Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: **Recommendation – APPROVE**
AWDM/0749/16

Site: **62 Old Fort Road**

Proposal: **Remodelling of existing building to include part single-storey and part two-storey front extension, new roof and over-cladding. Demolition of existing front garage.**

Neighbours checked: Y
Additional neighbour notifications: /N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

The proposal is for re-modelling with 3 key elements. These are a new 'boom-a-rang' roof to the main building, a 'barrow' shaped first floor front extension, and a front glazed 'rotunda' extension. The resultant building to measure 8 metres in height (excluding flue pipe), 22.5 metres in length, and 14 metres in width. The entire building would be clad in new brickwork and Siberian mountain larch, with new dark grey UPVc windows. The roof would be green/grey zinc.

The application property is a detached two-storey dwellinghouse. It is of a modern 1960s design with simple form and shape. There is a single storey flat roof front extension, used as a double garage. The rear of the property, which has a flat roof dormer, is directly onto the beach. The site is situated in an outer suburb of Shoreham, residential in its character.

The neighbouring building to the west is two-storey with a shallow pitched roof. It has a rear and side balcony onto the shared boundary with the application site. There is also a long double garage front extension, single storey in height.

The neighbouring building to the east, No. 64, is currently a bungalow with dormers. It benefits from an extant planning permission to convert for a new contemporary two-storey dwellinghouse (AWDM/1001/14 refers).

Relevant Planning History
None

Consultations
Adur & Worthing Councils Environmental Health: *Please impose precautionary contamination condition and PFA informative*

Representations
Support received from occupier of 60 Old Fort Road: *No objection. At present tired and sorry looking building, in particular western flank has unsightly lean too structure that would be demolished, something I welcome. Design style is*

improvement and pleased building work no higher than existing house. Movement of existing garage over to western side does not impact my house as our garage is of similar size. Rest of proposal looks reasonable and look forward to it being built.

Relevant Planning Policies and Guidance
National Planning Policy Framework
Adur Local Plan (saved policies): AG1, AH7

Planning Assessment

Principle

Upgrading of residential accommodation is acceptable in principle

Visual amenity and character

The existing garage building is non-descript and its loss would not be resisted.

Old Fort Road is subject to intermittent examples of contemporary re-modelling along its stretch, including an extant permission for the adjacent neighbouring building to the east. A further example of a contemporary re-modelling in itself would therefore not be resisted.

The scale of the main building would be reasonably comparable to the existing building as the ridge height is not greater and the footprint is only marginally increased. The scale of the existing building is in keeping with its neighbouring buildings, including the permitted re-modelling scheme at No. 64.

The mass and bulk of the overall building would increase due to its changed silhouette and remodeled form. However the integrated design and scale of the proposal means it would not be unduly obtrusive in the street scene, so it avoids being out of keeping in street scene or townscape terms or by way of overdevelopment.

This is for various reasons. The main building 'boom-a-rang' roof is seen face-on rather than in profile from the street scene, so is a reasonably subdued feature from front and rear. Despite distinctiveness of the three elements that make up the proposal, there is an overall cohesiveness to the entirety of the remodeled building. The 'barrow' roof height is at the same height of the eaves of the main building. The flat roof garage roof is aligned with the horizontal mid-sections of the rotunda and the main building behind. The first floor fenestration is aligned across the building frontage, which ties the building together.

The palette and glazing of the remodeling would avoid a heavy appearance overall, but especially with the barrow extension. Those exterior materials and finishes proposed would be sympathetic to the seaside location and have some local reference on other re-modelled buildings in the widest stretch of street.

The frontage of the remodeled building is staggered, which breaks up the building's perceived mass when viewed face-on. The curvature of the first floor 'barrow' is reflected in the subservience of the curved glazed 'rotunda'. The curvature is also referenced from the re-modelling scheme at No. 64, which has obtained planning permission, so the juxtaposition of the two schemes would not be jarring. The curved frontage and physical space between the building and the neighbouring buildings means the scheme avoids looking cramped on its plot and is not unduly prominent.

