Expiry Date – 1/8/18, ppa 28/9

Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/0784/18 Recommendation – Grant

Site: 158 Old Fort Road, Shoreham

Proposal: Removal of the existing roof over the eastern part of the single storey bungalow and an extension to form a 1st floor living space and kitchen with a balcony and privacy screens over the eastern end of the building and associated alterations.

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Date of Site Visit: 23.7.18

Site and Surroundings

This application relates to a semi detached bungalow on the south side of Old Fort Road at the bell mouth of the eastern end of the road. It is adjacent to the beach on its southern and eastern boundaries. This part of Shoreham Beach is a local nature reserve. The ancient monument of Shoreham Fort is further to the east. The site itself is not in a conservation area and is not a listed building.

The existing bungalow sits discreetly in the street as it recedes eastwards from the narrow street entrance into the wide site. The bungalow appears in two parts with the first half square to the road and the eastern end at an angle and at a lower level. The bungalow is mostly white painted render under a clay tiled roof with stone 'crazy paved' uprights and chimney on the main part and a front door recessed behind a curved, open, entrance porch.

The site has a large east side garden laid to lawn and a rear garden which includes a swimming pool.

Proposal

Planning permission is sought to remove the roof over the entirety of the eastern end of the building and to add a first floor with feature staircase detail. A glazed staircase detail will run up the middle of the new flat roof area. This has been revised to show obscure glazing on the north side. Beyond this is a fully gabled first floor under a shallow roof to create a new kitchen/dining/living space. This will have a maximum height of 6.35 metres. Also proposed is a wrap around balcony on the south and east elevations with privacy screens either end. This balcony has been curtailed on the eastern side to pull it 3 metres off the corner of the building and 6 metres away from the northern boundary with No. 160.

The existing concrete tiles will be used to reroof the extension with the new walls clad in vertically fixed timber. Windows are to be white uPVC to match the existing. The curved entrance area is to be squared off.

The plans were also revised to correct the boundary as the original drawings included land within the curtilage of No. 160.

Relevant Planning History

ADC/0172/09 – Flat roofed first floor extension (with rear balcony and timber visibility screens/sunshade). Granted 4.6.09

SU/320/78 – Garage and playroom to front. Granted 22.8.78

Consultations

Historic England: *On the basis of the information available to date, we do not wish to offer any comments. We suggest that you seek the views of your specialist conservation and archaeological advisers, as relevant.*

Health: No objection.

Representations

Objection received on behalf of occupiers of No. 160 to the revised scheme, as follows:

'Following the practice's letter of 19th July 2018, Mr & Mrs Cook asked the practice to review the latest amendments and provide further information to re-consider the above application and whether it will continue to have an impact on their home. Our client, the owner occupier of 160 Old Fort Road, Shoreham Beach, West Sussex, BN43 5HL will be directly affected by the applicant's proposal. We therefore maintain our objection and expect these comments to be given the weight they clearly deserve – the main issues are still the impact on direct sunlight, the underwhelming design and the significant impact on the occupants' privacy and the sense of enclosure caused by the first-floor balcony and gable end. This is regretful but important as the outcome (of an approval) will have a lasting and deleterious impact on our client's welfare and state of mind.

Daylight and over-shadowing
We are pleased to confirm that there is no objection to the technical issue of 'loss of daylight' following our lighting expert's appraisal of the proposals against the existing. As you are aware, the two things are difference. As such we do still aver our Client's previous comments about the unacceptable shadow cast on their south facing windows. In our opinion this could be mitigated by moving the building's proposed first floor extension westwards (which is a simple procedure).

Privacy

The balcony must be pulled away from the north-eastern corner in our opinion – standing on the balcony will give new and unwanted views from the proposals into our client's home – directly. Screening or an enclosure could be used to enliven this aspect of the design. Screening on the

balcony could lead to further direct shadowing however, as above, by making the balcony mainly southerly (as opposed to running full-length along the eastern and southern boundaries), this can be mitigated. Historically, the Council had insisted that my client's balcony was enclosed to avoid similar issues – however this was on a raised ground floor level i.e. not at first floor. It is important therefore to ensure that the existing relationship between sites is maintained and certainly not worsened.

Design

As per our earlier statements, the design creates the issues we believe are the cause of our client's distress. Namely the austere blank façade does little to benefit our client's view or experience of their external spaces. With articulation some relief could be found in a similar bulk but presented differently; as above, by pushing the first floor to the west, our client would benefit hugely as it effectively deals with the bulk of the issue. The design is still blander than need be and creates a harsh adjunct to its neighbour which is entirely unnecessary.

Conclusion

Mr & Mrs Cook asked the practice to review the latest amendments and provide further information that assists them to make proper and concise representation. Frustratingly, they have asked to uphold their objection and strengthen it on the basis that no mitigation has been offered concerning:

• The reduction in direct sunlight to our client's ground floor windows during the winter months and;
• The blandness of the design of the first-floor gable and its impact on our client's amenity due to its bearing and;
• The position of the first-floor gable being easternmost on the footprint of the original house i.e. the most impacting point and;
• The balcony which causes a loss of privacy and direct views into the neighbouring property/our client's home.

As such we believe that the application should be refused or withdrawn until a more considerate scheme is submitted with only a negligible impact to our client's home.'

Relevant Planning Policies and Guidance

The National Planning Policy Framework 2018
Adur Local Plan 2017 Policies 1, 2 and 15 including 'Development Management Standard No. 2 Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings'.

