene and over development of a limited plot.

Relevant Planning Policies

Adopted Adur District Local Plan 1993-2006 (ADC 1996) (saved policies): AG1, AH7, AH2
Internal Space Standards for New Homes (ADC 2010)
South East Plan (GOSE 2009): SCT1, SP3, CC1, CC6, H5, BE1
National Planning Policy Framework (CLG 2012)

Planning Assessment

Principle

The site is located within the built-up area and is not allocated for any particular use or purpose within the Adur District Local Plan. The existing dwelling has no particular architectural merit and there is no objection in principle to a replacement larger dwelling on this site.

National planning policy contained within the NPPF attaches great importance to good design, recognising that it is important to plan positively for the achievement of high quality and inclusive design for all development, including individual buildings. It states (paragraph 58) that planning decisions should aim to ensure that developments (amongst other things):-

- Add to the quality of the area;
- Establish a strong sense of place;
- Optimise the potential of the site to accommodate development;
- Respond to local character and history and reflect the identity of local surroundings an materials, while not prevent or discouraging appropriate innovation;
- Are visually attractive as a result of good architecture and appropriate landscaping.

Policy AH2 requires new residential development to be designed so that its appearance, character and scale create a pleasant place to live, in keeping with and enhancing the existing local environment with particularly attention paid to architectural form, height, materials density and the layout of buildings, associated structures and hard-surfaces. Also, that it does not have an unneighbourly effect on existing dwellings by unacceptable loss of privacy, daylight/sunlight, outlook or open amenity space and incorporates adequate standards of residential amenity for the future occupiers in accordance with the Council's adopted standards.

Visual amenity

Old Fort Road is predominantly made up of individual-style detached dwellings encompassing a broad range of differing styles. The road is undergoing a transition with a number of dwellings having either been re-built or remodelled in a contemporary style of architecture, many on the south side having a tiered second-floor element. Existing development on this side of the road has a characteristic deep frontage, but there is no clearly established building line or uniform building height. Many dwellings have front-projecting elements in the form of attached or detached garage buildings which are subservient in scale to the main dwelling.

The key issues are whether the scale and mass of the proposed building would appear over-large and visually intrusive in the context of surrounding dwellings, in addition to its detailed design approach.

At present, No.90 occupies a slightly recessed position in relation to its neighbours, with the main 2-storey front elevation some 4m south of the main front elevation of No.88 (to the west) and the existing cat-slide element of No.90 some 9m south of the main (timber panel-clad) 2-storey element of No.92.

The proposed building would occupy a substantially greater floor area than the existing house, extending closer to the side boundaries and the proposed garage/annex building projecting considerably further northwards closer to the front boundary (at a distance of 10m).

The 'bulk' of the proposed new dwelling would be sited further forward (north) in its plot than at present. The ground-floor would be sited approximately 2.5m further forward (north) of the main 2-storey front wall of No.88, and the first-floor element approximately 1m further forward. Following discussions with the applicant's architect the depth of the second floor element has been reduced by 1.2m. Consequently the second-floor element would now sit behind (south of) the main 2-storey front elevation of No.88. [Should the approved scheme AWDM/0583/11 at No.88 be implemented, the proposed second-floor element would be sited approximately 1m south of the second-floor flat-roofed element approved as part of that scheme.]

The overall height of the building would be roughly the same as the existing ridge height of No.88, and approximately 1.4m higher than the highest part of No.92. [The proposed second-floor element would be marginally lower than the second-floor element approved at No.88.] At first-floor, a gap of 4m would be retained between the flank wall of the proposed dwelling and the east side boundary (increasing to a gap of 6.5m between the flank of the second-floor element and the side boundary), which would allow views through and avoid a cramped appearance in relation to the considerable 'bulk' of No.92 in close proximity to the common boundary. On the west side, there would be a distance of only 0.9m between the full three-storey flank elevation and west side boundary. The 2-storey gabled flank elevation of No.88 is sited approximately 2.7m from the common boundary, so that a visual gap of approximately 3.5m would be retained between the buildings

The proposed garage/annex would be sited 5m further forward of the single-storey front-projecting element of No.92, but would roughly align with the front of the hip-roofed garage building at No.94 and the front garage extension approved at No.88 (not implemented).

The scale of the dwelling is in keeping with the pattern of recent development on this side of the road. Despite the large footprint, careful consideration has been given to the distribution of mass within the site and in relation to the neighbouring properties to avoid an over-dominant appearance. The 'ziggurat' form creates a pleasing architectural composition which has been improved by the reduction in depth of the second-floor element.

The elevations are articulated primarily through the use of window shape and angled recesses to create visual interest in views from the street, and in public views from the beach by the tiered V-shaped terraces. As originally submitted it was considered that the full 3-storey height of the western flank would appear visually overpowering in close proximity to No.88 and it was suggested that the second-floor element was 'set-in' from the outer flank wall, as has been the case with the majority of other three-storey dwellings in this road. However, it was argued by the applicant's Architect that this would detract from the overall composition, particularly the tiered form of the rear elevation. Instead the articulation of the western flank has been improved by elongating the recessed window form to alleviate the visual perception of 'bulk'.

