Application Number: ADC/0568/08 Recommendation - APPROVE

Site: **58 Old Fort Road,Shoreham-by-Sea BN43 5HA**

Proposal: **Replacement detached three-storey four-bedroom 'eco' house (revised design)**

The Application

This is a revised submission following the refusal in October 2008 of the previous application ADC/0451/08 by the Committee for the following reasons: -

> *"1. The proposed building would form an obtrusive and incongruous feature that would be visually out of keeping with existing development and detrimental to the environment, thereby conflicting with the policies of the West Sussex Structure Plan (CH1, DEV1) and the Adur District Local Plan (AG1 and AH2)"*
> *"2. The proposed building would be out of keeping in scale and design with the existing dwellings and would be detrimental to the visual amenities and residential environment of the locality and, if permitted, the Local Planning Authority would find it difficult to resist further similar proposals related to other sites in the road, the cumulative effect of which would be to spoil the character and appearance of the area, contrary to the policies of the West Sussex Structure Plan (CH1, DEV1) and the Adur District Local Plan (AG1, AH2)"*

The application site is on the south side of Old Fort Road, obliquely opposite the roundabout at the end of Shingle Road. It is to the south east of the roundabout, being the second plot eastwards from the gap giving access to the beach. The bungalow on the site has recently been demolished. On the west side is a chalet bungalow which has been extensively re-modelled and extended into a cottage-style dwelling. To the east is a large detached two-storey 'Georgian' style house built in the 1960s.
The application site has a small rear garden. This was extended under planning permission SU/70/97/TP which granted permission for the applicant to use and enclose part of the open area at the rear (within his ownership and not part of the public beach) as part of his rear garden.

Planning permission was granted in 2005 (SU/212/05/TP) for the remodelling of the now demolished bungalow to create new first floor and rear dormers, front extensions and rear balcony. The proposals were of a 'Spanish' style, with a front turret-like feature.

The recently refused application ADC/0451/08 was for redevelopment with a detached flat-roofed three-storey four-bedroom 'Eco-house' of contemporary design and materials. The house was proposed to have a maximum depth of 21.8m and maximum width of 13m. It was tiered with each storey set in from the front, rear and sides of the storey beneath (except for the first two storeys on the west side). The maximum height of the flat roof of the proposed building being 8.3m, intended to match the ridge height of the adjacent house to the east (which is the same overall height as the previously approved ridge-roofed 'Spanish-style' scheme). The house was shown set in from the boundary to the east by 0.5m and to the west by 1.2m; a slightly reduced width compared to the previous scheme. The building was proposed to be finished in silicone white render to all floors.

The latest application revises the design detailing and external appearance of the proposed house, replacing the flat roof on the top floor with shallow mono pitches. The ground, first and second floor layout remains the same as previously proposed with only three minor changes. At first floor the front balcony has three doors from the main living area; previously there was only one. Also the rear balcony at second floor level has been reduced in depth by 0.2m and there is a small front balcony accessed from the second floor.

The maximum height of the building remains the same as previously submitted at 8.3m. However, the main roof now comprises two mono pitches (separated by a lower narrow flat roof) sloping down to a height of 7.5m on either side. Also proposed is an extremely shallow pitch to the front and side of the first floor where it projects about 1.2m beyond the top floor.
The front projecting flat-roofed garage and ground floor remain the same as previously submitted. The building is generally symmetrical in design with a central section or doors of matching proportions. The materials proposed are silicon white render to all floors, grey powder coated aluminium roof trim windows and doors. The balcony balustrades are to be aluminium and glass.

Consultations and Representations

West Sussex County Council: As before, the Transport Planning Officer has no objection, stating that the proposed new house will use the existing access and there should be little intensification of vehicular traffic. The number of parking spaces proposed exceeds the adopted maximum parking standard (which is 3 spaces for a 4-bed house). There is also plenty of room to allow vehicles to turn and exit the property in forward gear. Any approval should be subject to conditions in relation to temporary storage of construction plant/materials and car parking layout details. As it is a replacement scheme, no transport contribution is required.

Nos 56 & 73 have no objection. Ward Cllr objects – too tall & overdominant.

