Expiry Date - 13-01-2015

Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: **Recommendation – APPROVE**
AWDM/1623/14

Site: **135 Greenways Crescent**

Proposal: **Rooms in roof with dormer to front (south) elevation and half hip to side (east) elevation**

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: /N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

The proposal is for:-

- A half hip-to-gable roof extension to measure (at max) 2.5 metres in height, 9 metres in length, and 3 metres in width
- A flat roof rear dormer to measure (at max) 2.1 metres in height, 4.6 metres in length, and 2.4 metres in width
- A flat roof front dormer to measure (at max) 1.5 metres in height, 5 metres in length, and 2.1 metres in width

The application property is a semi-detached bungalow on land raised slightly from the highway. It has a curved front bay.

The surrounding area is an outer residential suburb, predominately residential in its character.

Relevant Planning History
None

Consultations
None

Representations
None

Relevant Planning Policies and Guidance
Saved Adur Local Plan policies: AG1, AH7
National Planning Policy Framework

Planning Assessment

Principle

Upgrading of residential accommodation is acceptable in principle.

Visual amenity

Enough bungalows in the street have now been altered to half-hip with large front and side dormers, so that the character of the street has changed. A further bungalow altered in the same way would therefore not be out of character.

These alterations would be domestic in scale and in keeping with the architectural style of the host building.

The rear dormer is basic in its design but would sit reasonably comfortably within the silhouette of the extended roof slope.

Residential amenity – effect on existing dwellings

The neighbours principally impacted upon by this development as those at the rear and east side (it is removed from the remainder).

Neighbours at rear

The rear dormer would allow for additional views onto these neighbours. However the distance retained to the neighbouring building is sufficient to negate harm by way of overbearing and overshadowing.

Such distance is also sufficient to filter views onto neighbours, so negating unacceptable overlooking/loss of privacy.

Neighbour to east side

The bulk of the proposal sits above eaves height and there is some sufficient distance to negate adverse overbearing/overshadowing.

Views onto this neighbour would be oblique as there are no windows in the extension flank facing east apart from serving a landing, shown to be obscured glazed and non-opening. Being obscured would negate adverse overlooking/loss of privacy.

Recommendation

APPROVE

Subject to Conditions:-

1. Standard time limit
2. Approved plans
3. Materials and finishes to match
4. Landing window be obscured glazed.
5. Notwithstanding “pd” no further windows in flank of roof extension

Informative

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.

Is recommendation contrary to any representations? N

Case Officer signed: Matthew Porter Date: 10-12-2014

Authorised and signed by: Peter Barnett Date: 15 December 2014