Application Number: ADC/0461/08 Recommendation – APPROVE

Site: **98 Old Fort Road, Shoreham-by-Sea BN43 5HB**

Proposal: **Two-storey (and part single-storey) front extension (including on site of garage to be removed); alterations and reconfiguration including new roof with room in roof with rear balcony**

The Application

The application site contains a detached ridge-roofed two-storey house, built in 1963, with side gables together with a detached ridge-roofed garage also with side gables. The garage stands forward and to the side of the house. There is a large front garden with the house set well back from the road, in common with most other properties in the road. To the rear is a relatively small garden that opens directly onto the beach.

The application is for major extension and remodelling of the house, totally changing its external appearance and demolishing the garage in order to do so.

It is proposed to construct a large two-storey extension at the front of the house with, as originally submitted, a depth of 7.7m, resulting in the two-storey part of the house being 15.3m deep overall. The proposal would extend across the full width of the dwelling, incorporating the space left by the removal of the garage, up to the boundary with 96 Old Fort Road to the west.
A new roof is proposed for the building which is to be fully hipped at the sides to replace the existing gables. The front of the extension is rendered with extensive areas of glazing to provide full height windows and two new front gables of differing heights were proposed. At the rear, an existing first floor balcony is to be removed and replaced with a new balcony. The rear elevation is to include large amounts of glazing as per the front with the roof converted to include additional accommodation served by further extensive glazing and a balcony.

The applicant was advised that the original proposal was unacceptable due to the excessive depth of the front extension and the impact of the mass and bulk of the greatly enlarged building on the streetscene.
Amended plans have now been submitted in an attempt to overcome these concerns which, while retaining the same footprint as the original scheme, reduce the forward projection of the first floor by 2.5m at either end so that it would now project 5.2m from the existing front wall. A new central front gable is added projecting 6.5m overall (replacing the previously proposed two front gables), and resulting in the two-storey house becoming 14m deep overall. Balconies have been added at first floor level at the front. The extension projects more to the rear along the west side of the building than previously proposed.

Consultations and Representations

Third Parties: A letter received from the occupier of 100 Old Fort Road objects (retained) to the plans as originally submitted on grounds of loss of light to their side windows, also commenting that the design is of poor quality.

+ letters of no obj. from Nos 96 & 102.

Relevant Planning Policies and Guidance

Adopted West Sussex Structure Plan 2001-2016 (WSCC 2005) (saved policies): CH1, 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 policies seek to protect, and where possible, enhance the character and distinctiveness of an area, requiring high standards of design, layout and construction (DEV1). Policy AH7 of the Local Plan 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 Council's Development Control Standard No.3 states that front extensions should not usually extend significantly beyond the building line or abut side boundaries. In the case of semi-detached or detached dwellings, front extensions will only be allowed where the extension can be successfully assimilated into the street scene and not unduly affect neighbours.

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 accepted.

Visual amenity

The south side of Old Fort Road has a very eclectic mix of building designs with various types of houses varying in both height and scale. Although most of the houses are set well back from the road, there is little uniformity in the building line with many dwellings having been extended to the front in a piecemeal fashion, albeit predominantly at groundfloor level only. The immediate neighbouring house to the east, No.100, for example, has a recently-completed groundfloor front extension. However, No.92 Old Fort Road, which lies 40m to the west of the application site, was granted permission by the Committee at their meeting in February 2008 for large first-floor front extensions which bring the house well in front of the established first-floor building line (ADC/0773/07). These are currently under construction but unfinished.

The present proposal has a very large bulk and, even as amended, would bring the house well in front of the first-floor building line, with side flank walls that would be dominant in the street scene. However, its impact would be reduced to some extent viewed from the

west by the detached garage set forward of the adjoining property, No.96. Also, the removal of the existing side gables of the house and the provision of side hips to the roof would help offset the increased mass to some degree.

The design of the extension will modernise the current 'tired' appearance of the existing 1960s house, with rendered walls, large amounts of glazing and a new fully hipped roof. This would provide a more cohesive and contemporary appearance, albeit not to a particularly high standard of architectural design. On balance, given the mixture of building styles and sizes and the nearby permission given at No.92, it is considered that the amended proposal is acceptable in the circumstances of this site.

Residential amenity

The extension will project as far to the front as the existing garage and will be in line with the ground floor extension at No.100. To the west, No.96 has several windows in the front elevation which would have been adversely affected by the bulk of the original design. By setting the first floor back 2.5m closest to the boundary, the bulk has been significantly reduced and the extension now meets the 45 degree 'rule of thumb' guide in relation to the angle of outlook from the windows of the adjacent dwelling. The extension is set further back along the side elevation to compensate for the loss of accommodation at the front, but this does not result in any adverse impact on the amenities of the occupiers of No.96. The proposed first floor balconies will have 1.8m high privacy screens to protect residential amenities to both neighbouring properties.

To the east, No.100 has several windows at the side and the occupiers were originally concerned at the loss of light to these openings (which serve a first floor kitchen, stairwell and ground floor bathroom). The applicants arranged for a 'daylight assessment' to be carried out, the results of which demonstrate that the only window adversely affected would be the one serving the stairwell but that this would still receive in excess of 80% of its former light, and therefore meets good practice. The other windows would actually receive more light as a result of the hipping of the existing roof. Since then, the design of the extension has been amended with the bulk reduced at the sides which will further reduce the impact on the occupiers of No.100 such that no loss of amenity will occur.

At the rear, the replacement balcony does not result in any worsening of the potential for overlooking and nor does the proposed roof balcony. Balconies are common features along the rear of properties in Old Fort Road and, with their shallow rear gardens, there will be little overlooking. The rear of these properties is exposed to the beach in any event and is not particularly private.

Access and Parking

Suitable access and on-site parking provision would be retained at the front of the dwelling where there is a large area of hardstanding.

Recommendation

APPROVE for reason that:-

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 to be submitted and approved) (amended)
3. C14Aii (Permission relates to amended plans received on 10 December 2008)
4. No development shall take place until details of the design of the privacy screens to the proposed balconies have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The balconies shall not be brought into use until the screens have been erected in accordance with the approved details.
5. C18Cii (Obscure glazing of windows in east and west side walls)
6. C18Eii (No additional windows in east and west side walls)

.....