Application Number: AWDM/1143/13 Recommendation – APPROVE

Site: 98 Old Fort Road, Shoreham-By-Sea, West Sussex BN43 5HB

Proposal: Erection of replacement dwelling (in place of remodelling of existing house previously approved under reference ADC/0502/10)

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

This application relates to the site of a former two storey detached ridge-roofed two-storey house on the south side of Old Fort Road, backing directly onto the beach. Planning permission was granted in 2010 for the remodelling of the house to change it to a contemporary three-storey flat-roofed form. Extensions were proposed to the front and to the west side of the building, together with the removal of the pitched roof, to create a tiered appearance (ADC/0502/10).

Construction commenced during the summer of 2013 but the applicants discovered that the original walls would not successfully integrate with the new construction and they were advised by their structural engineer to demolish the original house and build a completely new structure. The old house was therefore demolished in August and work commenced on the construction of a new dwelling. However, the planning permission was only for the extension of the house and a new application was requested and eventually submitted. It was apparent from the submitted plans that a number of changes were proposed to the height, size and appearance of the dwelling but, following several meetings and discussions, amended plans have been received which show the house at the same height as approved. There have been a number of external changes, including an increase in the width of the second floor, but the proposal is broadly in line with the approved plans for the extension.

The height of the approved house extension scales off on an A3 drawing as 8.9m high but the architect has queried this measurement and believes that there may have been some shrinkage as a result of printing and photocopying. He considers that the approved height was 9.1m (compared with 8.3m for the original house) and this is reflected in the latest plans. Earlier plans showed the house at 9.5m and this reduction back to the approved height is a considerable improvement. The second floor has been 'squared off,' removing previously proposed recessed side windows on the ground and first floors and Juliet balconies on the 2nd floor, which had the potential to overlook neighbours. It will now be 9m wide for most of the second floor (an increase in width of 0.8m on each side towards the rear of that floor), but will retain the step in for the rear balcony.

The first floor rear balcony is wider at 10.5m wide compared with 9m as previously approved. The previously approved clerestory glazing between first and second floors

has been omitted and replaced with a line of ‘false’ windows around the top of the first floor parapet. There are also various changes to the side windows.

The external walls of the building will be rendered as previously approved. 18 solar panels are proposed for the centre of the flat roof in 6 rows of 3 set at 32 degrees above the flat surface.

Work has commenced with the frame of the dwelling already in place and some blockwork construction on the ground floor. The applicants have subsequently been advised to stop work until the application has been determined.

Relevant Planning History

As above

Consultations

None

Representations

Original Plans - 4 letters of objection received from the occupiers of 100, 123 Old Fort Road (3 letters) raising the following objections:

- It will be the tallest building on the beach
- It towers over No.96 and is taller than No.100
- Increased width of 2nd floor reduces light and increases bulk of building
- Developers have shown disregard for planning process
- How did they not realise that original walls would not fit their design?
- Overlooking
- Dimensions keep changing to confuse the issue
- Overbearing in terms of bulk
- Substantial increase in bulk and height
- Design has been coarsened with any relief or interest removed
- Ground floor bedrooms will be very dark resulting in substandard housing
- It will not be a sustainable construction
- Greatly increased accommodation at second floor dominated by 10m wide window and balcony will cause unacceptable overlooking and feeling of encroachment
- Loss of light to windows on west elevation of No.100 (serving kitchen, stairwell and bathroom)
- Poor design
- Shame applicants did not take opportunity to enhance design using the freedom offered by a new build but have instead increased the size while removing any charm or interest shown in the original design

- Will be over 1m taller than No.100

9 letters of support received from the occupiers of 35 East Meadway, 11, 109, 152 Old Fort Road, 11a Tudor Mansions (2 letters), Shoreham and addresses in Lancing, Brighton, Horsham supporting the application for the following reasons:

- It is not overbearing compared with what is happening elsewhere on the Beach, particularly next door
- One-for-one only rather than multiple properties
- Cutting-edge design
- High quality buildings like this will enhance the beach and add value to other properties

