Application Number: ADC/0455/08 Recommendation – APPROVE

Site: **160 Old Fort Road, Shoreham-by-Sea BN43 5HL**

Proposal: **Additional storey over part of existing single-storey dwelling (first-floor living room and bedroom)**

The Application

This is a revised application following the withdrawal of previous application ADC/0352/08. The dwelling is a 1960's flat-roofed bungalow located at the extreme eastern end of Old Fort Road, adjacent to the Old Fort.

The proposal is for an additional storey on top of the eastern half of the existing flat-roof. It would be flat roofed and timber clad and would comprise of two main rooms (a bedroom with ensuite bathroom, and a living room with kitchen area) with a linking stairwell/landing. The living room would have an external east facing terrace.

The bedroom would be located on the north-east corner of the dwelling and would be 6m wide, by 6m deep, by 2.7m in height, it would be set in from the northern edge of the building by 3m. The living room would be located on the south-east corner of the dwelling and would be, 8m wide, by 7.8m in depth, by 3.5m in height. The linking stairwell would be angled in shape, 2.4m-3.4m in width, by 4.3m in depth, by 2.2m in height. The two main elements would be clad in horizontal weatherboarding, similar to the existing 0.7m high fascia that runs around the bungalow (which is to be re-clad).

The bungalow has been extended previously with a utility room (SU/248/69); east side single storey extension (SU/421/77); and a porch and study on the front of the building (SU/83/84).
Permission for an additional first floor, with mansard roof, has previously been refused (SU/279/79) on the grounds that:- "*1. The proposed development would have an adverse effect on the privacy and quiet enjoyment of neighbouring properties and would be generally detrimental to the residential and visual amenities of the locality.*"

The recent previous application for a similar scheme earlier this year (ADC/0352/08) was withdrawn after concerns were raised over the effect on privacy to the property directly to the south (No.158), and the potential overbearing effect on the neighbouring house to the north (No.160).

The applicants planning statement says, amongst other things, that the design options are constrained by the need to maintain privacy to the first floor and rear garden of No.183 to the north, and to avoid overlooking No.158 to the south, at the same time as benefitting from the views to the south, east and north-east. The new timber frame structure and existing fascias are to be clad in horizontal cedar weatherboard, allowing the fascias and first floor extension to be visually integrated and a coherent whole.

Consultations and Representations

Shoreham Port Authority: No objection. Following detailed investigation, they conclude that it would not have a harmful effect on shipping or the operational safety of the Port.

Third Parties: 2 letters of objection have been received from residents of No's 181 and 183, the houses to the north and north west.

The residents of No.181 object on grounds that the proposals will considerably affect their visual amenity, and that the construction would be overbearing unsightly and out of proportion with the existing property. They feel the timber cladding is not a suitable material for the location, and the ceiling height of 3m is excessive.

The owners of the adjacent house to the north (No.183) feel that the proposals show little regard for their interests, with no hint of compromise and that it is pure self interest. They feel that their south-facing balcony would be rendered obsolete, since there would be no pleasure gained from sitting on it only a few feet from a featureless overlooking wall. They feel their south facing sun lounge would be equally affected. The proposals would obscure direct sunlight from the windows in their ground floor lounge for 4 hours a day. In their opinion the timber cladding should not be mixed with the existing white plastic cladding. On the revised application they feel that the revised plans show only a token 1.8m movement in the wall facing their property and that this has no practical improvement on the unacceptable aspects of the plans which remains the same.
[NB. the resident of No.183 has asked to speak at the Committee meeting]

Relevant Planning Policies and Guidance

Adopted West Sussex Structure Plan 2001-2016 (WSCC 2005) (saved policies): LOC1, DEV1
Adopted Adur District Local Plan 1993-2006 (ADC 1996) (saved policies): 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

Structure Plan policy LOC1 gives priority to locating development within built-up areas provided the impact on the environment is acceptable. DEV1 requires new development to be of high quality construction, layout, scale and appearance, taking into account the need to integrate with existing development and have regard to local context, including local character and distinctiveness, streetscape, views into and out of the site and materials and building styles. The aim is to create a high quality, socially inclusive and adaptable environment for occupiers and users meeting their long-term needs.