Although the flat roof front garage comes forward, it does not extend as far forward as the neighbour's garage alongside it to the west. This neighbouring garage has set a building line precedent for single storey development in the immediate street. The first floor element would also come forward its curvature reduces its perceived prominence.

This scheme now satisfies the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework including paragraphs 56 and 57 of, as well as local plan policies relating to design.

Residential amenity – future occupiers

The re-modelled interior would provide satisfactory room standards and garden size to accord with the Council's adopted standards.

Residential amenity - neighbours

The neighbours most affected are those either side of the application property as the development is physically removed from the remainder to avoid harm, including by way of overlooking.

Neighbouring building to west (No. 60)

New windows in this elevation either serve non-habitable space or as non-principal sources of light and outlook. Views from the rear and front facing fenestration, including that from the rear balcony, would be oblique in nature and the rear faces the beach where there is reduced expectation of privacy, so intrusive overlooking and loss of privacy would be avoided.

The external parameters of the main building would be comparable to the existing. Sufficient distance would be retained between it and this neighbouring building to ensure no adverse overbearing or overshadowing would result.

Neighbouring building to east (No. 66)

There are two scenarios to consider here. The first is the building remains in its current condition; the second is the permitted remodeling scheme is built out.

<u>Remains</u>

At present, this neighbouring building is positioned well forward of the application building. Due to the limited fenestration in the side elevation of the re-modelled dwelling, no direct window-to-window overlooking would result. At worst, views would be limited to oblique angles onto the neighbour's beach side balcony and rear conservatory. The rear faces the beach where there is reduced expectation of privacy.

Accordingly, no adverse harm would arise onto its living conditions by way of overbearing/overshadowing or loss of privacy/overlooking.

Re-modelled scheme

This scheme brings No. 66 in line with the buildings either side of it. It is designed to be two-storey with its principal fenestration orientated south and north, so its flanking fenestration is limited (apart from the curved glazing of bedroom 4).

The wall-to-wall distance between the application scheme and this neighbouring scheme would be sufficient to avoid adverse overbearing and/or overshadowing (the curvature of the glazing of bed 4 allows for respite). The fenestration arrangement means direct overlooking would be avoided. The oblique views would ensure intrusive loss of privacy is avoided. The rear faces the beach where there is reduced expectation of privacy.

Parking and Accessibility

The proposed parking provision would be comparable to the existing provision, which is ample. No highway safety would arise from the proposal. No access changes are proposed.

Flood Risk

The site falls within flood zone 3, the highest category for tidal flood risk. However the floor levels of the re-modelled building would be at the same level as the existing building, so human health would be put at no greater risk.

Contamination

The nearest contamination site identified on Council records is some 230 metres away from the application site. However the precautionary contamination condition is a proportionate approach to mitigation against the risk if unknown contaminates were discovered during construction.

Recommendation

APPROVE

Subject to the following reasons:-

1. Approved Plans
2. Standard time limit

3. Pre-conditionally contamination land condition
4. Notwithstanding “pd” no further windows/openings at first floor in side elevations

Informative:

1) *The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by identifying matters of concern within the application (as originally submitted) and negotiating, with the Applicant, acceptable amendments to the proposal to address those concerns. As a result, the Local Planning Authority has been able to grant planning permission for an acceptable proposal, in accordance with the presumption in favour of sustainable development, as set out within the National Planning Policy Framework*

2) *The developer should be aware that pulverised fuel ash (PFA) has been identified on Shoreham Beach. This is a potentially contaminative material, which can present as grey and ashy in nature or as small, black, coal-like deposits. It is the responsibility of the owner and developer to establish the extent of such material on the site and to carry out appropriate remediation where necessary.*

Is recommendation contrary to any representations? N

Case Officer signed: Matthew Porter Date: 08-8-2016

Authorised and signed by: Gary Peck Date: 8 August 2016