Expiry Date - 27/12/2011

Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number:
AWDM/0876/11

Recommendation – Approve Application

Site: **144 Old Fort Road Shoreham-By-Sea West Sussex BN43 5HL**

Proposal: **Remodelling of house (including ground floor front extension and extension to roof) to form 3-storey flat roofed contemporary dwelling with front 1st floor terrace and rear 1st and 2nd floor terraces plus detached flat roofed double garage in front garden linked to house by new pergola**

The Application

The application property is a detached 2 storey pitch-roofed dwelling located on the south side of Old Fort Road. It is proposed to remodel and extend the house to form a three storey dwelling. The extensions and alterations involve:

- The removal of the pitched roof and its replacement with a flat roof
- The addition of a second storey flat-roofed (grass roof) extension with rear terrace. The position of the second floor has been amended to be more centrally placed rather than on the western side of the building as originally proposed
- The rendering of the external walls of the dwelling
- The formation of a roof terrace over the existing garage at the front of the dwelling and the conversion of the garage into a bedroom with ground floor patio in front
- A front extension at the side of the existing garage to form a new entrance and study with 'beach' roof terrace above. The extension measures 7m deep, 6.5m wide and 3.2m high.
- A 2m deep first floor extension across the front of the building
- The construction of a detached double garage in the front garden with a pergola link to the new front entrance door. The garage measures 6.5m wide, 8m deep and 2.7m high.

Consultations and Representations

Consultations/Comments

Adur District Council – The Environmental Health Officer recommends a precautionary contaminated land informative be added to any consent

Third Parties

3 letters received from the occupiers of 142 and 146 Old Fort Road and 250 Harbour Way raising the following comments:

- Design and height of building is out of character with neighbouring dwellings
- Extension work should be limited to weekdays only
- Any windows facing neighbours' property should be obscure glazed
- Overlooking from second floor balcony and spiral staircase at rear (the staircase has subsequently been deleted from scheme)

Relevant Planning Policies and Guidance

Adopted Adur District Local Plan 1993 – 2006 (ADC 1996): AG1, AH7 and Appendix 11 'Supplementary Planning Guidance' comprising Development Control Standard No.3 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings'
PPS1 'Delivering Sustainable Development (ODPM 2005)

Planning Assessment

Policies

Policy AH7 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 proportion of the garden area taken up by a proposal should not be excessive.

Visual amenity and character

The existing dwelling is set back from Old Fort Road by approximately 29m, in common with many other dwellings on the south side of the road. Many properties have extended forward or have built outbuildings and garages in the front garden. No.142 has a garage extension at the front, No.110 has a detached garage in the front garden approximately 10m from the road while no.88 has recently been granted permission for a front extension projecting to within 11m of the pavement. No.136 also has extended at the front but that is considered to be too large and should not set a precedent for further similar developments.

The proposed garage will be flat-roofed and, as amended, located 8.5m from the front boundary. It will have a grass roof and white rendered walls. It will be linked to the house by a pergola 6m long and 2.5m wide. It will be a prominent feature but it has been moved back by 2.5m from the original submission which allows more space to be retained between the building and the road. The front wall of the garage will project 10m forward of the garage at 142 but in the overall street scene it is not considered that it would be unduly intrusive or harmful to the character of the area.

The removal of the pitched roof and addition of a second floor with flat roof will not appear especially unusual in the varied street scene of Old Fort Road where there are a number of flat roofed dwellings on two and three storeys. The second floor extension was originally proposed to be on the west side of the dwelling only rather than over the entire building but there were concerns that this would result in a rather imposing continuous three storey form which would not be found anywhere else in the road. Amended plans were therefore requested and the latest plans show the second floor more centrally placed, being set back by 1.5m at the front and west behind the parapet wall at first floor. It is 3m from the east side parapet and 2.5m from the rear wall, with a roof terrace running the full width of the second floor at the rear.

