# Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

**Application Number: ADC/0460/10 Recommendation – APPROVE**

**Site: 161 Old Fort Road, Shoreham-by-Sea BN43 5HL**

**Proposal: Replacement four-bedroom chalet-style dwelling with integral garage and front balcony (instead of extending existing dwelling as previously permitted)**

## The Application

This application proposes to completely rebuild the dwelling on this site, instead of extending it as previously permitted in August 2010 under ADC/0226/10, but to the same design (with the minor revisions described below).

The application property is a detached flat-roofed bungalow on the north side of the road, adjacent to a hip-roofed bungalow (No.159) to the west, on the corner of Falcon Close. To the east, is another bungalow (No.161) with a gabled roof. To the rear are chalet bungalows.

The recent permission ADC/0226/10 was to add a first floor within a new fully-pitched roof (ridge height 7m) with front and rear gables, also encompassing a proposed side extension 2.05m wide and 12.5m deep, almost the full depth of the dwelling. The new pitched roof included a wide overhang on the west side (front half forward of the 'step' in the side wall) to enable a consistent eaves line.

The rooms in the newly-created roofspace would comprise a large open-plan living-dining room with kitchen, served by a large glazed front window area with curved front balcony and by side rooflights, plus a separate study with small rear window and rooflights. The enlarged groundfloor would comprise 4 bedrooms, all with ensuite facilities and a utility/shower-room plus sauna. At the front, a porch is proposed to be added (beneath the proposed balcony) plus a bay window.

The present proposal is the same design as before except that:-

- the rear wall of the east side is now flush rather than 0.55m back from the main rear wall;
- there is a 0.6m increase in the width of the 0.45m set back portion on the front elevation to create a garage instead of a cycle store (with wider timber front doors) but the distance from the east side boundary remains at 0.45m;
- two windows are deleted from the west side and two others in the west side reduced in size;
- 3 low-level rooflights instead of 2 on the east side;
- the window and door arrangement in the rear elevation has been modified slightly;
- an additional window is added to the front elevation

## Consultations and Representations

***Third Parties:*** 2 letters have been received.

The residents of No.159 to the west comment that they accept that the revisions appear minimal and they do not anticipate any adverse impact on their light or

privacy but request, as before, confirmation from the Council that this is indeed the case. Their concerns in this respect are daylighting to their diningroom with its sole east side window and their study room with a north side window/door beyond which the applican'ts dwelling projects. They also reiterate their concern about the impact the proposed close-boarded fence (replacing the boundary wall) might have on the established planting scheme.

The resident of No.3 Falcon Close to the rear states that although his concerns have been alleviated as to what the new submission would look like he repeats his previous reservation about the effect on privacy to their rear-facing upstairs bedroom and asks that the proposed north-facing upstairs study rear window be fully obscured to retain modesty to residents in both properties.

**Relevant Planning Policies and Guidance**

Adopted Adur District Local Plan 1993 – 2006 (ADC 1996) (saved policies): AG1, AH2, AH7 and Appendix 11 'Supplementary Planning Guidance' comprising Development Control Standard No. 2 'Space Around New Dwellings and Flats'; and No.3 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings'
PPS1 'Delivering Sustainable Development (ODPM 2005)

**Planning Assessment**

***Policies***

The proposal is for a complete rebuild rather than the extension of the existing dwelling but to essentially the same overall design as the previous permission. New dwellings fall under policy AH2 (rather than AH7) of the Local Plan but the requirements are similar, namely that they should be designed so as not to result in an unacceptable degree of overlooking, loss of natural light or an overbearing effect on neighbouring dwellings, have a satisfactory standard of amenity, be of sympathetic design and materials and should comply with the Council's DC standards.

The Council's DC Standards No's 2 and 3 state that a distance of 22m is normally required between facing principal windows, to retain privacy, and that side elevations should be set back 1m from side boundaries to avoid a cramped appearance and allow access for maintenance.

Government policy is set out in Planning Policy Statement PPS1 'Delivering Sustainable Development'. Relevant paragraphs are 17, which refers to the commitment to protecting and improving the environment; 18 which states that planning should seek to maintain and improve the local environment and help to mitigate the effects of declining environmental quality through positive policies on issues such as design; and 34 which states that good design is indivisible from good planning and that design which is inappropriate in its context, or which fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area, should not be accepted.

