Expiry Date -

Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: **Recommendation – APPROVE**
AWDM/0230/12

Site: **1 Downside Close Shoreham**

Proposal: **Front dormer roof extension and rear single storey extension**

Neighbours checked: Y
Additional neighbour notifications: N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

The application site lies in a residential area of Shoreham within a small cul-de-sac characterised by bungalows. Many of these have front dormers.

The application property is a semi-detached bungalow with yellow brick walls and brown tiled roof. It has a single storey gabled front protrusion. The adjoining property has a front dormer. Its rear garden is terraced.

The proposal is to extend the bungalow by way of a flat roof single storey rear extension measuring (a maximum) 2.6 metres in height, 6.2 metres in length, and 3.2 metres in width, plus a flat roof front dormer measuring (a maximum) 1.8 metres in height, 4.2 metres in length, and 2.8 metres in width.

The drawing also shows a flat roof rear dormer for illustrative purposes only. The agent contends this element of the proposal would be built in a separate building operation under "permitted development". It is does not form part of this application.

Relevant Planning History

None

Consultations

Adur & Worthing Councils: The ***Environmental Health*** Officer recommends a precautionary condition relating to possible contamination.

Representations

One email received from residents of No. 2 Downside Close object on grounds that:-

- *Rear extension would block our light;*

- *How long will extension take, due to noise?*
- *Application described as "Front dormer" but plans show rear dormer too. Please can this be clarified?*

Relevant Planning Policies and Guidance

South East Plan (GOSE 2009): CC1, CC6, BE1
Adur District Local Plan 1993-2006 (ADC 1996) (saved policies): AG1 and AH7
Appendix 11 'Supplementary Planning Guidance' comprising: Development Control Standard No.3 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings'
National Planning Policy Framework 2012

Planning Assessment

Visual amenity

The proposed front dormer would reinstate a visual balance that was lost when the adjoining property itself extended. [Records show that rooms in the roof were added at 2 Downside Close in 1969.] It would be in proportion to the rest of the roof slope and is to be built with sympathetic external materials and finishes. Front dormers are a common sight in this small cul-de-sac.

The proposed rear extension is rudimentary in its design, and it is unfortunate that its roof does not sit below that of the eaves of the existing bungalow. However it is positioned to the rear of the building and is hardly visible from public vantage points. The fenestration and doors of the extension are in proportion and in the style of existing bungalow. It would be built of matching materials.

Residential amenity – effect on existing dwellings

The neighbours principally affected are those to the front and rear and those to either side.

Either side

The rear extension is single storey and flat roof in its design. The flat roof would not protrude substantially above the existing boundary treatment so any materially harmful overbearing and overshadowing effect is avoided. No windows are proposed on the eastern flank wall and the window in the western side is a good distance away from the neighbour on this side. This means intrusive overlooking is negated and loss of privacy avoided.

The front dormer is well contained within the front roof slope and is flat roofed. In this circumstance overbearing and overshadowing effect is avoided (the side window in the front dormer of No. 2 Downside Close is a secondary light source). Overlooking from the front dormer would be directed onto the public street. Neighbouring gardens are already overlooked from the terraced back garden and overlooking from the rear dormer would not significantly worsen the situation. In any event, the rear dormer does not form part of this application as the intention is that it will be built separately as 'permitted development'.

The occupier of No. 2 Downside Close has raised the issue of noise during construction. However this domestic scale of the development could not justify the imposing of a planning condition restricting building times.

Contaminated land

The site is not contaminated so an informative would be sufficient to raise the applicant's awareness of the risk.

Recommendation

APPROVE for the reason:-

The proposed development can take place without detriment to the local environment and would not detract from the character or appearance of the area. It would not result in any detriment to the amenities of neighbouring properties and consequently does not conflict with the saved policies of the Adur District Local Plan (AG1, AH7) and the South East Plan (CC1, CC6, BE1).

Subject to Conditions:-

1. Standard 3 year time limit
2. Approved plans
3. External materials to match existing
4. Notwithstanding "pd" no windows in east flank

Informatives
If during development, any visible contaminated or odorous material, (for example asbestos containing material, stained soil, petrol/diesel/solvent odour, underground tanks or associated pipework) not previously identified, is found to be present at the site, then no further development (unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority) shall be carried out until it has been investigated by the developer. The Local Planning Authority must be informed immediately of the nature and degree of the contamination present and a method statement detailing how the unsuspected contamination shall be dealt with must be prepared and submitted to the Local Planning Authority for approval in writing before being implemented

Is recommendation contrary to any representations? Y

Case Officer signed: Matthew Porter Date: 4-4-12

Authorised and signed by: Jo Morin Date: 4 April 2012