Expires 21/9/09.

# Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

**Application Number: ADC/0286/09 Recommendation - Permit**

**Site:** **184 Downside Shoreham-by-Sea West Sussex BN43 6HD**

**Proposal:** **Front dormer (with side gable and rear dormer as permitted development).**

## The Application

The application is the re-submission of a previously refused application (ADc/0448/08) for a loft conversion including a front dormer.

The current application has been revised to show a full hip-to-gable roof extension with rear dormer as permitted development (as amended).

Permission is now sought for a front dormer only. The proposed front dormer would be 2.6m in width, by 2.2m in height, by 2.7m in depth (as amended)

The application property is the eastern half of a pair of semi-detached, hipped roof bungalows located on the north side of Downside, directly opposite the junction with Ravensbourne Avenue. The surrounding area is characterised by a number of semi-detached bungalows on the north side of Downside, many of which have previously been extended at roof level with front dormers.

The previous application was refused for the reason that: *The proposed front dormer and part-hipped gable roof extension are unacceptable in that they are excessively large and do not relate sympathetically to the existing building. The development would be out of keeping with and detrimental to the character and appearance of the area and would result in unbalancing of the pair of bungalows, making it difficult, if permitted, for the Local Planning Authority to prevent similar additions to other dwellings, the cumulative effect of which would detract seriously from the area. It would therefore conflict with the policies of the West Sussex Structure Plan (CH1, DEV1) and the Adur District Local Plan (AG1, AH7).*

## Consultations and Representations

***Third Parties:*** There have been no third party representations on this application.

## Relevant Planning Policies and Guidance

Adopted Adur District Local Plan 1993-2006 (ADC 1996) (saved policies): AG1, AH7 and Appendix II 'Supplementary Planning Guidance' comprising:

Development Control Standard No.3 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings.'
PPS 1 'Delivering Sustainable Development' (ODPM 2005)

**Planning Assessment**

***Policies***
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.

Development Control Standard No.3 states, amongst other things, that roof extensions should respect the scale, character and appearance of existing dwellings, and that the acceptability of lack of symmetry as a result of a hip to gable extension would depend on the visual quality and character of the area.

In relation to roof dormers it states that they should not appear so large that they over dominate the dwelling, resulting in a top heavy 'box-like' appearance. They should be kept well below the ridge level of the existing roof and should not project as far as the walls of the house. A large amount of the original roof should still be clearly visible.

***Visual amenity***
As stated there are a number of other bungalows on the north side of the street which have been extended with front dormers.

The main concern with the original application was that the proposed roof extensions would have particularly overbalanced the pair of bungalows (No's 184 & 186), given the prominent location of the dwellings. However with the current application the hip-to-gable extension is proposed to be permitted development, and consequently beyond the Councils control.

The permitted development operation would need to have been implemented prior to the front dormer and as a result it would already have had the majority of the impact on the pair of dwellings.

The proposed front dormer itself has been reduced in scale from the first submission and it is now considered to be similar to many others within the street. In terms of its scale and the likely affect on the extended roof plane, it is not considered to be overdominant and it would not result in a box-like overbearing appearance.

Whilst the dormer would add bulk to the east side of the pair of semi-detached bungalows it is considered that, on balance, this would not in itself warrant refusal given the level of similar development permitted under planning permission within the surrounding area.

**Recommendation**

APPROVE for reason that :-

1PPi

1. C1Ci
2. C14Aii – 15.09.09 (AH7) + 18.09.09
3. C12E3 – amended
   ...tile hanging of the dormer hereby ...etc.

Case Officer: [redacted]
Date: 21/09/09 PB 21/9/09