Expiry Date – 9/4/13

Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/0179/13 Recommendation – APPROVE

Site: 13 Upper Boundstone Lane, Lancing

Proposal: **Raised gables with barn end hips, front dormer extension and rear roof extension.**

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

This application relates to a hipped roofed bungalow on the east side of Upper Boundstone Lane opposite Shoreham Academy. Upper Boundstone Lane is made up of bungalows with No. 13 being the only detached one. The bungalows have gable features over front projecting bays.

The roof of the existing bungalow has been extended on the north side over a ground floor addition and a bedroom and bathroom has been added to the roofspace lit via rooflights on the front back and sides.

Permission is sought to raise both side gables with barn ends and to add front and rear dormer windows. The application has been revised since first submitted with both the front and rear dormers reduced in width.

There are examples of hip to gable extensions in the street at 21 and 31, without planning permission, and also front dormers at 4, 15, 31 and 35 with only the one at No. 15 receiving planning permission it would seem back in the late 1960's.

The property is not in a conservation area and is not a listed building and there are no protected trees on the site.

Relevant Planning History

35/01 – Rooms in roof (with enlargement of hipped roof on north side). Granted 22.3.01

161/86 – Single storey side extension. Granted 1.10.86

Consultations

Lancing Parish Council: object to the size of the extension which is considered to be out of character with the street scene harmful to the light and privacy of neighbouring properties.

Representations

Six objections received from 22-30 (evens) Hamilton Road and 14 Upper Boundstone Lane summarized as follows:

1. The gable end will block light to and view from the south facing kitchen window at No.14.
2. The large gable additions and rear roof extensions will block out the afternoon and evening sunlight to the patio and garden area at No. 14.
3. The extension will impact on the privacy at No. 14.
4. The extension will overlook Hamilton Road bungalows and gardens, particularly No. 26 directly behind which has a short rear garden and its main living room facing the back garden along with a bedroom.
5. There will be increased noise from the enlarged building which is used as a foster home.
6. The proposed building is out of character with other properties in the vicinity.
7. The size of the extension and raised gables will obstruct afternoon sun to the rear gardens of Hamilton Road.
8. The proposed timber cladding is out of character.
9. We would like to speak at the committee meeting to which this application is sent.

Relevant Planning Policies and Guidance

National Planning Policy Framework (DCLG 2012)
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';

Planning Assessment

Principle

The principle of upgrading and enlarging residential accommodation is supported and provided such extensions have no significant impact on neighbours and are of acceptable design, permission will generally be forthcoming.

This application has been revised since first submitted. Both the front and rear dormers have been reduced in width. The rear dormer is now reduced to the width of the proposed staircase and bathroom, a reduction in width from 10.4 metres to 4.3 metres. The front dormer has been reduced from 3.8 metres to 2.8 metres. It is still proposed to gable each side with barn ended additions. The plans annotate these extensions to be permitted development, though they cannot both be as the original roof has already been extended on the north side.

Visual amenity

Policy AH7 (b) of the Adur District Local Plan requires extensions to be of a design and materials sympathetic to the original dwelling and the area in general. DC Standard No.3 states that dormers should not overdominate the roof and that rear dormers on

properties, particularly bungalows, less than 22m from principal windows to the rear are unlikely to be acceptable due to overlooking.

The applicant's agent believes the proposed raised gables to be permitted development and his drawings are annotated accordingly. Were they the only additions to the original roof they would be. However this roof has been extended already on the north side above a side addition. Therefore the volume of only one of the raised gables, together with the existing roof addition, would appear to be less than 50 cubic metres and permitted development.

As this is a detached property the introduction of raised gables is less problematic in visual terms as unbalancing does not occur. Whilst the character of the street remains predominantly hipped roofs there are two other examples of raised gables in the street and most other properties could extend their roofs with gable additions under permitted development. It would therefore be difficult to resist these raised gables on visual grounds.

The rear dormer has been reduced in width by more than half and now sits comfortably within the extended roofslope and proportionally comfortably within the existing roofslope.

The front dormer has also been reduced in width by 1 metre. Though still significant in size, it is now better proportioned in terms of the overall roofslope, bearing in mind the overall size of the enlarged roof. Front dormers do exist in the street, the nearest being at No.11 two doors to the north, though they remain an untypical addition. The impression of bulk in respect of the front dormer would be improved still further if the proposed hipped roof was removed (and a flat roof substituted) so that it would sit more comfortably well below the ridge line, as the flat roofed rear dormer does. The applicant has agreed to a condition to revise this detail. On this basis the dormer is now considered, on balance, acceptable.

Overall it is considered that the revised proposal will not be significantly harmful to the appearance of this bungalow and that in its context it will not be harmful to the streetscene.

Residential amenity

DC Standard No.3 states that dormers should not overdominate the roof and that rear dormers on properties, particularly bungalows, less than 22m from principal windows to the rear are unlikely to be acceptable due to overlooking.

The original application included a very large rear dormer almost the full width of the enlarged roofspace and included three large windows, two to bedrooms, the third a bathroom. Not surprisingly the owners of properties to the rear in Hamilton Road, also bungalows, have objected on the grounds that they would be overlooked, not least as the gardens in both roads are relatively shallow.

Notwithstanding the presence of many rear dormers in Upper Boundstone Lane and Hamilton Road it was considered that the rear dormer was excessively large and the applicant was asked to reduce its width to just that of the bathroom and staircase. This

has been done and now the dormer is considerably smaller with windows for the staircase and bathroom only. These windows can be obscurely glazed and can be designed to be unopenable below a height of 1.7 metres from finished floor level. The two rear bedrooms are to be lit by two rooflights each only. Again these can be set at 1.7 metres above finished floor level to minimize the potential for overlooking. Front rooflights to these rooms are possible if means of escape at a lower height is required under Building Regulations.

As a consequence of these changes it is not considered that the rear roof extension will result in a loss of privacy to neighbours.

The existing property has two rear rooflights already which allow overlooking to neighbouring gardens. The new rooflights can be placed at a higher level so as not to exacerbate this situation. This is recommended by condition. Therefore overlooking of gardens at 12 and 14 Upper Boundstone Lane will be no worse than at present.

No. 14 has objected to the raised gable proposed to the north side on the grounds that it would cause a loss of light and outlook to his side south facing kitchen window. This window will experience a reduction in both though it is at least 2.5 metres away. However, this room also has a rear window over the garden in a small rear addition and so it is not considered that planning permission could be withheld for this reason. It is also important to note that one of the raised gables could be added under permitted development.

The south side raised gable causes no significant neighbour impact due to the degree of separation between the two properties.

Recommendation

APPROVE for the reason:-

The revised proposal 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 National Planning Policy Framework, 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’.

Subject to Conditions:-

1. Standard 3 year time limit
2. Approved Plans
3. External materials to match existing
4. Rear velux windows to be 1.7 meters off finished floor level
5. Rear dormer windows to be obscurely glazed and non-opening below a height of 1.7 metres
6. Prior to works commencing the front dormer shall be revised to show a flat roof.

Informatives

1. The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by identifying matters of concern within the application (as originally submitted) and negotiating, with the Applicant, acceptable amendments to the proposal to address those concerns. As a result, the Local Planning Authority has been able to grant planning permission for an acceptable proposal, in accordance with the presumption in favour of sustainable development, as set out within the National Planning Policy Framework.

Is recommendation contrary to any representations? Y

Case Officer signed:	MOK	Date: 19/04/13
Authorised and signed by:	PD	Date:22.4.13