# Development Management– Delegated Officer Report

**Application Number: AWDM/0609/15 Recommendation – APPROVAL**

**Site: 81 Old Fort Road, Shoreham-By-Sea, West Sussex**

**Proposal: Removal of single storey side extension and construction of 2 storey side extension (previously approved under ADC/0164/10)**

**Date of site visit:** 21/07/15

**Neighbours checked: Y**

**Additional neighbour notifications: N**

**Proposal, Site and Surroundings**

The application relates to a detached two storey house built in 1919 located on the north side of Old Fort Road. The dwelling is a large detached house with a hipped roof, tiled in glazed cobalt blue roof tiles. To the east side is a two storey extension which makes up part of the east side boundary with the adjacent bungalow, (no.83) also tiled in the distinctive tile. Currently the dwelling has a balcony across the whole of its front elevation which increases in depth over the front entrance portico.

There is currently a single storey extension to the eastern side of the property with a hipped roof which is built within 0.35 metres of the boundary to the east with no. 83 the adjacent bungalow. This was granted permission under planning application ADC/0413/09.

Prior to this consent being granted permission was sought for a two storey side extension under ADC/0323/09. This proposal comprised a two storey part-side, part front extension which incorporated a front balcony. This scheme was refused under delegated powers. The design of the extension was not considered to be subordinate to the host dwelling. It was considered unsympathetic in terms of its design and would have a detrimental effect to the visual amenity of the surrounding area. The scale of the extension and proximity to the boundary would have a particularly overbearing and unneighbourly effect on the adjacent bungalow. The reasons for refusal are set out below: -

1. The proposed extension, by reason of its large size and unsympathetic design, would be out of keeping in scale and appearance with the existing building and would detract to an unacceptable extent from the visual amenities and residential environment of the locality and thereby conflict with the policies if the Adur District Local Plan (AG1, AH7)
2. The proposed extension, by reason of its large size and unneighbourly design and siting would be detrimental to the residential amenities of the locality, resulting in loss of privacy and

an overbearing effect on the adjoining property, contrary to the policies of the Adur District Local Plan, (AH7.)

Following this a revised application was submitted for a two storey side extension under reference ADC/0164/10. This showed a scaled down version of the former refused application. The two storey side extension was set in by 1 metre from the boundary wall and set back from the main front wall in a subordinate fashion by 0.1 metres and from the projecting balcony by 1.7 metres. It was considered by the officer that the revised application would have a reduced effect on the neighbouring dwelling and the street scene as a whole however it remained the stance that the extension would clearly be an incongruous feature. This application was also refused under delegated powers for the following reason: -

1. The proposed extension by reason of its large size and unsympathetic flat roofed design, would be out of keeping in scale and appearance with the existing building and would detract to an unacceptable extent from the visual amenities and residential environment of the locality and thereby conflict with the policies of the Adur District Local Plan (AG1, AH7)

Subsequently an appeal was lodged and allowed for the two storey side extension. The Inspector considered that the set back from the front of the building and set in from the side would allow the extension to appear subordinate to the main dwelling and the “gap between it and the adjoining bungalow would, in my view, be sufficient to avoid it appearing cramped or creating a terracing effect”. The permission allowed on appeal lapsed in October 2013.

A further application was submitted in 2014 AWDM/1649/14, this was for a proposed first floor side extension above the existing single storey side extension as previously approved and constructed. This was considered to be materially different from the scheme approved on appeal and was refused for the following reason: -

1. The proposed extension, by reason of its size, form, unsympathetic detailing and proximity to the boundary would, in conjunction with the other alterations proposed, be out of keeping in scale, design and appearance to the existing dwelling and appear visually overbearing in relation to the neighbouring property, No.83, and the streetscene generally . The proposal would detract to an unacceptable extent from the visual amenities and residential environment of the locality thereby conflicting with the saved policies of the Adur District Local Plan (AG1, AH7)

The current application seeks renewal of the lapsed permission for the scheme previously refused and allowed on appeal ADC/0164/10.

**Representations:** 1 letter received from the owner/occupiers of no. 83 Old Fort Road. From viewing the plans it is understood that the extension is a metre away from the boundary. If this is not the case there would be an objection due to loss of privacy and day light. If the extension is a metre away then loss of privacy with regards to the windows on the ground and first floor. Could the plans be altered with

no windows on the east side like the extension which is there already. If not could the windows be the same size as existing and obscured.

**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***

There is no objection in principle to the proposed development which involves an extension to an existing dwelling house. The previously permitted application ADC/0164/10 is a material consideration in the determination of this case. The site has changed from when this proposal was considered in 2010 in that the single storey extension has been built. This would be demolished should the current two storey extension that is the subject of this application be implemented. There are no other changes to the site or surrounding area that would influence the consideration of this proposal in the light of the previous consent.

***Visual amenity***

The previous scheme that was approved on appeal showed the two storey extension to be set in from the boundary with no.83 by 1 metre and from the front main wall by 0.1 metres and the projecting balcony by 1.7 metres.

The Inspector refers in her appeal decision: "The proposed extension would be set back from the front elevation and set in 1 metre from the boundary with no. 83. It would therefore appear subordinate to the main dwelling and the gap between it and the adjoining bungalow would, in my view, be sufficient to avoid it appearing cramped or creating a terracing effect".

In the previous scheme, ADC/0164/10, granted on appeal the Inspector justified the flat roof addition as a link bringing together the different parts of the building, i.e. the existing pitched roof main roof and the pitched roof of the existing addition. "The use of a flat roof to link together the different parts of the building is an appropriate design solution since it would avoid the need to disrupt either of the existing roof forms." This scheme provides a subordinate 'link'.

***Residential amenity***

The Inspector did not consider the appeal scheme to result in any loss of light or overbearing impact to the occupiers of the adjacent bungalow to the east no. 83 Old Fort Road. This was due to the set in of the extension and the position of the extension in relation to the windows of habitable rooms.

When ADC/0164/10 was considered the neighbour expressed concern in relation to the loss of privacy due to a balcony with the parapet along the east side of the extension. The Inspector stated in the appeal decision “any intention to provide access to the flat roof and to do so would require alterations to the roof which would in all likelihood require planning permission. I consider concerns about the use of the roof as a balcony are therefore unfounded.”

The neighbour objection received relates to the windows on the side elevation of the proposed extension. These are shown on the plans to be fitted with obscure glazing and to be fixed shut. There is also a condition to ensure this is the case. Therefore this will overcome any issues or concerns relating to overlooking to the side. This was considered an acceptable relationship when the Inspector allowed the decision.

In the light of the previous approval and provided that the existing single storey extension is removed prior to commencement of works then it is considered that the two storey extension as previously approved is acceptable.

Conditions: -

1. 3 years

2. Works shall not commence until the existing single storey extension has been demolished and all debris removed from the site.

3. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: - Drawing no. 11,429/A – received 8th June 2015 Drawing no. 11,549A – received 8th June 2015.

4. The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

5. The windows in the eastern elevation of the extension hereby permitted shall be fixed shut and fitted with obscured glazing and shall be permanently retained in that condition thereafter.

Informatives: -

1. Proactive no amendments

**Is recommendation contrary to letter(s) of representation? N**

Case Officer: Hannah Barker Date: 10th August 2015

Authorised by: Jo Morin Date: 18.08.2015