Development Management - Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: **Recommendation –** Approve
AWDM/1216/15

Site: 3 Old Farm Court New Salts Farm Road

Proposal: Single storey side extension and new tool shed in north east corner of the site

Neighbours checked:
Additional neighbour notifications:

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

The application site relates to part of a converted single storey barn, situated next to open farm land just to the west of Shoreham.

The proposal is for a single storey side extension and a free standing timber shed in the north east corner of the site. The extension will measure at max, 4.4 metres in height, 3.8 metres in length, and 3.1 metres in width (full details are shown on the submitted drawings).

Relevant site history
AWDM/0531/15
Single storey rear extension
Withdrawn 12.06.2015

L/99/99/TP
Timber garden shed and timber panel fence on eastern side boundary (0.76 metres high) (retrospective)
Refused 16-08-99

L/40/93/TP
Fencing (1.1 m high) on north and east boundaries
Refused 14-06-93

L/143/92/TP
Fencing (1.8 m high) on north and east boundaries (retrospective)
Refused 11-01-93

L/201/87/TP/FP
Rebuilding of barn to form 4 dwellinghouses (Design as per conversion scheme previously permitted)
Approved Conditionally 22-12-1987

L/54/86/TP/FP
Conversion of barns into 8 dwellings (comprising 4 three-bedroom houses, 2 two-bedroom bungalows and 2 one-bedroom bungalows) (amendment to previous permission L/106/82/TP)
Approved Conditionally 22-04-1986

L/106/82/TP/FP
Residential development involving the conversion of main barn into 4 houses and outbuildings into 3 new bungalows and 8 garages; extension to north garage block (3 additional garages); and erection of new infill block of 2 flats
Approved Condition 23-11-1982

Consultations (summarised)
Southern Water: *Attach informative*

Representations (summarised)
Objection received from occupier of 4 Old Farm Court New Salts Farm Road Shoreham By Sea: *adjoin the applicants property. Design and construction is not in keeping with construction of main barn (house) and significantly alters the design as originally granted under planning consent L/201/87 which required detailed replication of original farm building. Development control guidelines issued in 1993 stated that all extensions would be resisted in principle and we purchased No. 4 OFC on this basis. The original planning consent being L/106/82 and L/201/87 were subject to removing "permitted development rights" to carry out extensions, the purpose being to control alterations or extensions to main the rural character of the original conversion and development scheme. The applicant requires a tool shed presumably for storage, however they own a garage which remains empty and this could be used by the applicant. The applicant has revised a previous application made in April 2015 which was subsequently withdrawn. The extension was described as a study in the previous application but the current application states required as a studio. Suspect the applicant requires additional space in connection with their business see http://www.shirleytrevena.com. Historically applicant has offered art classes and observed and recorded on CCTV groups of visitors arriving which places a huge strain on parking making it difficult for residents to park in the communal car park. Parking is very limited with 8 spaces to serve 22 homes. The application states that extension cannot be seen from Main Road due to an overgrown hedge. Original planning consent and guidelines restrict fences to post and rail and 3 ft. high. Previous applications made by owners of No. 3 to erect taller fence panels have been rejected. Current owner is not abiding by original planning consent and guideline to restrict height. Applicant has received pre-planning advice from planning office and understand same planning officer can approve this application. I see this as a conflict of interest.*

Representation received from occupier of Hanger 4 Cecil Pashley Way Shoreham By Sea: *OFC property owners have a restricted covenant in their transfer of Part as follows: THIRD SCHEDULE Para. 7. Not to erect any building on the said land unless it has been approved in writing by the Transferor. Have applicants sought such approval?*

Relevant Planning Policies
National Planning Policy Framework
Saved Adur Local Plan policies: AG1, AC1, AC4, AH7
Development Control Standard No.3

Planning Assessment

Principle

The upgrading of residential accommodation is acceptable in principle in this countryside location, subject to satisfying the amenity issues below.

Flood Risk

The far end of the garden falls within Fluvial and Tidal Flood Zones 3a, the highest category.

However the footprint of the extension would be outside of the fluvial flood risk zone and its floor levels would be no lower than the existing barn building, so human health would be put at no greater risk than at present. This can be secured by condition.

Residential amenity

The extension is physically removed from neighbouring buildings so no adverse harm would result onto their living conditions by way of overlooking/loss of privacy, overbearing or overshadowing.

Visual amenity

Policies in the Development Plan and National Planning Policy Framework require development to meet high standards of design and to relate sympathetically to the existing built environment.

Because the countryside gap between Lancing and Shoreham is mostly flat farmland, its open character means Old Farm Court is an important component to the area's landscape setting and character.

The flint-walled converted barn and curtilage has retained much of the intrinsic character of an agricultural building. This is reflected in the removal of "permitted development" rights by planning condition in the original conversion.

However it is important to understand the purpose of this condition was not to prohibit any future extension/alteration – only to enable control over works that could potentially result in harm.

The new tool shed will be very modest in scale and of an appropriately functional design, with suitable exterior timber finish. It is to be positioned close to the building, so the rest of the curtilage remains free of domestic clutter. A shed was previously refused. However, this was due to its unduly domestic feature - which is not the case with the current proposal.

The proposed extension is modest in its scale and size in relation to the host building, with a simple pitched roof form. It is designed to be akin to a store building for hay or other crops, which would not have been untypical to the historic function of the barn. This is reflected in the sympathetic use of slate roof tiles, timber framed doors, fascia, and cladding all stained black (plastic guttering and down-pipes exist on the host dwelling). Such a store would have

been located on the southern flank of the building to keep stored goods dry, so it is in the correct position on the building.

Due to its modest scale and appropriate design quality, the extension would not be intrusive in the wider landscape, or incur harmfully into the building's curtilage, which will retain its open character. As some of the curtilage would be lost to the extension and shed footprints, it is prudent to re-impose the permitted development condition relating to outbuildings.

The barn interior has already been compromised in the original conversion. The existing flint work to the outside wall will remain exposed and unpainted, so there is a memory of this for future.

Existing fenestration in the south flank will be lost, but these are not distinctive features being an inappropriate 'domestic' choice of window system. The new French doors are simple in design, and similar to existing rear doors on the host dwelling. The new glazed openings maximise daylight without compromising the building's character; these are expressed as modern interventions without resorting to making them appear historic. The glazing in these openings is to be recessed as far as possible, with the framing hidden in the wall, so these would appear as widened vertical ventilation openings – a feature not untypical of barns of the Sussex Downs.

Because the creation of inappropriate openings would be harmful under permitted development, it is prudent to prohibit this opportunity on the extension itself by way of condition to avoid this

Given the merits of this proposal, the host building as a whole is capable of absorbing this change without substantial and lasting damage to its character and interest.

Recommendation

Approve

Subject to Conditions:-

1. Standard time limit
2. Approved Plans
3. Architectural details, including treatment of opening to existing flintwork, a complete side elevation, and material and finishes samples and schedule, to be agreed built out in accordance
4. Floor levels set no lower than existing barn building
5. Notwithstanding "pd" no further openings in any elevation of extension.
6. Notwithstanding "pd" no domestic outbuildings

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 letter(s) of representation? N

Case Officer: Matthew Porter Date: 18-11-2015

Authorised by: Peter Barnett Date: 18 November 2015