Policy AH7 of the Local Plan, relates specifically to extensions and alterations to dwellings, states that they should be designed so as not to result in an unacceptable loss of light or privacy or have an overbearing effect on the neighbouring dwelling and be sympathetic to the original dwelling. They should not result in an excessive amount of overlooking of garden areas.

Supplementary Planning Guidance in DC Standard No. 3 'Extension and Alteration to Dwellings' is relevant as the proposal would have a similar effect as a two-storey extension to the rear of a conventional house. The DC Standard states that the closer a rear

extension is to the boundary of a neighbouring property the more likely it is to cause overlooking or loss of daylight.

Government policy is set out in Planning Policy Statement PPS1 'Delivering Sustainable Development'. Relevant paragraphs are 17, which refers to the commitment to protecting and improving the environment; 18 which states that planning should seek to maintain and improve the local environment and help to mitigate the effects of declining environmental quality through positive policies on issues such as design; and 34 which states that good design is indivisible from good planning and that design which is inappropriate in its context, or which fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area, should not be acceptable.

Visual amenity

There is a mixture of building types and styles at the end of this cul-de-sac at the far end of Old Fort Road. The application bungalow and the neighbouring dwelling to the south (No.158) are both single storey but with larger footprints than the two-storey houses. Unlike the other houses, No.183 is a house with a flat roof and No.158 is a bungalow with a tiled roof with a very low pitch.
Within the surrounding area a number of the dwellings adjacent to the beach are modern flat-roofed design properties, with balconies and large areas of glazing. The neighbouring house directly to the north (No.183) is an example of this type of design.

The existing building has been extended in a variety of ways since it was built in 1969, and as a result the appearance of the building from the east is of a modular form, with the east side dining room having a roof level 0.8m higher than the rest of the bungalow. Viewed from the west, the garage projects in front of the main entrance lobby which itself projects forward of the kitchen and adds to the irregularly-shaped 1960's design.

The proposed additional rooms would result in the bungalow becoming much more dominant in the streetscene than at present, although it would not block the view of the much taller, derelict coastguard tower beyond. The proposed rooms would differ in height from each other. The northern bedroom would be 2.7m in height with a roof that would be 5.7m above ground level, the southern living room would be 3.4m in height and would be 6.3m above ground level. It is not considered that the difference between the two heights would result in an incongruous design, given that the original structure has a stepped roof line and, as described the form of the building is of a modular appearance.

The proposals would be set back from the western side of the building by at least 4.5m, this would help to prevent the proposals from appearing too top-heavy within the streetscene. The west side elevation would be broken up by the insertion of two high-level windows and the glazed stairwell, which would create visual interest and break up the appearance of the plain timber cladding, preventing it from appearing top-heavy.

The design of the eastern elevation has been amended since submission of the application and now show a more integrated design, with the dining room windows on the east elevation matching the scale and size of the glazing in the stairwell, and the glazing in the ground floor sunroom being re-fitted to match the size of those in the proposed lounge above. The applicants architect has stated that the whole of the dwelling will have new windows fitted throughout, and that they would be of grey powder-coated aluminium design, with thin framework and mullions. It is considered that the new windows would enhance the contemporary design of the resulting building and help to integrate the new

floor into the old building where, matching of the uPVC windows may have been problematic.

The existing sunroom sits between the east side of the ground-floor living room and the east side boundary. It was felt that, to successfully integrate the proposals with the existing building, the sunroom would have to have been demolished to provide enough separation between the boundary with the beach and the two-storey element of the house. It is considered that, on balance, the amendments to the design of the sunroom and the window frame design will prevent the sunroom from appearing discordant with the resulting house as proposed to be enlarged.