Third Parties: ~~To be reported (NB. the period for comments to be made does not expire until 29 December 2008).~~

[On the previous application, 4 letters were received from nearby residents at No's 56 & 116 Old Fort Road and Flats 9 & 11 Beach Court raising the following issues: -

- The residents of the Beach Court flats stated that the proposed house would be out of keeping with other houses/properties in the area and that the flat roof appears to be higher than adjoining dwellings; an artist's impression would be useful.
- The neighbours to the east at No.56 commented that their only concern is overlooking and loss of privacy that could occur as a result of the two south-facing balconies (onto lounge and bathroom); the existing dwelling has no balconies. The proposed balcony screens are angled, thereby allowing some sideways view, and this needs to be rectified.
- The resident at No.116 commented that the solar panels are shown flat whereas they would only be effective if they are tilted; this would increase the height of the building above those nearby and would expose the back of the supporting framework to the street and flats opposite which would be visually unacceptable.

Additional comment was made that the rear garden has been extended, allegedly beyond legal boundary onto the protected beach]

Relevant Planning Polices and Guidance

Adopted West Sussex Structure Plan 2001-2016 (WSCC 2005) (saved policies): LOC1, NE1, CH1, ERA1, DEV1, DEV4-5.

Adopted Adur District Local Plan 1993-2006 (ADC 1996) (saved policies): AG1, AH2 and Appendix 11 'Supplementary Planning Guidance' comprising:
Development Control Standard No. 2 'Space Around New Dwellings and Flats'
Revised West Sussex Parking Standards and Transport Contributions Methodology (WSCC 2003 and ADC 2004)
PPS1 'Delivering Sustainable Development' (ODPM 2005) and Supplement 'Planning and Climate Change'
PPS3 'Housing' (DCLG 2006)

Planning Assessment

Policies

Structure Plan policies give weight to making the best use of land provided that the impact on the character of the area and environment is acceptable (LOC1, ERA1, CH1). Policy DEV1, entitled high quality development, states that development should not be permitted unless the construction, layout, scale, appearance and landscaping are of high quality taking into account the need to, amongst other things, integrate with and where possible enhance adjoining land uses; have regard to context including site characteristics, townscape/streetscape, views into and out of the site and building styles/materials; give high priority to pedestrians and reduce dominance of cars; create a high quality socially-inclusive adaptable environment; protect and enhance biodiversity; ensure energy efficiency; and meet the needs of service providers.
Policy DEV4 states (amongst other things) that development should not be permitted unless the travel needs it generates are met; it achieves safe and convenient access by a choice of means of travel; it encourages and enables an increase in walking and cycling. DEV5 includes a requirement that development should not be permitted unless the level of parking is compatible with the need to avoid environmental or safety problems.

Local Plan policy AH2 relates to new residential development (by way of infilling and redevelopment) and states that new dwellings should be designed so that their appearance, character and scale create a pleasant place in which to live and are in keeping with and enhance the existing local environment with particular attention being paid to architectural form, height, materials, density, layout of buildings and hardsurfaced areas; they do not have an unneighbourly effect due to loss of privacy; daylight/sunlight; outlook or open space, incorporating adequate standards of residential amenity for the new dwellings in terms of amenity space, daylight, outlook and privacy; access and parking provision meets the adopted standards; and they accord with the Council's DC Standard No.2 'Space around New Dwellings and Flats'

Government policy guidance in PPS3 encourages best use of urban land for housing development, particularly affordable housing and a mixture of types to create a balanced community, at higher densities (avoiding developments at less than 30 dwellings per hectare) and without rigid application of parking and amenity space standards. However, it also seeks to improve the quality and attractiveness of residential areas and urges imaginative designs and layouts which make more efficient and sustainable use of land without compromising the quality of the environment. PPS1 states:-

> "Design which is inappropriate in its context, or which fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions, should not be accepted."

PPS3 also states that Councils should "facilitate good design by identifying the distinctive features that define the character of a particular local area..... ...Careful attention to design is particularly important where the chosen local strategy involves intensification of the existing urban fabric... .....successful intensification need not mean high rise development or low quality accommodation with inappropriate space.....The density of existing development should not dictate that of new housing by stifling change or requiring a replication of existing style of form.....If done well, imaginative design and layout of new development can lead to a more efficient use of land without compromising the quality of the local environment."

PPS1 encourages the prudent use of natural resources, sustainable consumption of resources and use of renewable energy sources.

Visual Amenity

As with the previous scheme, the overall design of the proposed house differs very greatly from the bungalow which previously stood on the site and from the neighbouring dwellings either side and will not sit particularly comfortably between the existing buildings. Nevertheless, Old Fort Road as a whole has a very eclectic mix of properties of widely varying designs and styles, juxtaposed with one another, including some flat-roofed houses, a wide variety of designs and forms having been approved over a long period of time (NB. recently, an additional flat-roofed third storey was approved to the flat-roofed house at No.32 under ADC/0284/07 and a large two-storey flat-roofed front projection to No.92 under ADC/0773/07). Beach Court, obliquely opposite, is a three-storey flat-roofed block of flats.

