Exp 29/11

**Application No.: ADC/0612/07 Recommendation – Refuse Application**

**Site: 92 Old Fort Road, Shoreham-by-Sea, West Sussex**

**Proposal: Flat-Roofed First Floor Front Extensions.**

## The Application

The application site contains a detached double storey dwelling with brick and feature timber elevations, a tiled butterfly profile roof and a double bay attached garage. To the front of the dwelling is a detached annexe or flat, which in association with the dwelling and attached garage encase a small courtyard that serves as a formal entrance to the dwelling.

The property has a large front garden with the building being well setback on the southern side of Old Fort Road. To the rear is a relatively small garden that opens directly onto Shoreham Beach, almost exclusively taken up by an existing swimming pool.

The original house dates back to the early 1960's, with the installation of a sun room, extension of the staff annexe and enclosure of the rear balcony being approved in the early 1970's. In 1980 a further approval was granted to the erection of a front protruding garage extension. After discussing a number of various schemes for the property with Council Officers, the new owners now propose:

- A flat roofed, white walled first storey front extension over the garage containing additional living space;
- A flat roofed, timber walled first storey front extension partly over the staff annexe and entrance courtyard containing a master bedroom, dressing room and ensuite; &
- To remove the existing rear spiral staircase and erect a frame that will give the illusion of tightening the glazed rear elevation into a more cuboid shape to match the front elevation.

Earlier schemes involving separation of the two first storey front extensions such that two cubes of additional floorspace floated above the garage and staff annexe were discouraged by Council Officers due to concerns relating to:

- The length and height of the western first floor extension over the existing staff annexe;
- It's impact on neighbouring properties, particularly No.90 Old Fort Road in terms of overbearing impact, loss of outlook and access to daylight for existing windows;
- Impact on the streetscene, particularly the western elevation which extends well in front of No.90 and would therefore be extremely prominent to traffic travelling eastward along Old Fort Road; &
- The extensions being unsympathetic to the existing character of the building and the area in general.

A number of those concerns remain with the current proposal, however of note is the way that the western first floor extension has now been pulled away from the side boundary of No.90, such that access to daylight has been improved and the extension is arguably less overbearing on the front gardens of adjacent development.

Overall Old Fort Road provides an eclectic mix of building designs with various types of properties varying in both height and scale. There is little uniformity in the building line with many dwellings having been extended to the front in a piecemeal fashion. To either side of the dwelling are double storey houses.

The house to the east (No.94) has been modified several times including the erection of a long ground floor front extension along the eastern boundary of its site. The house to the west (No.90) is relatively modest and untouched, has only a very small original front protrusion and is recessed back farther from the road than either of its adjacent neighbours.

## Consultations and Representations

***Third Parties:*** Council has received one submission from the owner of adjacent No.90 Old Fort Road who in principal raises no objection to the size and design of an earlier advertised design (which was larger and located closer to their common side boundary). His only concern was that whatever improvements to the design were employed to improve the visual amenity of the highly prominent western elevation not be such that it would adversely restrict future additions to his dwelling.

## Relevant Planning Policies and Guidance:

Adopted West Sussex Structure Plans 2001-2016 (WSCC 2005):

LOC1, DEV1

Adopted Adur District Local Plan 1993-2006 (ADC 1996):

AG1, AH7 & Appendix 11 'Supplementary Planning Guidance' comprising: Development Control Standard No. 3 'Extensions & Alterations to Dwellings'

## Planning Assessment:

### *Policies*

Structure Plan policies seek to protect, and where possible, enhance the character and distinctiveness of an area, requiring high standards of design, layout and construction (DEV1). Policy AH7 of the Local Plan states that extensions and alterations should be designed so as not to result in an unacceptable degree of overlooking, a loss of natural light or an overbearing effect on neighbouring dwellings. They should be of sympathetic design and materials to the original dwelling and the area in general.

The Council's Development Control Standard No.3 states that front extensions should not usually extend significantly beyond the building line or

abut side boundaries. In the case of semi-detached or detached dwellings, front extensions will only be allowed where the extension can be successfully assimilated into the streetscene and not unduly affect neighbours.

***Visual Amenity***

The design of the extension involves a contrasting modernist architectural style considered unsympathetic to the character of the existing structure.

Furthermore, the manner in which the first floor extensions reach towards the highway brings the upper floor of the dwelling well in front of the established first floor building line for Old Fort Road. The result is the creation of a flank wall that is extremely prominent rather then blending in with the existing streetscene.

Whilst it is clear that a lot of work has been put into improving the aesthetic appearance of that wall through the use of windows, building materials and finishes, it remains out of context with surrounding development, detrimental to the streetscene and likely to set a precedent for similar inappropriate development along Old Fort Road.

***Residential Amenity***

By virtue of the western wing having now been pulled back from the highway and in from the western side boundary with No.90, the extensions no longer fall within the 45 degree cone of influence whereby windows of adjacent development are considered to be adversely impacted upon in terms of loss of outlook or access to daylight. Notwithstanding the above, the addition will certainly have a dominating affect when viewed from the front garden of No.90. The use of glazing also impinges on the limited privacy of that front garden space, although a condition requiring the use of opaque and fixed glass could suitably remedy the privacy concern.

***Amenity Space***

Despite the increased floor space, there is no change to the availability of amenity space on-site. The size of the rear garden is already below the standard specified in Council's Development Standards, however this is offset by the site's large front garden and immediate access to public open space in the form of the adjacent beach.

***Access & Car Parking***

The site maintains suitable on-site parking provision in the form of the double garage, with a long driveway and fully paved verge at the front of the property providing adequate space for visitor parking.

**Recommendation:**

REFUSE for reason that :-

The proposal would be out of keeping in scale and design with the existing dwelling, would be detrimental to the visual amenities of the locality and the residential amenities of No.90, and would consequently conflict with the policies of the West Sussex Structure Plan (CH1, DEV1) and the Adur District Local Plan (AG1, AH7).

Case Officer: ..... Date: 22/4/07