Expiry Date - 20/10/2011

Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number:
AWDM/0583/11

Recommendation – Approve Application

Site: **88 Old Fort Road Shoreham-By-Sea West Sussex BN43 5HB**

Proposal: **Extensions and alterations to remodel the house as a three-storey flat-roofed house (including groundfloor front wing with double garage and external stairs on west side to rear balcony)**

The Application

The application property is a detached 2 storey pitch-roofed dwelling located on the south side of Old Fort Road. It is proposed to remodel and extend the house to form a three storey dwelling. The extensions and alterations involve:

- The removal of the pitched roof and its replacement with a flat roof
- The addition of a second storey flat-roofed extension
- A single storey flat roofed extension at the front of the dwelling on its west side measuring 15m deep and 6.5m wide incorporating a garage and family room
- A new front courtyard to be formed between the extension and the eastern boundary with a 2.2m high rendered wall running between the end of the extension and the eastern boundary.
- The rendering of the external walls of the dwelling
- The formation of a first floor balcony across the rear partly on a pier and partly over an existing rear extension, served by external stairs

Consultations and Representations

Consultations/Comments

None

Third Parties

2 letters received from the occupiers of 90 and 113 Old Fort Road supporting the application, which they feel will enhance the area and will not be overbearing.

Relevant Planning Policies and Guidance

Adopted Adur District Local Plan 1993 – 2006 (ADC 1996): AG1, AH7 and Appendix 11 'Supplementary Planning Guidance' comprising Development Control Standard No.3 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings'
PPS1 'Delivering Sustainable Development (ODPM 2005)

Planning Assessment

Policies

Policy AH7 states that extensions and alterations should be designed so as not to result in an unacceptable degree of overlooking, a loss of natural light or an overbearing effect on neighbouring dwellings. They should be of sympathetic design and materials to the original dwelling and the area in general. The proportion of the garden area taken up by a proposal should not be excessive.

Visual amenity and character

The existing dwelling is set back from Old Fort Road by approximately 25m, in common with many other dwellings on the south side of the road. Many properties have extended forward or have built outbuildings and garages in the front garden. Examples of properties that have extended significantly forward include No. 94, while No. 92 has extended to a slightly lesser extent. No. 86 has a detached garage in its front garden.

The proposed front extension will be single storey but will project 15m forward of the front of the dwelling. It will be just short of the extension at No.94 and will be 11m from the pavement. While a deep extension, it should not appear unduly out of character with other similar extensions in the street, having a crisp, modern appearance in keeping with the recent extension at No. 92.

The construction of a front wall to form an enclosed courtyard is more of an issue as it will result in a solid wall across the full width of the plot, thereby removing the open character that is common with these beachfront dwellings. However, following the submission of amended plans, the wall will be set back 4m behind the line of the front wall of the garage, 15m from the wide pavement and 20.5m from the road. As amended, it is not considered that the wall will appear overbearing or harmful to the street scene.

The removal of the pitched roof and addition of a second floor with flat roof will also not appear unusual in the varied street scene of Old Fort Road. The second floor extension will be set in from the sides and will be consequently be a subsidiary addition which will not appear too dominant or overbearing in the street scene. Its flat roofed form is consistent with other recent extensions in the street and its overall height will be similar to the ridge height of the existing dwelling. Amended plans have been received showing a 0.3m

reduction in its height of the top floor to improve the overall proportion of the dwelling. The rear balcony will be in keeping with many other dwellings on the beach.

Residential amenity

The front extension will run along the western boundary with No. 86 where there is a substantial garage and a hedge on the other side of the boundary. The front extension will not therefore result in a loss of light or amenity for the occupiers of No. 86. No. 90 has written in support of the application and it is not considered that they will be adversely affected by the proposals. The roof extension is set in from the sides of the dwelling by 2.5m and will not be overbearing or affect light to its neighbours. Full height glazing is proposed for its south and west sides but it is considered that its 2.5m set back will prevent overlooking of the neighbouring dwelling. A condition is recommended to prevent access to the roof.

The rear balcony will run across the entire width of the dwelling and will be a substantial area of some 5.5m depth. In order to preserve privacy, the sides of the terrace were originally to be built up with 2.5m high rendered walls. This was considered to be rather overbearing to the neighbouring properties to each side and the design has been amended therefore to a 1.2m high wall with 0.6m high glazed screen above. This provides a less solid feature which is more acceptable in terms of its impact on neighbours. The external stairs on the west side of the balcony are screened by a 1.3m high wall which, while not completely obscuring views towards No.86, is considered to be acceptable. The staircase will rise between the side walls of the properties and is unlikely to result in a prolonged or harmful loss of privacy.

The wall will project slightly beyond the rear wall of No. 86 and will obscure the view to the east that is currently enjoyed from their balcony. However, this view is also over the rear garden of No. 88 and, on balance, it is not considered that the loss of this view or outlook is serious enough to require a reduction in the projection in this area. There is not considered to be any adverse impact on the adjoining occupiers who both have balconies of their own.

Recommendation

APPROVE for reason that:-

1PPi

Subject to:

1. C1Ci

2. C12Aii
3. C18Di
4. This permission relates to the following approved plans:
   Ordnance Survey Sitemap received 25 August 2011
   Drawing No. 211/420/3A (Proposed Ground Floor Plan) received 28 October 2011
   Drawing No. 211/420/4 (Proposed First Floor Plan) received 25 August 2011
   Drawing No. 211/420/5 (Proposed Second Floor Plan) received 25 August 2011
   Drawing No. 211/420/6B (Proposed North and West Elevations) received 7 November 2011
   Drawing No. 211/420/7B (Proposed East and South Elevations) received 7 November 2011
   Drawing No. 211/420/8B (Proposed Roof Plan, Site Plan and Street Scene) received 7 November 2011

   Reason– For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning

Case Officer Peter Barnett Date 8 November 2011

8/11/11