The now demolished bungalow lacked any architectural merit and had a front roof extension of very poor design. Although the scheme of major extension and remodelling to a 'Spanish style' approved under SU/212/05/TP had a pitched roof design, its style, finish and detailing would have produced a prominent building not particularly harmonious with its neighbours. The current revised proposal is of a contemporary design that would contrast with the neighbouring buildings either side. However, compared to the previously refused scheme, it is of a much improved quality of appearance and it is considered, taking account of the variety of styles in the road as a whole, that it is acceptable.

The detailing and interest of the front elevation is much improved. The three storey 'tiered' design is softened by the vertical emphasis of the central doors and also the main shallow sloping roofs which limit the height and bulk of the building and produce a more pleasing design.

Residential Amenity

As stated above, the neighbouring dwellings either side are, to the west, No.56 Old Fort Road, a chalet bungalow, and, to the east, No.60, a large two-storey hip-roofed house. To the rear (south) is the beach and, on the opposite side of the road (north) are a two-storey flat-roofed house with a front balcony, which is directly opposite. To the east of this is a pitch-roofed two-storey house and, to the west, the three-storey flat-roofed block of flats (Beach Court) on the corner of Shingle Road. Due to the set back position of the proposed house, these buildings opposite are at a minimum distance of 40 metres away; therefore, no loss of privacy or overbearing impact would result.

As to the effect on No.56, there is a distance of 1 metre between the proposed house and the side boundary with No.56. The height and bulk of the proposed house will be significantly greater than the existing chalet bungalow on the application site and it will exceed the height of No.56 by approximately 1.8m. Windows are proposed in the side elevation but all will be fitted with obscured glass and fixed to be permanently non-openable, thus avoiding overlooking to the side from the house itself. No.56 has a single-storey extension which abuts the boundary but it has no facing side windows. There are two dormer windows which face onto the site but these are not main windows and one is obscurely glazed. The degree of loss of light to these windows as a result of the proposed building would not be such as to warrant refusal.

The owners of No.56 previously expressed concern on the previous application about the proposed rear balconies resulting in loss of privacy to their rear first-floor windows. The present plans show privacy screens to the side (obscurely glazed) at a maximum height of 1.8m including at the front where an additional small balcony area is proposed. A condition needs to be imposed requiring details of the balcony screening to be submitted and approved prior to commencement of works.

As to the effect on No.60, to the east, this house has a first-floor secondary window in its facing side which serves a bedroom. However, there is a larger rear window (facing south) and thus there is no problem of unacceptable loss of light or overbearing impact in this case. There will be no loss of privacy as the eastern side elevation of the proposed house would have windows all to be obscurely glazed and permanently non-openable.

The existing side boundary walls are to remain, providing adequate screening between the properties. The rear garden will remain unchanged and there will be landscaping to the front of the dwelling with parking and turning space laid out.

Access and Parking

The access and parking arrangement has not changed from the previous application. The vehicular access will remain as existing from Old Fort Road. Parking will be provided for three cars, two in the double garage and one in the driveway. There will be space for cycle storage in the garage.

Recommendation

Subject to consideration of any representations received by 29 December 2008, APPROVE for reason that:-

The proposed development is within the built up area and would help meet the need for sustainable housing without detracting from the existing local urban environment. It can take place without resulting in unacceptable detriment to the amenities of neighbouring properties and without detraction from highway safety. It would consequently not conflict with the relevant policies of the Adur District Local Plan (AG1, AH2) and the West Sussex Structure Plan (LOC1, NE1, CH1, ERA1, DEV1, DEV4-5)

Subject to:-

1. C1Ci (Standard time limit)
2. C8Biii (Parking spaces to be provided and retained) (amended)
3. C9N (Temporary provision for contractors' vehicles, materials, etc on the site)

4. C12Ai (Details of external materials for walls and roof of building to be approved)
5. C18C3(Windows in east and west side elevations of building to be fitted permanently with obscured glass and be non-openable)
6. C18E3 (No additional windows to be formed in the side walls without planning permission) (amended)
7. C18K (Provision for waste storage)
8. Prior to occupation of the proposed house, obscure-glazed privacy screens shall be provided on either side of the proposed rear balconies in accordance with details to be submitted to and approved in writing by the LPA. These screens shall be 1.8m in height above the floor level of the balcony to which they relate and shall be retained permanently.
9. Details of the siting, scale and appearance of the solar panels shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the LPA prior to their installation and shall be installed and retained in accordance with such details as approved.

.....