Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/0954/14 Recommendation – APPROVE

Site: 67 Old Fort Road Shoreham-By-Sea West Sussex BN43 5RL

Proposal: Remodelling with front, side and rear extensions and rooms with enlarged roof with front and rear dormer (re-submission of AWDM/1505/13)

Date of site visit: 12.09.2014

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

The application property comprises a detached bungalow occupying a wider than average plot on the north side of Old Fort Road. It has been enlarged by single-storey flat-roofed front and rear extensions, and front and rear dormers. The flat roof of the front extension is used as a sitting out terrace accessed from patio doors in the front dormer and enclosed by decorative concrete blockwork. A drive on the east side leads to a garage set back from the rear of the original bungalow attached by a flat-roofed link.

To the west, No.65A consists of one of a pair of modern link-detached 2-storey houses with a part-hipped roof form and 1½-storey eaves to the sides. To the east, No.69 consists of an older end of terrace bungalow clad in white uPVC horizontal boarding with a slate roof. The road is made up of a diverse range of dwelling styles and type although plot sizes on the north side of the road are typically shallower and narrower than those on the beach side.

Planning permission was granted under AWDM/1505/13 for remodelling the existing bungalow with front, side and rear extensions and rooms within an enlarged roof with front and rear gables and enlarged front balcony. The current proposals by the same applicant similarly comprise remodelling of the bungalow with front, side and rear extensions and rooms in the roof, but are less comprehensive in scale than the previously approved scheme which is not financially viable.

It is proposed to create an L-shaped extension at ground-floor, extending eastwards by 3.5m to align with the front of the existing flat-roofed front addition and wrapping round approximately half of the rear elevation (involving the demolition of the existing garage and link extensions). Additional roof accommodation would be created by extending the form of the existing roof eastwards by 3.5m with a matching hip and gablet. The existing front dormer would be extended eastwards by 3.5m. The existing rear dormer would be enlarged both eastwards and westwards and would be 1.4m high, 1.8m deep and 11.2m wide. The proposed single-storey rear element would have flat roof 2.8m high. It is proposed to erect a verandah on the front south-

west corner aligned with the existing flat-roofed front element with an enlarged balcony/sun terrace above accessed from the front dormer. The existing fenestration would be altered and the existing and proposed external walls would be clad in cement weatherboard (apart from the rear walls of the single-storey rear element which are to be rendered).

Consultations: The precautionary contamination condition is recommended due to the possibility of PFA on Shoreham Beach and that a Contaminated Land Officer be allowed to inspect the foundations before construction begins.

Representations: 1 objection has been received from a nearby resident commenting that the amount of off-street parking provision is inadequate; also that the design which appears to extend up to the eastern boundary appear overdeveloped.

Relevant Planning Policies

Adopted Adur District Local Plan 1993-2006 (ADC 1996) (saved policies): AG1, AH7 and Appendix 11 'Supplementary Planning Guidance' comprising: Development Control Standard No.3 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings' National Planning Policy Framework (CLG 2012).

Planning Assessment

Principle

Upgrading of the existing housing stock located within the built up area can be supported in principle. The relevant issues are the effects of the development on the amenities of neighbouring residential occupiers, and the effect on the character and appearance of the dwelling and its surroundings.

Visual amenity

The existing bungalow has suffered a number of minor additions and alterations which have resulted in an overall loss of visual cohesion. Although the proposals will help restore a sense of balance to the front elevation, the overall composition is less visually dynamic than the previously approved scheme, involving less substantial alteration to the existing structure. Nevertheless, bearing in mind the considerable variety in the style and form of development in the immediate vicinity, it is considered the proposals would not appear visually out of keeping.

As before, there would be a minimum gap of 1.2m between the extended east side of the dwelling and the boundary with No.69. Despite the extremely diminutive scale of No.69 the retention of a narrow visual gap and form of the roof sloping down to a single-storey eaves height would avoid the enlarged dwelling appearing visually overpowering in relation to No.69. There is a slightly wider visual gap on the west side which would remain unaltered.

The proposed fenestration alterations to the existing front elevation and dormer, to match the style and proportions of those within the proposed new extensions, will help create a more visually cohesive appearance. Similarly,

there is no objection to the cladded exterior of which there are many other examples along this road.

Residential amenity

As before, the most affected property would be No.69 to the east. There are 2 windows in the side wall of this bungalow sited approximately 1m from the common boundary, which appear to serve habitable rooms and are clear glazed. The bulk of the proposed side extension and enlarged roof/dormers will have some effect on daylight to, and the outlook from these windows. However, the impact will be less significant than for the previously approved scheme given the reduced footprint and altered form of the additions.

The existing first-floor terrace would be extended approximately 1.2m eastwards leaving a gap of 3.5m to the boundary. The enlarged terrace would allow a degree of overlooking of the side of No.69 but is not sited as close to the boundary as the previously approved balcony. In granting permission under AWDM/1505/13 it was argued that overlooking the front of a property is less sensitive than overlooking at the rear (where there is reasonable expectation for a greater degree of privacy) and in the absence of any objection from the neighbour the balcony was accepted without privacy screening (which would appear ungainly in aesthetic terms). It would therefore be difficult to insist on privacy screening in this case where the resulting degree of overlooking would be less severe.

On the west side, the verandah feature and enlarged terrace would roughly align with the front of No.65A. The terrace would be set-in approximately 2.5m from the west side of the enlarged bungalow and would enable overlooking across the front of No.65A but not directly into the ground and first-floor windows/French doors. The western edge of the enlarged terrace would be sited approximately 1m further from the common boundary with No.65A than the balcony which formed part of the previously approved scheme and bearing in mind it is not positioned so far forward in relation to No.65A, would have a lesser impact in terms of overlooking.

There is a distance in excess of 25m between the proposed enlarged rear dormer the rear elevations of No.69 (a traditional pyramid-roofed bungalow) and 71 The Meadway (a chalet) to the north. The rear dormer would include 4 windows serving 2 bedrooms, a stairwell and bathroom (the 2 latter being existing). Unlike the previous scheme, the first-floor of which had been deliberately designed to minimise an overlooking relationship with the properties to the rear, the current proposal would introduce a greater degree of overlooking, but in view of the separation distance involved would not be to an unacceptable level as to warrant refusal on this ground.

Other Issues

The site is within Flood Zone 3. The former application was accompanied by a FRA in accordance with EA Standing Advice which it is considered remains applicable to the current proposals which are similar in nature.

The comments of the EHO reflect heightened awareness of the issue of PFA (pulverised fuel ash) on Shoreham Beach generally. However in the absence

of any evidence specifically relating to the contamination of this site it is considered an informative is adequate for the purpose of informing the applicant of the risk.

Recommendation: APPROVE subject to conditions:-

1. Standard time limit
2. Approved plans
3. Agree materials samples for external walls, roof, window/doors, verandah and balustrading
4. No additional windows in side elevations or side roof slopes

Informative

1. The applicant is advised that any additional alterations to the building envelope required in order to comply with Building Regulations but not forming part of the current proposals (including any increase to the roof height of the infill extension or former garage building) is likely to require the submission of a further planning application. Any such further application will be considered on its own merits and may not be acceptable if considered to have a deleterious effect on the appearance of the bungalow.

2. Pre-cautionary contamination.

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

Case Officer: Jo Morin Date: 15 Sept 2014

Authorised by: Gary Peck Date: 16 September 2014