Expires 16/5/08.

Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: ADC/0156/08 **Recommendation – Permit Application**

Site: **63 Old Fort Road Shoreham-by-Sea West Sussex BN43 5RL**

Proposal: **Demolition of bungalow and erection of pair of flat-roofed three/four-bedroom houses with integral garages**

The Application

The application site is a four bedroom detached bungalow located on the north side of Old Fort Road, Shoreham. The property sits on a good sized plot (32m by 18m) with an east-west orientation and a large pitch roofed garage/store located on its western boundary. Adjoining the site to the east is a pair of recently built semi-detached chalet style bungalows (SU/233/03/TP) whilst to the west is a detached bungalow with front and west facing dormers. Beyond this is recently built large three storey semi-detached chalet dwelling with side dormers (SU/253/04/TP). To the rear are various detached bungalows along The Meadway, some of which have, or are, in the process of being redeveloped into larger dwellings. Opposite are a plethora of large detached houses and bungalows set back from the road, many of which are contemporary in style.

This application seeks permission to demolish the bungalow and outbuilding and to erect two very contemporary semi-detached art-deco style box houses in its place. The houses will be built on the same front and rear buildings lines as the adjacent dwellings and will be two storey in nature with roof top balconies accessed by central stairwells/lightpods. They will sit on a 16.1m by 13.3m footprint with a height of 6.9 metres to the main roof level and 8.3 metres to the top of the stairwell pods.
The building will be mainly completed in white render, with timber doors, aluminium windows and aqua blue glazed brick detailing. The rooftop balconies will be central to the front of the site to limit overlooking whilst further balconies will be at first floor level on the front/south elevation. Integral garages will cater for one vehicle each with additional parking available on frontal hardstandings.
The accompanying Design and Access statement states that the houses will be designed to achieve level 3 in the design codes for sustainability and will include rainwater harvesting systems in the rear gardens and solar hot water heating panels on the rear sections of the roof in order to help achieve this. The buildings are also designed to achieve 100% compliance with the sixteen Lifetime Home Standards.

Consultations and Representations

Consultations/Comments

Chief Environmental Health Officer	No Objections.
WSCC- Highways & Transport	No significant concerns. The parking and cycle provision is in accordance with the maximum standards. Pedestrian visibility splays should be secured within the site. A TAD contribution of £1,880 is required.

Third Parties

No.61 The Meadway have objected on the following grounds:

- The proposal is against the council's policy for the area which appeared to be the replacement of buildings on a like-for-like basis with sloping roofs to retain the 'bungalow' feel of Shoreham Beach.
- The proposal is for, essentially, a three storey building which is in contrast to the two storey chalet nature of the area. No.59 is three storey only as the previous building was of this height; the third storey is within the sloping roofspace.
- As the existing building is a bungalow, it should remain as a bungalow/chalet bungalow. The roof terrace adds a third floor and a additional 2.5m to the ridge which is deemed excessive.
- Shoreham Beach is defined by 'pastiche' housing that compliments each other, retaining the original feeling of the Beach.
- The proposal is not in keeping with the design and height of other housing on the north side of Old Fort Road, and would be more appropriate on the southern side where the properties are fiercely individual. This property is not sympathetic to its surroundings.
- The rear first floor windows will cause overlooking and a total loss of privacy to their rear garden. Bathrooms and frosted windows are requested on this elevation.
- The visual impact of the increase in height will be huge and inappropriate to the area.
- The plans appear inaccurate in terms of the drawn and actual distances between the rear elevations.

Contributors

No representations have been received.

