Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/1505/13 Recommendation – APPROVE

Site: 67 Old Fort Road Shoreham-By-Sea West Sussex BN43 5RL

Proposal: Remodelling with front, side and rear extensions and rooms within enlarged roof with front and rear gables and enlarged front balcony

Date of site visit: 8.1.2014

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

The application property comprises a detached bungalow occupying a wider than average plot on the north side of Old Fort Road. It has been enlarged by single-storey flat-roofed front and rear extensions, and front and rear dormers. The flat roof of the front extension is used as a sitting out terrace accessed from patio doors in the front dormer and enclosed by decorative concrete blockwork. A drive on the east side leads to a garage set back from the rear of the original bungalow attached by a flat-roofed link.

To the west, No.65A consists of one of a pair of modern link-detached 2-storey houses with a part-hipped roof form and 1½-storey eaves to the sides. To the east, No.69 consists of an older end of terrace bungalow clad in white uPVC horizontal boarding with a slate roof. The road is made up of a diverse range of dwelling styles and type although plot sizes on the north side of the road are typically shallower and narrower than those on the beach side.

Permission is sought to remodel the existing bungalow with a larger footprint extending eastwards by 3.5m, at the front (south) by a maximum 4.2m and at the rear by a maximum 4.3m partly in place of the existing garage and link which would be demolished. Remodelled roof accommodation would be created in an enlarged pitched roof with an east-west ridge 10m wide and 6.7m high with 3 new front gable features and a gable on the east part of the rear elevation – all projecting from the main ridge. The central front gable feature would project 1.8m further forwards (south) than those on either side which incorporate part-hip elements. The first-floor element of the central front gable incorporates an enclosed balcony and would project above a colonnaded verandah which extends across the entire front elevation. There would be open balconies on either side of the central gable above the verandah. The remodelled roof would slope down to single-storey eaves on either side. The existing single-storey rear element on the west side (3.2m x 3.5m deep) would be retained, with a new single-storey rear element (10m x 4.3m deep) to the east.

The re-modelled accommodation would consist of entrance lobby and hall, living room, kitchen/dining area, dining room, play room, utility room, bedroom, bathroom and guest suite on the ground-floor, with 4 bedrooms (1 with en-suite), family bathroom and 'snug' on the first-floor.

Materials would consist of a mix of brick and horizontal timber weatherboarding, timber windows and doors, and a red clay tiled roof.

Relevant Site History: None

Consultations: None

Representations: No third party representations received.

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

Upgrading of the existing housing stock located within the built up area can be supported in principle. The relevant issues are the effects of the development on the amenities of neighbouring residential occupiers, and the effect on the character and appearance of the dwelling and its surroundings.

Visual Amenity

The existing bungalow has suffered a number of minor additions and alterations which have resulted in an overall loss of visual cohesion. The proposals retain the overall scale of a bungalow but with first-floor accommodation provided within a modulated chalet form. Remodelling allows for some integrity of design to be restored to the front elevation (rather than the alternative of further incremental addition). There is considerable variety in the style and form of recent development in the immediate vicinity which lends greater scope for a degree of individuality in the detailed design of dwellings than in other parts of the Beach. In this respect it is considered the series of gable features, balconies and colonnaded verandah will create a visually interesting composition which would not appear out of keeping in this road.

The rear elevation would display a lesser degree of visual harmony with the proposed rear gable having uneven eaves resulting in an asymmetric appearance. The existing modest sized rear dormer would be retained. The shallow rear garden and relationship to properties in The Meadway to the north effectively limit scope for more substantive extensions at the rear.

There would be a minimum gap of 1.2m between the extended east side of the dwelling and the boundary with No.69. The easternmost part-hipped front

gable would roughly align with the front of No.69, with the verandah and balcony above projecting further forward by 1.8m. Despite the extremely diminutive scale of No.69 the retention of a narrow visual gap and form of the roof sloping down to a single-storey eaves height would avoid the enlarged dwelling appearing visually overpowering in relation to No.69. There is a slightly wider visual gap on the west side of 3.4m which would remain unaltered. The western part-hipped gable would infill an existing recessed area to roughly align with the front of No.65A but would not appear visually overbearing or cramped in relation to this larger scaled dwelling.

Residential amenity

The most affected property would be No.69 to the east. There are 2 windows in the side wall of this bungalow, sited approximately 1m from the common boundary, which appear to serve habitable rooms and are clear glazed. The siting and 'bulk' of the proposed extension would have an effect on daylight to, and the outlook from these windows. However, the impact is minimised by the single-storey eaves height of the extension on this side and retention of a modest gap to the boundary such that physical effect of the extension would not be overbearing or result in an excessive loss of light.

The existing first-floor terrace currently overlooks the front of No.69. The open balcony in front of the easternmost gable serving a 'snug' would be closer than the existing terrace (2.5m from the common boundary) and project forward of the front of No.69. A 45º angle drawn from SE corner of the balcony indicates it would not be possible to see into the windows of No.69. The issue of overlooking the front of a property is less sensitive than at the rear (where there is reasonable expectation for a greater degree of privacy). Side screens could be installed to limit the angle of view but would need to be at least 1.7m high to be effective and would appear ungainly as a consequence. On balance and in the absence of any objection from the neighbour it is considered a privacy screen is not warranted.

A similar concern arises in respect of the open balcony in front of the western gable, which would be sited forward of the front elevation of No.65A – although there is a greater separation distance (3.7m) on this side. The balcony would enable overlooking across the front of No.65A but not directly into the ground and first-floor windows/French doors. As above, side screens could be installed to limit the angle of view but would need to be at least 1.7m high to be effective and would appear ungainly as a consequence. On balance and in the absence of any objection from the neighbour it is considered a privacy screen is not warranted.

There is a distance in excess of 22m between the proposed rear gable and the rear elevations of No.69 (a traditional pyramid-roofed bungalow) and 71 The Meadway (a chalet) to the north. The proposed rear gable design incorporates a large expanse of glazing although the larger part serves a double height 'gallery' (and would not give rise to overlooking). Glazing in the proposed rear bedroom has been designed specifically to avoid overlooking with only high level and low level panels. A rooflight would provide an additional source of daylight but the consequence of this glazing arrangement is that this room would have a very limited outlook. However, this is one of 6

proposed bedrooms and an amendment to provide the room with an outlook in not considered essential in this case.

Other Issues

The site is within Flood Zone 3 and the application is accompanied by a FRA in accordance with EA Standing Advice which is considered adequate.

The ground-floor layout includes annexe accommodation/guest suite with its own kitchen/bathroom/living room/bedroom(s) and a condition is considered necessary to ensure this is not used independently of the property as a single dwelling house.

Recommendation

APPROVE for the reason:-

The proposed development would not detract from the local built environment and can take place without detraction from the residential amenities of neighbouring occupiers. It would not therefore conflict with saved policies AG1 and AH7 of the Adur District Local Plan, DC Standard No.3 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings' and the NPPF.

Subject to Conditions:-

1. Standard time limit
2. Approved plans
3. Materials and samples for walls, roof, windows, doors and balustrading to balconies to be agreed
4. No additional windows in side elevations or side roof slopes
5. Rooflight windows in side slopes to be obscure glazed with restricted opening in accordance with details to be agreed
6. Annexe/guest suite not to be used as independent dwelling

<u>Informative</u>

1. The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by identifying matters of concern at pre-application 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.

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

Case Officer: Jo Morin Date: 16.01.2014

Authorised by: Gary Peck Date: 16 January 2014