Development Management - Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/0600/21 Recommendation – APPROVE

Site: 110 Old Fort Road, Shoreham-By-Sea

Proposal: Proposed two storey gabled front extension and front porch, first floor extension to south elevation and raised balcony area. Retrospective consent for shed.

Date of site visit: 30th September 2019 and subsequently to assess no. 108 Old Fort Road.

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

Amendment to previously approved AWDM/1388/19: Addition of roof over rear balcony and front extension at first floor.

The application site is a detached chalet bungalow on the south side of Old Fort Road. It is set back in the plot with a large front parking area as with other properties on the south side of the road. There is a large detached garage to the front of the property. The property is of gable roof design with a front gable projection. There is a flat roof single storey section to the east side.

Consent was originally sought under AWDM/1388/19 to enlarge and remodel the building with the use of contemporary grey Cedral boarding and white render. The extensions included an additional large gable extension to the front of the building on the eastern side to provide a main entrance with accommodation above. The existing main gable roof is to be extended to the east also with the side flat roof additions removed. A wide sloping roof dormer style extension was permitted along the rear roof of the building south facing to provide first floor open plan living space. At ground floor to the rear a flat roof extension is proposed also the full width of the building, 2.7 metres in depth. Above the flat roof section is a balcony with privacy screens and a glass balustrade to the rear.

Following this consent an amendment to this approval was permitted under AWDM/1725/19. This included a roof over the rear balcony and front extension at first floor.

The current application seeks consent for further changes and enlargement to the latest consent. Changes to the roof of the rear first floor extension, enlarging the extension with a rear balcony and some additional side windows. The ground floor single storey flat roof is to be retained on the east side. A shed has been built on the boundary with no. 108 to the west, retrospective consent is sought here.

Materials…

Representations

2 letters of objection have been received from the occupier/owners of no. 108 Old Fort Road and Gwen Monk a resident of Shoreham Beach making the following points: -

- No objection to the front extension or formation of new balcony however the siting of the balcony I object to.
- It is deeper than balcony at 108.
- Strongest objection is the siting of the balcony tight against the boundary line it should be re sited to follow the building line of 110.
- If permission is granted in the current location the two balconies will be so close to each other that it would be possible to shake hands across the space.
- 110 is rented out for air B and B frequently.
- It is impossible to control noise with a group of guests and the balcony right next to the boundary will exacerbate the problem.
- The privacy screen should mirror the existing at no. 108.
- If the property was for privacy residence then no objection however the property is advertised for letting all year round further expansion of the property will have more implications for neighbours.

Relevant Planning Policies

Adur Local Plan 2017 Policy 15
'Supplementary Planning Guidance' comprising: Development Management Standard No.2 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings''
National Planning Policy Framework (February 2019)

Planning Assessment

Principle

The proposal comprises upgrading 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.

There is reference to the property being let as an Air B and B. This is the case and this is being monitored to ensure that the property has its main use as a residential property and not a holiday let. Environmental Health can also deal with any noise or disturbance complains as a result of this use. At this current time the property is a residential dwelling occupied by the applicant.

Visual amenity

In visual terms the changes proposed are acceptable. When viewed from the street the proposed works are similar to that already permitted with the use of materials remaining the same as those previously approved. The changes to the building

complement the eclectic mix of dwelling design and use of materials. Consent has recently been granted for works at both adjacent bungalows nos. 112 and 108.

The main change is to the rear of the building with the enlarged ground and first floor extensions and balcony. These will be visible from public views and the beach. The first floor addition increases in bulk from that previously permitted however within the context of the beach front location and surrounding development the design, scale and finish of the building and proposed balcony will not be out of keeping or harmful in terms of character or impact upon the street scene.

As stated in the previous report, rear balconies and terraces are commonplace along the beach. The increased scale of development as a result of the proposed roof extension will not be excessive or out of keeping in relation to surrounding development; there are many other larger developments along this part of Old Fort Road. The development will be more prominent when viewed from the beach however this is acceptable for the reasons discussed above and in the previous planning assessment.

The front shed is small in scale and set back in close proximity to the front of the house. It is not clearly visible within the street scene and has no adverse impact.

Residential amenity

The main properties to be affected are those either side of the site no. 108 and no. 112 Old Fort Road. No 108 has completed works recently with a rear balcony and first floor extensions. The proposed works here will extend further to the rear of no. 108 than previously permitted. The roof form will increase in bulk and depth to the rear however this is not considered to be such to warrant a refusal. Light and aspect will remain to the adjacent property to an acceptable degree.

The addition of the balcony in close proximity to the boundary will also give rise to some neighbour impact. Amended plans show the balcony set in, in line with the rear of the building. The balcony at no. 108 adjacent to the boundary has a section of privacy screen directly to the rear of the house then the remainder is clearly glazed, this was a mutual agreement between the neighbours to allow views through the balustrade. In this case a similar arrangement is proposed, a privacy screen directly to the rear then a clear section. A similar arrangement has also been agreed at no. 112 Old Fort Road. This is considered acceptable and has been discussed with the adjacent neighbours. Within this locality with properties in close proximity and projections, balconies and terraces toward the public beach area full privacy is uncommon and this relationship between the properties is considered acceptable here.

There is a clearly glazed window to the side at first floor which will face onto the side privacy screen at no .108. It will therefore not overlook, this will be conditioned to be high level opening only. The applicant’s agent has shown the position of this window in relation to the neighbouring property to show that no overlooking will occur. There is a ground floor external door and W.C window on the ground floor facing no. 108. It is therefore not considered that any overlooking to the side will occur.

The shed is adjacent to the side boundary with no. 108. It does not cause any harm in terms of loss of light or overbearing impact.

No 112 to the east has recently had consent to enlarge the bungalow with a rear dormer and terrace and full remodelling. This has not yet been implemented and therefore consideration must be given to the existing and proposed. The proposed balcony is adjacent to the west boundary to no direct impact will occur here (a rear terrace/balcony is proposed at no. 112) As stated before with no. 108 the rear projection at no. 110 is bulky and increases the scale and depth of existing however it is not such to warrant a refusal. Ample outlook and light will be received by no. 112. A side window is proposed facing onto the boundary with no. 112 however this is shown as obscurely glazed up to 1.7 metres to protect the neighbouring property from direct overlooking as unlike the relationship with no. 108 this will look directly to onto the rear garden of no. 112. There are two ground floor windows serving bathrooms which will be obscurely glazed. These will not result in any overlooking to the side.

The flat roof section of building to be retained will not have any adverse impact it currently exists adjacent to the boundary with no. 112. Spacing remains between the properties.

Despite the large rear addition and balcony proposed here it is considered on balance as discussed above that the impact upon the amenities of the adjacent occupiers will not be such to warrant a refusal in this case, subject to safeguarding conditions as set out below.

Recommendation

APPROVE

Subject to Conditions:-

1. Approved Plans
2. Standard 3 year time limit
3. Grey Cedral Boarding and white render
4. No additional windows on the east and west elevation of the building or roof slope.
5. Balcony screens as shown on the approved plans shall be installed prior to use of the balcony hereby permitted and shall remain in place at all times unless otherwise approved in writing by the LPA.
6. The window on the eastern side at the first floor shall be fitted with obscure glazing and be permanently non openable at all times except for above 1.7 metres finished floor level. West side high level opening only.

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

1. Proactive with amendments

Case Officer: Hannah Barker Date: 15th June 2021

Authorised by: Peter Barnett Date: 21 June 2021