Relevant Planning Policies and Guidance

Adopted West Sussex Structure Plan 2001-2016 (WSCC 2005): LOC1, CH1, NE1-2, ERA1, DEV1, DEV4-5
Adopted Adur District Local Plan 1993-2006 (ADC 1996) (saved until adoption of the new Adur Development Plan): AG1, AH2, AH5, AH7 and Appendix 11 'Supplementary Planning Guidance' comprising: Development Control Standard No.2 'Space around New Dwellings and Flats'
Revised West Sussex Parking Standards and Transport Contributions Methodology (WSCC 2003 and ADC 2004)
Design Bulletin No.1 'Trees and Landscaping' (ADC 1996)
PPS1 'Delivering Sustainable Development' (ODPM 2005)
PPS3 'Housing' (DCLG 2006)
PPG24 'Planning and Noise' (DoE 1994

Planning Assessment

Policies
The site is located within a residential part of the built-up area of Shoreham and the proposal constitutes redevelopment as provided for in both Structure and Local Plan policies. There is no objection in principle to infill development within the built-up area and, in order to meet the housing requirements of the approved Structure Plan and Local Plan, a significant proportion of housing development by way of 'unidentified' small infill sites is necessary.

Structure Plan policies give significant weight to making the best use of land through higher density development provided that the impact on the character of the area and environment is acceptable (LOC1, ERA1, CH1) and subject to policy DEV1 requiring high quality development. Policy NE1 requires the provision of new residential developments of sizes, types and tenures to suit the varied needs of local households and to minimise the need to develop Greenfield sites. Policy DEV4 states (amongst other things) that development should not be permitted unless the travel needs it generates are met. DEV5 states that "Development should not be permitted unless the level of parking is compatible with the need to avoid environmental or safety problems and the need is to encourage walking, cycling and the use of passenger transport where this is or can be a realistic alternative". The explanatory text refers to a transport contributions methodology (now adopted as TAD payments to sustainable transport improvements).

Local Plan policy AH2 relates to new residential development (by way of infilling and redevelopment) and states that new dwellings should be designed so that their appearance, character and scale create a pleasant place in which to live and are in keeping with and enhance the existing local environment with particular attention being paid to architectural form, height, materials, density, layout of buildings and hardsurfaced areas; they do not have an unneighbourly effect due to loss of privacy; daylight/sunlight; outlook or open space, incorporating adequate standards of residential amenity for the new dwellings in terms of amenity space, daylight, outlook and privacy; access and

parking provision meets the adopted standards; and they accord with the Council's DC Standard No.2 'Space around New Dwellings and Flats'.

Government policy guidance in PPS3 encourages best use of urban land for housing development, particularly affordable housing and a mixture of types to create a balanced community, at higher densities (avoiding developments at less than 30 dwellings per hectare) and without rigid application of parking and amenity space standards. However, it also seeks to improve the quality and attractiveness of residential areas and urges imaginative designs and layouts which make more efficient and sustainable use of land without compromising the quality of the environment. PPS1 states:-

> "Design which is inappropriate in its context, or which fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions, should not be accepted."

PPS3 also states that Councils should "facilitate good design by identifying the distinctive features that define the character of a particular local area..... ...Careful attention to design is particularly important where the chosen local strategy involves intensification of the existing urban fabric... .....successful intensification need not mean high rise development or low quality accommodation with inappropriate space.....The density of existing development should not dictate that of new housing by stifling change or requiring a replication of existing style of form.....If done well, imaginative design and layout of new development can lead to a more efficient use of land without compromising the quality of the local environment."

Visual Amenity- character and density

The overall plot size is 32 metres in depth and 18 metres in width, resulting in plot sizes of 32m by 9m per dwelling. This compares favourably with plot sizes for the recent developments at No.65 (32m by 9.5m) and No.59 (31m by 7m), and the adjacent detached bungalow at No.61 (33m by 13m). The resultant density will be 33.3 units per hectare for the site which is not excessive to the local area of Old Fort Road and The Meadway (24 units per hectare) or the minimum requirements of PPS3 (30 units per hectare).

