Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/0522/13 Recommendation – Approve

Site: **100 Old Fort Road, Shoreham-By-Sea, West Sussex, BN43 5HB**

Proposal: **Extensions to front and roof, plus other alterations, to form a 3-storey flat-roofed dwelling with first and second floor rear terraces (amendment to planning permission ADC/0033/11)**

Date of site visit: 9 May, 5 June and 26 June 2013

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

The application relates to a detached chalet-style bungalow located on the south side of Old Fort Road with direct beach access at the rear.

Permission has been granted previously as follows:-

- ADC/0021/07 – Single-storey front and east side extension and alterations and two-storey rear extension (including first floor roof terrace with side. Delegated approval 13.03.07
- ADC/0319/09 – New boundary wall and greenhouse to front, and revisions to ADC/0021/07 including side screens, solar panels, additional rooflights and windows. Approved by Committee 19.10.09
- ADC/0033/11 - Extensions to front and roof, plus other alterations, to form a 3- storey flat-roofed 'contemporary-style' dwelling, including front first-floor balcony and rear second floor terrace (NB – despite the description, the front first floor balcony was removed from the application)

The approved proposal is to enlarge and re-model the dwelling to create a contemporary-style six-bedroom house. The ground floor would not be further extended. At first-floor level, a projecting flat-roofed front extension with integral bay window is proposed, to add a separate dining room to the existing first-floor livingroom and kitchen (currently partly within the roofspace). Above the original main structure, an entire second floor would be added to provide a master bedroom with ensuite bathroom and south side terrace. Work has commenced.

This application seeks approval for a number of amendments to the design, as follows:-

- Lowering of high level window to front

- Increase in size of spiral staircase projection to front
- Squaring off of first floor extension at front and its re-siting further east
- Provision of enlarged second floor terrace at rear with louvred screen
- New window to west elevation to serve stairwell
- Infilling of door opening to west elevation
- Addition of stainless steel flue to east elevation
- Replacement of 2nd floor rear window with two smaller windows
- Removal of 2nd floor bathroom projection

Directly to the east is a two-storey traditional pitch-roofed house (No.102) sited 1m from the common side boundary. This house has previously been extended with a rear sun lounge with a balcony above (west side).

To the west is No.98, another two-storey pitch-roofed house with a flat-roofed rear extension with terrace and sunroom above (east side). This property has permission to be extended and remodelled (ADC/0502/10) to form a large contemporary-style flat-roofed six-bedroom house. It would result in the dwelling being a three-storey 'tiered' house with front and west side extensions (including rear balcony with spiral stairs). This permission includes a part two-storey, part single-storey front extension of 6.2m in depth, with a three-storey glazed entrance, resulting in an overall height of 8.8m.

Consultations

Adur and Worthing Councils: The EHO recommends a precautionary condition relating to possible contamination.

Representations

1 letter of support received from the occupier of 90 Old Fort Road who considers it to be a great design which will further enhance the improving quality of the foreshore. It is an interesting, contemporary design which should sit very well in the street.

1 letter of objection and several emails received from or on behalf of the occupier of 98 Old Fort Road raising the following concerns: (NB many of the comments relate to the approved plans submitted with the previous application)

- Overdevelopment
- Incongruous and detrimental to amenities of the area
- Loss of privacy and loss of daylight to No.98
- Out of scale and overbearing with increased sense of enclosure
- Extends beyond building line and includes a balcony at the front
- Rear external staircase has resulted in loss of privacy
- Front stairwell has extended further out than shown on plans and causes loss of light
- First floor balcony was not screened for more than 3 years
- Existing extensions have caused a loss of light – current proposals will worsen situation
- Many discrepancies between plans and what has been built

- Noise and disturbance for over 3 years as applicant has carried out work himself, often late into the evening
- Extension is not needed
- Boundary dispute over wall
- Concern that front flat roof over garage will be used as a balcony
- There should be no door opening onto garage roof and louvres should remain to protect privacy

Relevant Planning Policies

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' National Planning Policy Framework (CLG 2012)

Planning Assessment

Principle

The proposal comprises upgrading of 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.

Visual amenity

The amendments include two elements that were previously negotiated out of the earlier application ADC/0033/11. These are the squaring off at the front at first floor level and the second floor rear terrace. However, having re-assessed these elements, it is not considered that they would cause material harm to the visual amenities of the locality or to the character and appearance of the building.

Rear terraces are common along the foreshore, including at second floor, and the proposal, with its timber louvres, provides a coherent design feature which, in its recessed position, will not detract from the building. It has also been set in further from the east side and is now less dominant. The squaring off at the front of the dwelling at first floor will not add excessive additional bulk to the building as this projection is not full width and retains sufficient subservience to not dominate the overall appearance. It also does not include the projecting balcony which was previously removed from the earlier scheme.

The other changes are considered to be relatively minor. The increase in the size of the curved stairwell projection at the front does not have a material impact on the overall scale and bulk of the extended dwelling.

Residential amenity

The first floor front extension will be squared off on its eastern side but this should not reduce the light or outlook for the occupiers of No.102 to any significant extent as it will be set in from the eastern edge of the dwelling. There was previously concern that the additional bulk would break with the traditional building line in a particularly prominent fashion, particularly when seen from the east, and would not comply with the 45 degree rule when measured from the nearest north-facing windows of No.102. However, having viewed the development from the front window of No.102 it is clear that the set back of the extension from the edge of the building will reduce the impact on the neighbouring property and ensure that the front projection at first floor will not have an adverse effect. Furthermore, the ground floor north-facing window of No.102 serves an open plan room which also enjoys light from the south. There has been no objection from the occupier of No.102.

The new window in the west elevation (serving the spiral staircase) has already been installed and is obscure glazed. It is considered prudent that a condition is imposed to ensure that it remains as such.

The second floor rear terrace is smaller than the first floor terrace and set in from the sides of the dwelling. With the louvred screens in place it should not result in unacceptable loss of privacy to neighbours. The approved plans for 98 Old Fort Road (construction has commenced so this is a material consideration) show a louvred screen to their proposed first floor balcony and to side windows which will afford additional safeguarding of privacy to that property.

The other alterations are also not considered to have an adverse impact on residential amenity. The increased size of the front curved stair wall is not considered to be significant and its impact is reduced by its curved form which helps to minimise its bulk. There are no balconies or terraces at the front, or any access to the flat roof at the front) and no increased overlooking as a result.

Other issues raised by neighbours either relate to earlier permissions or to civil matters which are not relevant to the planning merits of the case. The amendments which are the subject of this application are considered to be acceptable and can be approved.

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 saved policies of the Adur District Local Plan (AG1, AH7) or the policies of the National Planning Policy Framework

Subject to Conditions:-

1. Standard 3 year time limit
2. Materials to be as previously approved
3. Approved plans
4. No use of 2nd floor balcony until privacy screen in place
5. No windows in side elevations other than as approved
6. Window to stairwell in west elevation to be obscure glazed

The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by assessing the proposal against all material considerations, including planning policies and any representations that may have been received and subsequently determining to grant planning permission in accordance with the presumption in favour of sustainable development, as set out within the National Planning Policy Framework.

Informative: Precautionary contamination.

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

Case Officer: Peter Barnett Date: 3 July 2013

Authorised by: Gary Peck Date: 3 July 2013