Planning Assessment

Principle

The principle of development can be supported as it upgrades a dwelling within the built up area boundary. For consideration is the impact of the proposals on neighbour amenity, whether it represents good design and as such its impact on the character and

appearance of the area. Also for consideration is the impact on the adjacent scheduled ancient fort, archaeology and the adjoining nature conservation area.

Neighbour impact

No. 160 is a two storey house to the north of the application site. Originally a flat roofed bungalow it has been extended both at ground floor and in the last 10 years it has been remodelled to include a first floor and has a modern flat roofed design. The various extensions pushed development very close to the north, east and south boundaries. Since the permission in 2008 it would appear No. 160 has purchased some garden area from No. 158 which allows them a small garden area in the south east corner of their property. Otherwise they have a north east corner courtyard and a larger front garden.

No. 160 has a large kitchen window and kitchen door in its southern wall facing that part of No. 158 to be remodelled. This kitchen also has a front, west facing, window and a rear, east facing, window. No. 160's main ground floor living room is also in the southern wall and will face the proposed new floor. This living room window and the east facing kitchen window are under a deep cantilevered first floor, the kitchen door to a lesser extent. Beyond the living room and up a few steps is a sun room addition which has south and east facing windows. The living room and sun room are open plan. No. 160 also has a large kitchen/diner/living room at first floor level with east and west windows and an east facing terrace with southerly obscurely glazed side wall.

Having employed a light assessor No. 160's architect has conceded that measured against the BRE daylighting standards the proposed extension will have little impact on the amount of daylight received to No. 160.However, they maintain their objection to the proposal on the grounds of loss of sunlight and have provided illustrative shadow drawings to indicate the loss. These indicate that during the winter months when the sun is at its lowest the shadow cast by the proposed first floor will reduce the sunlight received to the kitchen and central living space. The sun lounge beyond is not affected.

It is not disputed that winter sun to these rooms will reduce at this time of year. However, this is for less than 3 months of the year. In addition the property benefits from a ground floor sun room which will be unaffected and also has a first floor kitchen/diner/living room which will also be unaffected. In the circumstances 'significant' loss of sunlight will not occur.

In terms of overlooking there are no windows proposed in the north side of the extension. The glazed staircase has dual aspect. The applicant's architect has amended the plans to show the north side of the staircase to be fully obscurely glazed. A condition is recommended requiring it be obscurely glazed and non-opening on installation and to be retained as such. Clear glazing and openings are acceptable on the southern side.

A 1.2 metre deep balcony is proposed around the south and east side of the extension. It has been truncated on the east side to pull it 3 metres off the north corner of the build and 6 metres away from the garden boundary of 160. A 1.8 metre high obscurely glazed screen is shown at the northern end to prevent overlooking of No. 160. The orientation of this room is south and south easterly, away from No.160. No loss of privacy will occur.

The gabled extension is close to No. 160's boundary and primary private external garden area. To avoid overlooking the north elevation is deliberately blank and consequently in the neighbour's opinion 'austere'. They consider their outlook will suffer and the extension will be overbearing. They also believe this could all be avoided by moving the new first floor to the western end of the building, adjacent to No. 156. In 2009 planning permission was indeed granted to the previous owners of the site for a flat roof first floor addition at the western end. The current owners are aware of this scheme but during discussions it became clear that they did not want to resurrect it or try and amend it to suit their needs, even though it would be a more neighbourly proposal.

Outlook from the southern kitchen window and door and living room doors will change and the first floor extension will be very apparent to occupiers at No. 160. However, the kitchen benefits from a western and eastern outlook too. In addition part of the existing pitched roof opposite the southern kitchen window is to be removed and left flat with the staircase feature set centrally on the roof away from the edge. This may partially improve outlook. The outlook from the living room is partly obstructed by 160's own cantilevered roof, and again there is an alternative outlook from the summer room adjunct at the eastern end of the same room, and a first floor living room.

The extension will sit parallel with a third of 160's south east garden boundary, garden purchased previously from No. 158. However, two thirds of this garden area will be unfettered.

Consequently, it is not considered that permission could be withheld for this proposal on the grounds of loss of outlook or overbearing impact.

The property to the west, No. 156, is a two storey dwelling with rear dormers and a first floor rear balcony. The proposed extension is well removed from them, 14 metres. The southern balcony is the same distance from them. An element of mutual overlooking will occur. Occupiers of 156 have not raised an objection to the proposal.

Design/Character

This part of Old Fort Road has no strong single character. This is the last remaining bungalow in this part of the street and most of the houses differ in design or materials. It could not be argued that the proposed extension would be out of character in the streetscene. The design is simple, possibly even bland, but not harmful to the appearance of the host building or the wider area. The use of timber cladding will soften its appearance.

Heritage/Archaeology/Nature conservation

The conservation architect has confirmed no harm to the scheduled ancient monument. As the extensions are essentially an upper floor it is not expected that any significant harm will occur in terms of archaeology nor will it harm the adjoining nature conservation area.

Recommendation APPROVE subject to the following conditions:

1. Approved plans
2. 3 years
3. Sample of timber cladding
4. No new windows - north
5. North side of staircase non opening and obscure to level 5, including screen
6. Privacy screen added to west end of southern balcony

Informative

The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by identifying matters of concern within the application (as originally submitted) 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 any representations? YES.

Case Officer signed:	MOK	Date: 27.9.18
Authorised and signed by:	Peter Barnett	Date: 28 September 2018