The result of this amendment is to form a more subsidiary second storey which rises 2.1m above the first floor parapet and is proportionally much smaller than the lower floors. It will be approximately only 0.5m higher than the ridge line of the existing roof and 1.5m higher than No.146 to the west. While a more substantial building, it is considered that it would be an acceptable form of extension which will not appear unduly prominent or out of place in the varied street scene of Old Fort Road.

Residential amenity

No. 144 is set further southwards than 146 but is generally in line with 142 to the west. There will be a new vertical wall almost 2m higher than the existing eaves, plus a front extension which brings the first floor of the dwelling almost 2m further forward. A first floor front roof terrace over the existing garage is also proposed. These alterations will have some impact on two side windows at No.146 but, because of the staggered relationship between Nos 144 and 146, the impact is not considered to be significant.

A low glazed screen is proposed only around the front terrace but it is not considered that any loss of privacy will arise as the windows are at a slightly higher level. The windows appear to be secondary windows only and were obscured by blinds at the time of the site visit.

The roof extension and new vertical form of the extended dwelling should also not unduly affect the amenities of the occupiers of 146. They are separated at first floor level by 4m distance and, while No.144 is positioned almost 7m further south than 146, the extension does not bring the line of the house further into the site to the south. The third storey is positioned to the north and

west, 3m from the edge of the roof to minimise the impact on the occupiers of 146. Any side windows can be obscure glazed by planning condition.

To the west, the impact on No.142 has been reduced by removing the external spiral staircase and by moving the top storey further from the edge of the building. Two roof terraces are proposed at the rear, one of which replaces an existing first floor balcony. The top floor terrace is restricted in area to that in front of the roof extension only and 1.8m high obscured glass screens are proposed at either end of the terrace to prevent overlooking. The impact on the occupiers of No.142 is therefore not considered to be harmful.

The new garage will be forward of, but adjacent to, the garage extension at No.142 and will not cause any loss of light or outlook. The front extension to the dwelling itself will also be adjacent to the neighbouring garage extension, approximately 2.5m from the side wall of the garage which does contain windows facing 144. It is believed that the garage may have been partly converted into a granny annex. However, the loss of light to the side windows is not considered to be serious as the extension at that point will be single storey and flat-roofed only. Two side windows to serve a utility and study can be obscure glazed to protect privacy. The use of the roof above as a terrace should not cause any loss of amenity as it is shown on the plans as a 'beach roof' which is more for landscape value than practical use as a sitting area.

Recommendation

APPROVE for reason that:-

1PPi

Subject to:

1. C1Ci
2. C12Aii
3. C18Cii
4. C18Di
5. This permission relates to the following approved plans:
   TA599/P01 rev C (Block & Site Location Plans) received 22 December 2011
   TA599/P10 rev D (Proposed Site Layout) received 22 December 2011
   TA599/P11 rev A (Proposed Ground Floor Plan) received 2 December 2011
   TA599/P12 rev D (Proposed Upper Floor Plans) received 22 December 2011
   TA599/P13 rev D (Proposed Front Elevation) received 22 December 2011
   TA599/P14 rev D (Proposed West Elevation) received 22 December 2011
   TA599/P15 rev C (Proposed Rear Elevation) received 22 December 2011

TA599/P16 rev D (Proposed East Elevation) received 22 December 2011
TA599/P17 rev B (Proposed Section AA) received 22 December 2011
TA599/P18 rev D (Proposed Section BB) received 22 December 2011
TA599/P19 rev D (Proposed Street Scene) received 22 December 2011
Reason– For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

Informative: If during development, any visible contaminated or odorous material, (for example asbestos containing material, stained soil, petrol/diesel/solvent odour, underground tanks or associated pipework) not previously identified, is found to be present at the site, then no further development (unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority) shall be carried out until it has been investigated by the developer. The Local Planning Authority must be informed immediately of the nature and degree of the contamination present and a method statement detailing how the unsuspected contamination shall be dealt with must be prepared and submitted to the Local Planning Authority for approval in writing before being implemented.

Case Officer Peter Barnett Date 18 January 2012

18/1/12