The building itself will sit comfortably within the plot, following the same front and rear building lines of the adjacent properties and set 1 metre from the side boundaries as required by the Council's DC standards. The surrounding properties both on Old Fort Road and The Meadway feature hipped roofs with the majority of a chalet style, however they are notable for the inconsistency of their designs. The south side of Old Fort Road is dominated by a wide variety of housing set on inconsistent and recessed building lines. Many have flat roofed features creating an eclectic mixture of architectural styles. On the north side of Old Fort Road, although consistently pitch roofed, there are incidences whereby flat roofed redevelopments have been permitted and built at No.37 (ADC/0041/08) and No.77 (ADC/0284/06). Further flat roofed flats sit on the corner of Old Fort Road and Shingle Road nearby to the east. The approved scheme at No.37 follows a similar design to this application, being

of a two storey box format with a central rooftop lightwell amidst consistent pitch roofed chalet bungalows. It is therefore considered that the principle of such flat roofed structures on the north side of Old Fort Road is acceptable.

The overall height of the main section of the building will be 6.9 metres which is higher than No.61 (6.3m) but lower than No.59 (9.1m) and No's 65 & 65A (7.3m). Although the central stairwell feature will add a further 1.3 metres to this height, it will be recessed 3.4 metres from the front and rear elevations and is thus not considered to have a significant visual impact within the streetscene.
The building will be finished in white render with glazed aqua brick detailing and timber doors. Although markedly different to the red brick and tile hanging of neighbouring properties, the proposed material finishings is appropriate to the style of building and, given the white cladding on the existing bungalow and No.61, not entirely out of character.
It is therefore considered that, despite the proposed building being significantly different in design and form to the surrounding mix of bungalows and houses, this proposal is appropriate to its setting and will serve to enhance the streetscene by introducing contemporary architecture to mirror similar recent approvals along Old Fort Road, thus complying with local plan policy AH2, structure plan policy DEV1, and PPS3.

Residential Amenity
The resident of No.61 The Meadway to the rear has objected on the grounds that this proposal will increase overlooking and cause a total loss of privacy to their rear garden. The building site plan indicates that there will be a separation of 25 metres between the rear elevations of these properties with a garden depth of 11 metres retained, in accordance with the minimum distances as set out in the Council's DC standard No.2. Following concerns over the accuracy of the drawings these distances have been confirmed by the council's datamap system. Additionally, it is noted that the building is on the same rear building line as the neighbouring dwellings of which all bar No.61 have rear facing first floor windows. It is therefore considered that the overlooking potential is no greater than already exists on this part of Old Fort Road. There are no first floor windows proposed in the side elevations whilst the ground floor windows will be either frosted to serve the w.c or high level facing the new 1.8 metre cedar boundary fencing that will be installed around the rear gardens. The first floor and floor balconies are sited centrally to the front of the building minimising any potential for overlooking.

Access and Parking
The existing single access on the west of the site is to be enlarged and an additional access point added on the east side to serve the second house. County Transport Services have raised no objection to this additional access subject to the securing of adequate pedestrian visibility splays. The front hardstanding is capable of holding 2-3 vehicles per dwelling additional to the space provided by the integral garage. This, as well as the rear cycle stores for 4 bicycles each, meets the maximum standards. A TAD contribution of £1,880 is required under the adopted transport contributions methodology for sustainable transport improvements in the locality.

Landscaping
The plans indicate that the existing hedging is to be retained during the course of construction. There are no trees on the site whilst new grassed beds are to be sited within the front hardstanding. The rainwater harvesting system in to be sited under the rear grassed garden.

Other Issues
Details of the proposed drainage connections are contained on the site plans whilst adequate provision for refuse and waste is shown within the frontal hardstandings. The boundary fencing is to be reinstated at the side and rear with 1.8 metre high cedar whilst low 1 metre high white rendered walls will form the front boundary to the highway. The site is not within a flood risk zone.

Recommendation

APPROVE for reason that :-

2PPi (remove AT12)

Subject to:

- C1Ci
- C8Biv
- C9Aii
- C9F accesses ... 5 metres ...
- C14H AM2 , 26v.
- C18B
- C18F 'No part of the roof of the building other than hereby permitted shall be converted into or used as a balcony or terrace. Reason....'

Case Officer..... Date: 29/4/08. PB 30/4/08

Planning Services Manager:..... Date: 16/5/08

Chairman of Planning & Regulatory Committee: A.J. Mills Date: 16/05/08