The proposed cladding materials of horizontal cedar weatherboard are considered to be appropriate in principle, given that the whole of the existing fascias will be re-clad to match, and that the adjacent house (No.183) has timber-clad fascias around its roof and balcony area.

Residential amenity – outlook and daylighting

To the north, the neighbouring two-storey house (No.183) is sited slightly to the west of the applicant's dwelling. It is arranged with its main living rooms on the upper floor with the main lounge on the east side of the building (with two east-facing windows); adjacent to this is a sunroom with an east-facing window and south-facing glazed doors which open directly onto a balcony. The balcony provides panoramic views from the north east round to the south over the sea and to the west. These views are interrupted by the Coastguard tower to the east and the houses in Old Fort Road (No.156 westwards).

The proposed northern room would be located at its closest 6.2m from the balcony of No.183 to the north, and 10.4m from the patio doors of the south facing sunroom. The width of the two rooms combined would result in the loss of sea views towards the south from the south-facing balcony and sunroom of No.183 and to a lesser extent from its lounge. However, loss or reduction of a private view (especially of a seascape) is not a valid reason to refuse planning permission. The relevant planning concerns are the effects on significant views from public places and, insofar as private properties are concerned, whether there would be excessive and overbearing 'enclosure' of their outlook.

The main concern with the previously withdrawn application (apart from the impact on privacy of No.158 to the south) was that the cumulative effect of the proximity to the boundary, height and overall bulk of the proposals would have lead to an unacceptable loss of outlook and overbearing presence for No.183.

No.183 has a groundfloor lounge on the south side with east-facing patio doors which allow for direct access to the garden. The lounge is already affected to a certain extent by the neighbouring dwelling, receiving direct sunlight in only a small portion of the downstairs lounge from the east in the early morning. Two small high-level windows in the south elevation and glass bricks in the west side allow for some additional daylighting but these are insufficient to avoid the room seeming dark.

Daylight indicators do show that the proposals would remove morning sun into the east side windows of the ground floor lounge, but not the south side high level windows or the west side glass bricks. The proposed extra height of the proposals would result in a degree of additional shadowing of the garden which would 'sweep' across the rear garden of No.183 through the day, but this would only be relatively small in extent (about 1 metre

extra in March) and most of the garden would remain unaffected by shadowing from the proposals.

It is considered that the scaling down of the bedroom and re-siting of it 3m from the northern side of the building (4m from the boundary) would help mitigate the effect on the outlook of No.183. The upstairs lounge of No.183 has ample outlook towards the east away from where the proposal would be sited. The adjacent sunroom has a mainly southern outlook, and owing to it being offset to the west, the proposals would be seen at an angle. The proposals would be sited 10.4m from the sunroom itself and 6.2m from the balcony.

Although the proposals involve considerable mass and would reduce the extent of the distant views enjoyed by No.183, on balance, it is concluded that the overall effect on No.183 would be acceptable and not warrant refusal.

The bungalow to the south/south west (No.158), which currently appears unoccupied, has a southern aspect to its main living areas, with a large south side patio area, swimming pool and beach access, plus a large east side grassed garden area. North facing windows are obscurely glazed and the proposals would not cause loss of outlook to them.

Residential amenity – privacy

The original proposals would have resulted in direct overlooking of the side garden of No.158 from the proposed living room. However, this has been avoided with the current application, where the south elevation of the living room terrace is now a solid wall, only allowing easterly views.

Recommendation

APPROVE for the reason:-

The proposed development would not detract from the local environment and can take place without resulting in unacceptable detriment to the amenities of neighbouring properties. It would consequently not conflict with the policies of the Adur District Local Plan (AG1, AH7) and the West Sussex Structure Plan (DEV1).

Subject to:-

1. C1Ci (Standard time limit)
2. C12Ai (External materials for walls, roof and windows of extensions to be approved) (amended)
3. C14AB (Permission relates to amended plans received on 8 October 2008)
4. C18ii (No additional windows to be formed in the side walls of the extension without planning permission)

.....