expires 27/4

Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: ADC/0075/09 **Recommendation - Application Permitted**

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 (amendment to ADC/0156/08)**

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.

Planning permission was granted in May 2008 to demolish the bungalow and outbuilding and to erect two very contemporary semi-detached art-deco style box houses in its place (ADC/0156/08). The houses would be built on the same front and rear buildings lines as the adjacent dwellings and would be two storey in nature with roof terraces accessed by centrally positioned elevated turrets. They would 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 turrets.

The building would be mainly completed in white render, with timber doors, aluminium windows and aqua blue glazed brick detailing. The rooftop balconies would be centrally positioned to the front of the site to limit overlooking whilst further balconies would be at first floor level on the front/south elevation. Integral garages would cater for one vehicle each with additional parking available on frontal hardstandings.

This application seeks to amend the design by omitting the roof turrets and terraces, as well as carrying out other minor amendments, which has arisen as a result of trying to reduce the construction costs. Another omission is the bike store in the rear gardens (bicycle storage will now take place within the integral garages).

Consultations and Representations

Consultations/Comments

West Sussex County Council – The Transport Planning Officer has no objection. A TAD contribution of £1,880 is required as before.

Adur District Council – The Environmental Health Officer has no adverse comments

Third Parties

None

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)
PPG13 'Transport' (DTLR 2001)

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 amount of development and the layout have been previously approved and are not changing here. The main issue is the impact of the design amendments on the surrounding area.

The removal of the roof turrets reduces the overall height of the dwellings and results in a more conventional flat roofed appearance. The roof of the dwellings is now to contain rooflights and solar hot water heating panels which will be raised at an angle of 33 degrees but hidden from the street by the parapet roof. It is therefore considered that the removal of the roof turrets will not have a detrimental effect on the overall appearance of the proposed dwellings.

Residential Amenity

The previous application received an objection on the grounds that the dwellings were to be three storeys in height and would be inappropriate for the area. The reduction in the height of the buildings is therefore expected to be welcomed by the neighbour concerned and, indeed, no representations have been received to this application. Overlooking and other amenity issues were fully considered at the time of the previous application and there are no significant changes that are likely to result in any harmful impact on neighbouring occupiers. The roof will have an access hatch but a condition is recommended to restrict access to roof maintenance purposes only. New first floor side windows are proposed for each dwelling to serve bathrooms (previously proposed to be served by rooflights) but these are to be obscure glazed and high level.

Access and Parking

The removal of the bicycle sheds is acceptable as bicycles can be stored within each garage. Access arrangements are as previously approved. A TAD contribution of £1,880 is required under the adopted transport contributions methodology for sustainable transport improvements in the locality.

Recommendation

APPROVE for reason that :-

2PPi (remove AT12)

Subject to:

1. C1Ci

2. C8Biv
3. C8Gii (amended) The dwellings hereby permitted shall not be occupied until provision for the secure storage of cycles has been made....Authority and thereafter such provision shall be permanently retained.
   Reason – To ensure adequate provision of cycles to encourage transport by means other than the private car and to comply with PPG13.
4. C9Aii
5. C9F
6. C14H – AH2, DEV1
7. C18B Delete "or any incidental building.....curtilage"
8. C18Cii The glazing serving the first floor bathroom windows in the side elevations of the dwellings hereby approved .....
9. C18Ei side walls of the dwellings
10. C18F 'No part of the roof of the dwellings hereby approved shall be used as a balcony or terrace and access to the roof shall be limited to maintenance purposes only."
11. The section 106 Obligation dated 14 May 2008 associated with application reference ADC/0156/08 shall continue to apply to the proposed development.
    Reason: For the avoidance of doubt having regard to policy DEV5 of the West Sussex Structure Plan.

Case Office[redacted] Date...6/4/09