The use of a relatively simple palette of materials underlines the concept of articulating the proposed design through the use of form and shape. Some concern has been expressed by officers about the 'robustness' of the proposed timber-slatted side screens in this seafront environment, but similar structures have been used successfully on other nearby dwellings. The Architect has argued that the angled position of the screen is integral to the concept of the tiered rear terraces and to safeguard minimal inter-visibility between neighbouring dwellings. The use of a hard wood such a cedar has been confirmed. In addition, it is considered the introduction of additional vertical timber 'ribs' along the entrance canopy, helps integrate both these features within the design concept.

The proposed dwelling would make a striking and elegant contribution to the streetscene, which is presently undergoing transition. The scale, form, massing and detailed design is appropriate to its context both in terms of local character and the relationship to existing surrounding development.

Residential amenity

Patio doors in the east side wall of No.88 serves a large open-plan kitchen/dining area (also served by south-facing windows in the rear), and first-floor windows in this elevation serve a bedroom (also served by a south-facing window in the rear elevation) and an en-suite facility. There are no windows in the flank wall of the single-storey rear element. The increased height, forward position and closer proximity of the 'bulk' of the proposed dwelling will have an impact on the amount of daylight received and the outlook from the windows in the side of No.88. An overall separation distance of 3.5m would be retained and it is considered the impact would not be

excessively overbearing or oppressive particularly as the affected habitable rooms (a bedroom and dining room/kitchen) have a dual aspect with their main orientation and outlook to the south.

The proposed dwelling would not extend further south than the rear (south) of the single-storey extension to No.88, which incorporates concertina opening doors serving a living room. Thus the outlook and receipt of daylight to the main living area would not be unduly affected. The first-floor bedroom window in the south elevation of No.88 would be north of the tiered rear elevation of No.90. The increased height of the dwelling compared to existing would result in an additional enclosing and overshadowing (morning) effect on the rear bedroom window. However, a 45º angle from the nearest edge of the window would be retained and thus it is considered the additional impact would not be excessively overbearing, or the extent of additional overshadowing unneighbourly.

Windows in the west flank of the proposed dwelling serve a utility room at ground floor and bathrooms a first and second floor (the latter contained within an angled recess). The western flank also incorporates a feature corner window wrapping round into the front elevation which would serve a bedroom. The window would be sited forward of the main 2-storey front elevation of No.88 and would overlook the area in front of the main entrance and (at an oblique angle) the first-floor window serving the en-suite. There are no first-floor windows in the nearest part of the front (north) elevation of No.88. A requirement for obscure-glazing would detract from the design of this window feature and on balance is considered unnecessary in view of the narrow width of the side element, that it would not overlook any ‘habitable’ rooms and the absence of any objection from the neighbour.

Windows in the ground-floor east side of No.92 serve annex accommodation (towards the front), and a bedroom and bathroom (towards the rear). A section of glazed wall in this side serves the main entrance lobby. The amount of light and outlook from these rooms is curtailed by the height and close proximity of the boundary wall.

A high level window at first-floor provides light to a lobby area.

The ‘bulk’ and massing of the upper elements of the main dwelling, stepping away from the eastern boundary, would minimise the impact on daylighting and sunlighting to, and the outlook from windows in this elevation. The most affected windows would be those within the annex accommodation (within which one room has no alternative outlook). An amendment was sought suggesting that the proposed garage be set in from the boundary to lessen the impact on the neighbouring property. An amendment has been received reducing the height of the garage/annex by 0.3m and nominally setting the building in (so no longer proposed to be built onto the boundary). The proposed garage/annex building (as amended) will project approximately 0.9m above the boundary wall (opposite the windows serving the annex) and would clearly have an impact on daylighting/sunlighting and views of the sky, but on balance it is considered would not be so overbearing or result in such serious loss of daylight as to warrant refusal on this ground. No objection has been received from the neighbour at No.92.

Access and Parking
The proposals include a garage with 2 parking spaces. There is additional provision on the drive within the front garden area, but this is no different to the existing situation. There is additional space within the generously sized garage that could be utilised for cycle storage.

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 or detract from highway safety. It would consequently not conflict with the saved policies of the Adur District Local Plan (AG1, AH2) or the policies of the South East Plan (SCT1, SP3, CC1, CC6, H5, T4, BE1)

Subject to Conditions:-

1. Standard 3 year time limit
2. Materials and finishes (including samples) to be agreed etc
3. Details of parapet, timber canopies and porch to be agreed
4. Details and position of solar PVs to be agreed
5. No additional windows or other openings in side walls of the dwelling/annex etc
6. No cables, wires, aerials, satellite dishes, pipework, meter boxes or flues to be fixed or fitted externally to the front elevation
7. Remove pd rights
8. Annex not be to used as separate dwelling
9. Hours of construction
10. Construction method statement
11. Permission relates to approved plans:

Informative: Demolition notice

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

Case Officer: Jo Morin Date: 27 July 2012

Authorised by: P Barnett Date: 30 July 2012