Development Management – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/1145/17 Recommendation – APPROVE

Site: 5 Upper Brighton Road Lancing

Proposal: Rooms in Roof with side hip to gable roof extension to east elevation and front and rear dormers.

Date of site visit: 19.09.17

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Site, Surroundings and Proposal

The application relates to a semi-detached bungalow on the southern side of Upper Brighton Road Lancing. There is a layby to the front of the bungalow, which is positioned within a row of semi-detached bungalows. The bungalows to the west have been altered with hip to gable extensions. The application site and attached bungalow remain symmetrical with hipped roofs as does the pair to the east nos. 1 and 3 Upper Brighton Road.

Consent is sought to add a hip to gable extension, flat roof front dormer and flat roof rear dormer to no. 5. The bungalow currently has a single storey flat roof rear extension. The front dormer is proposed at 2.2 metres wide, 1.7 metres high with a maximum depth of 2.4 metres. The rear flat roof dormer is larger at 7.2 metres wide, 2.6 metres high with a maximum depth of 3.7 metres. The roof extension will provide two bedrooms and an en-suite.

Lancing Parish Council: - No objection

Representations: None received.

Relevant Planning Policies

Saved Local Plan policies (ADC 1996): AG1, AH7
Development Control Standard No.3 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings'
National Planning Policy Framework (CLG 2012)
National Planning Practice Guidance

Planning Assessment

There is no objection in principle to the proposed extension which would upgrade an existing property within an established residential area. The key concerns are the effects on the residential and visual amenities of the locality.

Visual Amenity

The hip to gable extension and front dormer will be clearly visible within the street scene. As existing there is a front hedge at the property and adjacent attached bungalow, this will screen the frontage to some extent however there is no requirement for this hedge to remain and it could be removed or die at any time. The principle of the hip to gable extension is acceptable, although it changes the symmetry between the bungalows and adds bulk this is not, on balance a form of development that would be detrimental in this case. The row of bungalows are not uniform as existing with other hip to gable extensions to the west. Also for consideration here is that this form of development alone could be carried out as permitted development and therefore no consent required. This combined with the flat roof front dormer will alter the character of the bungalow when viewed within the street scene. Yet the front dormer is small in scale and positioned centrally within the roof slope. Although front dormers are not existing in any of the adjacent bungalows this feature is not considered to be so detrimental to warrant a refusal in this case in the light of the other alterations to the roof of this bungalow. Any further development at adjacent bungalows would be considered on its own merits in the light of this proposal, which is modest in scale and complies with Development Control Standards.

The rear flat roof dormer is large is scale however it will not be clearly visible within the street scene. It is not considered that such a form of development would be significantly out of keeping here nor would warrant a refusal in this case.

Residential Amenity

The main properties to be affected in this case are no 3 Upper Brighton Road to the east and no. 7 attached to the west. The dwellings to the rear on Glebe Way are at a distance of in excess of 25 metres therefore although the rear dormer will be visible it is not considered that there will be any loss of privacy here that would warrant a refusal. To the east there is a garage at the application site and at no. 3 adjacent which allow spacing between the bungalows. The dormer to the rear and hip to gable extension will be adjacent to the boundary yet there are no windows overlooking to the side within the roof. It is not considered that there will be any significant loss of light, privacy or overbearing impact to the occupier of no. 3 in this case.

The attached bungalow to the site no. 7 will not be impacted detrimentally to a degree that would warrant a refusal here. The dormers are adjacent to the boundary however again there are no side windows and there will be oblique views of the rear garden yet this would not be significantly detrimental here and is common place with roof extensions such as this within residential environments.

Recommendation

APPROVE

1. Standard time limit
2. Materials to match
3. Approved plans

Informative

1. Proactive no amendments

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

Case Officer: Hannah Barker Date: 19th September 2017

Authorised by: Jo Morin Date: 19.09.2017