Development Management - Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/0433/15 Recommendation – Approve

Site: **128 Old Fort Road, Shoreham-By-Sea, West Sussex BN43 5HL**

Proposal: **Addition of first floor to existing bungalow to form a two-storey house with proposed first-floor balcony to rear (south) elevation. Addition of pitched roof to front projection over existing garage**

Date of site visit: 22 April 2015

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

The application relates to a detached hip-roofed bungalow with an attached flat-roofed garage projecting at the front of the building on the south side of Old Fort Road. A conservatory extends across the full width of the bungalow at the rear, fronting the beach.

Planning permission was granted in October 2013 for the demolition of the bungalow and construction of a 'contemporary' two storey 5-bed dwelling (AWDM/1165/13) which was subsequently amended AWDM/1638/14). As approved, the new dwelling had a cubed appearance from the front but with a butterfly roof. Its height would be 7.6m at its highest point.

To the east, there is a similar bungalow to No.128, also with a flat-roofed extension across the rear. This bungalow (No.130) does not project as much to the rear but does sit forward of the front wall of No. 128. To the west (126) there is a two storey dwelling with a shallow pitched roof and white rendered walls, which has been recently remodelled from a chalet bungalow (AWDM/0674/12). Further west at No. 124 is a 3 storey flat roofed contemporary dwelling.

The current application proposes to extend the existing bungalow by raising the ridge to form a first floor. Following the receipt of amended plans which lowered the ridge height by 0.6 metres, it would have an asymmetric roof design to a height of 7.6m which is the equivalent height to the previously approved application in 2014, albeit to a different design. At the front the first floor would have lower eaves with windows straddling the eaves. At the rear the eaves would be higher with first floor sliding doors opening onto a balcony. A pitched roof is to be constructed over the existing garage in order to provide guest accommodation within the roofspace.

Relevant site history

As above

Consultations

Adur and Worthing Councils: The Environmental Health Officer has made no comments other than to require the PFA informative.

Representations

1 letter received from the occupier of 116 Old Fort Road objecting to overdevelopment of the site, overlooking and height of building compared to immediate neighbours.

Relevant Planning Policies

Adopted Adur District Local Plan 1993-2006 (ADC 1996) (saved policies): AG1, AH2 and Appendix 11 'Supplementary Planning Guidance' comprising: Development Control Standard No.3 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings' National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012)

Planning Assessment

Principle

The proposal comprises upgrading of the existing housing stock located within the built up area and can be supported in principle. The relevant issues are the effects on the amenities of neighbouring residential occupiers and the effect on the character and appearance of the dwelling and its surroundings.

.

Visual amenity

The proposed dwelling would be considerably taller and bulkier than existing, with the addition of a first floor with a large central window feature. However, its height, at 7.6m, would be no higher than that of the dwelling with extant permission on the site. It is not considered that it would be out of keeping in the overall street scene of Old Fort Road where there is a variety of dwelling styles and sizes. At two storeys high it would be of a similar height to No.126 to the west (albeit higher by 0.5m) but lower than the three storey building at No.124. It is not considered to be an overdevelopment of the site, particularly as the footprint of the building is not being increased.

Residential amenity

The extended dwelling will have a greater bulk, mass and height than existing but the rear part of the side of the bungalow at No. 130 does not contain any windows. Towards the front there are three windows which are all obscure glazed and which are not considered to be adversely affected by the proposal.

The proposed extension at the rear will replace an existing conservatory and will be a more solid feature with a balcony above running the full width of the house. It will not have an increased footprint. The neighbouring bungalow has its own extension at the rear, with no side windows, and it is not considered that the proposed rear extension will cause a loss of light or outlook to No.130. The proposed balcony is shown with 1.7m high screen walls/panels to the sides to prevent overlooking.

To the west, No. 126 has two windows (obscure glazed) on the side facing the site and the proposed extended dwelling will not therefore have an adverse impact on light or outlook for No.126. At the rear there is a flat roofed single storey extension and the proposed extended dwelling will project beyond this. However, the projection to the rear will not be to an extent that is likely to result in a harmful loss of light or outlook. First floor side windows in the proposed extension can be required by condition to be obscure glazed.

The proposed extension is not therefore considered to result in any adverse impact on residential amenity. Neither neighbour has made representations against the proposal.

Recommendation

APPROVE

Subject to Conditions:-

1. Standard 3 year time limit
2. Obscure glaze 1st floor side windows
3. Materials to match
4. Screen to balcony before first use
5. Approved plans

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

1. 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.
2. PFA

Case Officer: Peter Barnett Date: 13 May 2015

Authorised by: Gary Peck Date: 14 May 2015