expiry 18.01.08

Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: ADC/0711/07 **Recommendation - Permit**

Site: **56 Old Fort Road Shoreham-by-Sea West Sussex BN43 5HA**

Proposal: **Single-storey detached games/study room at front (amendment to ADC/0325/07 to increase length)**

The Application

The application relates to a detached chalet bungalow on the south side of Old Fort Road, on the south-east side of the roundabout at the junction with Shingle Road.

The site has undergone extensive development in the past, including a front conservatory, a single-storey east side extension including a garage, an increase in height of the boundary wall (SU/211/04); pitch-roofed dormers on the east side (SU/25/02); an enlarged rear dormer with pitched roof and balcony and additional west side port-hole window (SU/12/02); and a front extension including a double garage and rooms in the roof with side dormers, front dormer and rear dormer with balcony (SU/78/97).

The southern side of Old Fort Road is made up of a variety of building styles and types, many of which have been enlarged including large additions projecting in front of the building towards the road. The chalet bungalow to the east, No.58, has permission for extensive alterations and re-modelling to create a large house including a circular tower on the front elevation and a projecting gym with bedroom above at the front utilising part of the existing garage walls (SU/212/05 expiry 23.11.08).

The proposal is for a second revised submission following the refusal of an application (ADC/0169/07) for a large detached out building at the front of the property (an appeal has been lodged against that refusal and a decision is awaited).

The reason for refusal was:-

The proposal would be out of keeping in scale and design with the existing dwelling and would be detrimental to the visual amenities of the locality and the residential amenities of No.58.

A permission was granted for a smaller size out building by committee (ADC/325/07) to which a condition was attached restricting the building from being no closer than 9m to the road.

The current submission is for an alternative sized outbuilding to the front of the property, again to be used as a games room. It would be 11.0m wide, by

3.65m deep, by 3.0m in height. It would have a sloping tiled roof to match those of the existing property.

The applicant's agent has stated that the site plan as submitted with the approved application was in accurate in terms of the site length, and that this only came to light at the time of the appeal site visit, after approval had been granted. The site plans submitted with this application are stated to be an accurate representation of the site.

Consultations and Representations

Third Parties:
There have been three letters of objection received from the owners of No.6 Beach Court, and from 58 & 136 Old Fort Road.

The owner of No.6 Beach Court opposite objects to the increase in length and height of the games/study room. They feel that the proposal will be completely out of keeping with all the other houses. They believe that the usage is not essential being as they are not for health reasons or living accommodation. They feel that it could open the flood gates for other properties to build rooms in their front gardens.

The owner of No.58 Old Fort Road the adjacent property feels that the increase in height will create an even bigger eye sore and block out even more natural light. They state that the boundary between the two properties will be reduced in height to 1.2m and feel that the building will obscure views. They feel that the site is already overdeveloped and misrepresents the size of their garage and they request a site visit is made.

The owner of No.136 Old Fort Road feels that the plot is already overdeveloped and is of an unattractive design which is out of keeping for the area.

Relevant Planning Policies and Guidance

Adopted West Sussex Structure Plan 2001-16 (WSCC 2005): LOC1, DEV1, DEV4-5.
Adopted Adur District Local Plan 1993-2006 (ADC 1996): AG1, AH7, and Appendix II ' Supplementary Planning Guidance' comprising: Development Control Standard No.3 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings'.

Planning Assessment

Policies
Structure Plan policies seek to protect and, where possible enhance the character and distinctiveness of areas, 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 proposed detached building is designed to retain the same 9m separation from the front boundary of the property, as requested by condition 2 of the approved decision (ADC/325/07). The planning considerations are therefore whether the additional height and length of the outbuilding would have an unacceptable effect on the outlook of No.58 to the east, and whether the additional bulk would be visually worse that what has been approved.

Residential amenity

The main concern is with the boundary wall which separates the site from the east side neighbour (No.58), which is currently approximately 2.0m in height. The neighbour states in their objection that the wall will be reduced to 1.2m when works they are proposing are complete. Whilst this may be the case, it is still felt that the separation between the proposals and the property at No.58, either existing or extended, would be sufficient to prevent there being a detrimental effect on the amount of natural light.

As existing the eastern neighbour has a garage to the front of their property which has been converted into a gym. As extended the property would retain the gym use at ground floor level and have a bedroom put above with a west facing dormer. It is felt that should the adjacent property be extended the west side dormer would have views over the proposed outbuilding and therefore its outlook would be unaffected.

The existing gym has an outlook towards the west which currently is across the parking area at the front of the house and at the side boundary wall and part of the existing side of No.56. Although projecting well forward of the dwelling with a reduction in the gap between the rear of the proposal and the existing house, it is still felt that, on balance, the proposed enlarged outbuilding would not change the outlook from the gym at No.58 to an extent that it would have an unacceptable adverse effect on the outlook.

Visual amenity

The proposed building would be an additional 0.5m in height and 4m in depth from that of the previous approval. The increase in height would result in a 3.0m high building which would still be lower than the roof of the east side single-storey extension of the building, and would therefore not over dominate the existing property. The outbuilding would still be seen against a background of built form of two-storey properties going east and in the context of many other front projecting elements in the surrounding area. Due to the retention of the 9 metre gap from the highway it is felt that the outbuilding would not appear incongruous in its siting or out of keeping in size.

Recommendation

APPROVE for reason that :-
1PPii

1. C1Ci
2. The proposed building shall be sited so that no part of it is less than 9 metres from the front boundary of the application site.
   Reason: *In the interests of visual amenity having regard to policies AH7 of the ADLP and DEV1 of the WSSP.*
3. C12Ei – amended
   ...prior to the commencement of its use, be completed...etc
4. C18E3 ~~[illegible]~~ .. east side wall of the building ..

PB 18/1/08

Case Officer: [signature]
Date: 17-01-08

Planning Services Manager: [signature]
Date: 18/1/08

Chairman of the Planning and Regulatory Committee: [signature] Vice Chair
Date: 18/1/08