***Visual amenity and character***

The existing building has a very poor quality flat-roofed form and appearance and detracts from the streetscene, although it is not prominent because of its low profile. The rebuilding of the dwelling with a pitched roof, as previously permitted, would improve the appearance and make it more in keeping with the majority of dwellings

on this side of the road, albeit that it would differ from the adjacent ones, including by its greater ridge height and front gable.

The proposal still includes the east side addition bringing the building to 0.45m from the east side boundary (instead of the usual 1m). It also includes a wide roof overhang on the west side forward of the 'step' in the side wall. However it would not appear cramped because of the low eaves line. The details of the design with extensive front glazing and balcony would add visual interest, making it more distinctive, as well as giving it a more contemporary feel.

***Residential amenity***

In terms of the effect on the chalet bungalows to the rear, No's 2 and 3 Falcon Close, their original main rear walls are 27m/28m away respectively, more than the Council's minimum standard of 22m. No.3, the one directly behind, has a firstfloor dormer window approximately 30m away from the proposed firstfloor study window. It has a rear conservatory but this is 25m away and shielded by tall hedges on the intervening boundaries.

No.4 Falcon Close is offset to the east. It has a very large rear dormer, 30m away at its closest, and a large flat-roofed groundfloor rear extension but this is 25m away at its closest corner and screened by hedges. It would not be unacceptably affected.

The rear garden of the application site is only 5m deep but the applicant has minimised potential for overlooking by designing the upper part of the rear elevation with only a single very narrow first-floor window (0.5m wide and 2m high) serving the study. It is not considered that this would cause unacceptable overlooking of the properties to the rear subject to its lower portion being obscure-glazed and fixed shut as previously required by condition (and shown on the present plans). It is not considered that there is sufficient justification to require it to be fully obscure-glazed.

With regard to the rooflights in groups of 4 on the side elevations, these are shown as before with their glazing 1.4m above the floor level of the rooms they serve (living/dining/ kitchen and study). The angle of view from within the rooms would not enable unacceptable overlooking unless the rooflights were opened and the person stood within the opened area. There are now 3 instead of 2 rooflights on the lower part of the east side roof slope but there would be no overlooking from these.

As previously approved, the front balcony would be set back behind the southernmost wall of the bungalow at No.159 which has no windows in this part of its facing side elevation. Although there would be some potential overlooking of the front garden of No.159, it is not considered that this warrants refusal. The proposed front decking (only 0.15m above ground level) would benefit from having a screen fence on the adjacent part of the boundary. No.159 has a window to its east side dining room approximately half way along its east side. The proposed roof overhang would extend to about 0.7m from the boundary but the low eaves height, compared to the existing high parapet wall height, is such that the effect on daylighting would not be so serious as to warrant refusal.

No.163 has a high-level side window and a side window in its rear addition, slightly further from the boundary. The proximity of the proposal and the pitched roof would cause some effect on sun/daylighting and a more enclosing effect. However, it is no worse than previously permitted and not considered to be to a degree warranting refusal because of the low eaves line of the proposal (2.6m as compared to the existing parapet wall height of 3.3m).

**Recommendation**

APPROVE for reason that:-

2PPi

Subject to:-

1. C1Ci
2. C12Ei ....prior to commencement of use of the rebuilt dwelling, be completed in accordance with the details shown on the approved plan and with the roof tiles coloured grey unless otherwise...
3. C18C3 The rear study window to a height of 1.2m (above the floor level of the study) shall at all.....
4. Unless otherwise approved in writing by the LPA, a 1.8m high close-boarded fence shall be erected on the west side boundary where it is adjacent to the proposed decking, prior to commencement of construction of the decking and thereafter retained. R. as 3 above.
5. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:-
   OS Sitemap; Drawing No's 210/410/1 (Existing plans); 210/410/2 (Proposed Floor Plans); 210/410/3 (Proposed Elevations); 210/410/4 (Roof plan, etc); 210/410/5 (Block Plan); and 210/410/6 (Proposed cross section) all date stamped received 25 November 2010.
   R. For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

Case Officer: Keith Morgan Date: January 2011