Amended Plans – No representations received

Relevant Planning Policies and Guidance

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'
'Good Practice Guidance Note: Internal Space Standards for New Homes' (ADC 2010)
West Sussex Parking Standards and Transport Contributions Methodology (WSCC 2003)
West Sussex 'Guidance for Parking in New Residential Developments' and 'Residential Parking Demand Calculator' (WSCC 2010)
The Provision of Service Infrastructure Related to New Development in West Sussex – Part 1 (WSCC 1999)
National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012)

Planning Assessment

Principle

The site is located within a residential part of the built-up area and is not identified or allocated for any particular use or development in the Local Plan. The replacement of the dwelling on the site is acceptable in principle subject to consideration of its impact on the character of the area and on residential amenity. Regard should be had to the design and scale of the approved extension.

Visual amenity

The principal consideration is the impact of the changes on the street scene. The approved height of the extended dwelling was 9.1m above ground level and the proposed house will be the same.

The sides of the dwelling have a plainer appearance, with the removal of the recessed areas and clerestory windows. The height of the vertical wall from ground to top of first floor will be 6.6m as opposed to 6m in the previous scheme. In order to provide some respite from the wall, a line of feature windows is to be placed along the top of the wall along the flanks, front and rear of the building.

The alterations to the elevations are not considered to be of such significance as to warrant refusal on this ground. While wider at second floor, that floor will be set in from the first floor walls by 2.2m, retaining the previously approved tiered appearance. At the rear there will be slightly more glazing but this will not cause harm to the appearance of the building when viewed from the beach. The solar panels may be noticeable due to their angle on the flat roof but they are to be centrally positioned and set in from the sides of the building to minimize any visual intrusion.

The proposal will result in a tall building at 9.1m, 0.35m higher than 100 Old Fort Road to the east which has itself been recently extended and remodelled. It will be considerably taller than No.96 to the west, which is approximately only 6.5m tall.

However, there are a number of substantial properties along this road, particularly on the foreshore where plot sizes and the lack of neighbours immediately to the front or rear enable larger extensions and dwellings to be built than would be allowed in a more standard street scene. This height has been previously agreed.

Overall, it is not considered that the changes to the building are sufficiently significant or harmful to warrant refusal of the application.

Residential amenity

To the east, No.100 does have several windows in the side facing the proposed house. However, these serve largely secondary areas such as a stairwell and bathroom, while the affected kitchen also has an outlook to the south.

No.100 has been extended and remodelled to form a 3 storey contemporary dwelling and this has helped to reduce the impact of the proposals at No.98 upon it. No.100 has two large terraced areas at the rear at 1st and 2nd floor with louvred screens and there are similar proposals at No.98 which are not considered to cause any loss of privacy or overlooking. It is not considered therefore that the impact upon the amenities of the occupiers of No.100 will be significantly harmed.

To the west, No.96 is a bungalow which does not have any windows in its side gable and has an obscure glazed single-storey extension at the side which is not considered to be adversely affected by the proposal.

Recommendation

APPROVE for the reason:-

The proposed development would not detract from the local environment and can take place without resulting in unacceptable detriment to the amenities of neighbouring properties. It would consequently not conflict with the saved policies of the Adur District Local Plan (AG1, AH7) or the policies of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Subject to Conditions:-

1. Standard 3 year time limit
2. External materials to be as previously approved
3. Privacy screens as approved
4. Side windows to be obscure glazed
5. Removal of PD rights
6. Approved plans
7. Height of dwelling not to exceed 9.1m

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

The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by assessing the proposal against all material considerations, including planning policies and any representations that may have been received and subsequently determining to grant planning permission in accordance with the presumption in favour of sustainable development, as set out within the National Planning Policy Framework.

Case Officer: Peter Barnett Date: 5 December 2013

Authorised by: Gary Peck Date: 5 December 2013