Development Management - Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: **Recommendation – Approve**
AWDM/0234/15

Site: **76 Old Fort Road**

Proposal: **Removal of existing roof and construction of a new first floor with new roof, demolition of existing rear conservatory and erection of a new single storey rear extension and internal alterations**

Neighbours checked: Y
Additional neighbour notifications: N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

The application relates to a low lying bungalow with shallow pitched roof. It is situated in an outer residential suburb of Shoreham, facing directly onto the beach.

Permission is sought for a remodelling of the existing dwellinghouse by removal of the existing roof and construction of a new first floor with new roof, together with a new single storey rear extension. In totality, the resultant building would measure (at max) approximately 6.7 metres in height, 15.7 metres in length, and 17 metres in width.

Relevant site history
None

Consultations
Adur & Worthing Councils *Environmental Health contamination officer: require the addition of the PFA informative*

Representations (summarised)
Objection from occupier of 116 Old Fort Road: *Plans show 2 bedroom 3s (so has 4 bedrooms). Plot surrounded by 1.5 m fence without means of access and front wall to Old Fort Road should be 1 m max.*

Relevant Planning Policies
National Planning Policy Framework
Adur Saved Local Plan policies: AG1, AH7

Planning Assessment

Principle
Upgrading of the housing stock is supported in principle.

Visual amenity

The local distinctiveness of Shoreham Beach is derived from the open sky and wide vistas. The beach has a strong character, with long and high ridge of

stablished shingle. Behind this is a long row of detached buildings designed with purposeful intent to address the foreshore.

The existing building is of a non-descript design and, while it involves the loss of a bungalow, the south side of Old Fort Road has been redeveloped with larger properties over the years and the loss of the original architectural form is therefore considered to be acceptable in principle.

The new first floor with butterfly roof over the main house and a mono-pitch roof over the garage would represent a striking architectural statement, with nautical overtones.

It would contribute to the diversity of architectural styles and scales of buildings along Old Fort Road, without appearing out of character. The south side of Old Fort Road has The property to the east has an equally shallow pitched bungalow with a modernist ‘box’ built hard up against the shared boundary with the application site. The property to the west has a higher ridge with front dormers. It is a chalet bungalow in terms of scale. Both neighbouring buildings are wide fronted with well-defined horizontal low eaves. The new design of dwelling would share these physical attributes.

The proposed exterior materials and finishes and treatment of balcony enclosures all have local reference in the immediate area on other new buildings in the street, and are sympathetic to the sensitivities of its seaside situation.

Residential amenity

It is the neighbours to either side who would be impacted upon by this development (which is physically removed from the remainder, so as to avoid harmful impact).

Neighbour to east

This neighbouring building is two-storey hard up against the shared boundary with the application property. It has an over-sailing canopy with balcony atop it at the rear, hard up against the shared boundary.

The over-sailing canopy has already removed the majority of outlook and light to the ground floor fenestration closest to the shared boundary, so the proposed development would make this situation no worse.

Given this, and that the proposed development does not protrude forward of the neighbouring building to the east, no harm would arise from adverse overshadowing and overbearing.

The balcony and the first floor room it serves would experience a reduction in light, and outlook westerly would be reduced. However, there is an expanse of glazing which would be unaffected, so this room would continue to be served with adequate light and outlook to an extent that avoids harm.

Overlooking between neighbours would be mutual due to both having their own balconies, and there is no expectation of privacy at the rear because it

faces the open foreshore. Even so, a privacy screen is proposed that would negate intrusive views.

Neighbour to west

This neighbouring building is a bungalow with a rear dormer and associated balcony. It exhibits a habitable room window close to the shared boundary with the application site.

However the proposed development would not come forward of this neighbouring building and the dormer is sufficiently distant off from the boundary, so negating any potential for adverse overbearing and overshadowing is negated.

The largest of the proposed balconies would be screened from this neighbour to avoid intrusive overlooking, and in any case there would be mutual absence of privacy since both properties would have their own balconies and face onto the foreshore.

Parking

Sufficient parking would be retained on site to satisfy adopted Council standards.

Recommendation

APPROVE

Subject to the following conditions:-

1. Standard time limit
2. Approved Plans
3. Notwithstanding “Pd” no further windows/openings above first floor
4. Balcony not occupied unless and until privacy screen installed

Informative

The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by assessing the proposal against all material considerations, including planning policies and any representations that may have been received and subsequently determining to grant planning permission in accordance with the presumption in favour of sustainable development, as set out within the National Planning Policy Framework.

PFA

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

Case Officer: Matthew Porter Date: 2-4-2015

Authorised by: Peter Barnett Date: 7 April 2015