Expires 25/3

Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: ADC/0037/09 **Recommendation - Application Permitted**

Site: **107 Manor Hall Road Southwick Brighton West Sussex**

Proposal: **Side extension and enlargement of roof with full hip and rear dormer**

The Application

The application site is a semi-detached bungalow located on the north side of Manor Hall Road, Southwick. The property has a west side garage and a large rear extension, and is bounded to the east by the adjoining bungalow and to the west by a further semi-detached pair. The pair form the central bungalows within a set of three identical semi-detached pairs, all of which are hipped with long front projections. The bungalow two doors to the east at No.103 has recently added a part hipped gable ended extension to its west side with an enlarged rear extension and a rear dormer.

Planning permission was refused in February 2008 and later dismissed at appeal for the demolition of the garage and erection of a 2.3 metre wide and 7.7 metre deep single storey side extension in its place (ADC/0770/07). The extension was to have a part hipped gable end, an 8.4 metre wide rear dormer and a small front gable projection, and would have provided an enlarged ground floor kitchen with a master bedroom and ensuite in the roof space. The dormer featured central double doors opening onto a small balcony with balustrade.

The Inspector considered that the half hip and front gable "would look alien and intrusive and would unbalance the prevalent design symmetry of the bungalows and their roofs." The rear dormer "would look ungainly, top-heavy and overpowering" with its impact made worse by the windows appearing asymmetrical with those on the ground floor. The proposal would set an undesirable precedent and would be likely to harm the living conditions of the occupiers of 105 Manor Hall Road and lead to overlooking of a number of properties from the dormer balcony.

This application has amended the design to take account of the Inspector's conclusions. The side extension now has a full hip to maintain the form of the other bungalows in the street, with the gable removed over the front projection. The rear dormer has been reduced in width and now has windows which better reflect the window openings on the ground floor. The balcony has been removed.

Consultations and Representations

Consultations/Comments

None

Third Parties

2 letters of objection received from the occupiers of 29 and 31 Springate Road on the following grounds:- previous application was turned down on appeal and they see no reason to allow this proposal; it will continue to result in loss of outlook and privacy; out of keeping with the area; if approved, all windows should be obscure glazed fixed shut and no building work should be carried out at weekends

Relevant Planning Policies and Guidance

Adopted West Sussex Structure Plan 2001-2016 (WSCC 2005): LOC1, DEV1
Adopted Adur District Local Plan 1993 – 2006 (ADC 1996): AG1, AH7 and Appendix 11 'Supplementary Planning Guidance' comprising Development Control Standard No.3 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings'
PPS1 'Delivering Sustainable Development (ODPM 2005)

Planning Assessment

Policies

Structure Plan policies seek to protect, and where possible, enhance the character and distinctiveness of an area, requiring high standards of design, layout and construction (DEV1). 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. The Council's Development Control Standard 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings' states that dormers should not project as far as the rear walls of a dwelling and should be proportioned such that a large amount of original roofspace is still visible.

Visual Amenity

The current application is considered to be a more successful proposal than the previous refused scheme. The extension of the building to the side with a fully hipped roof matches the design of the existing roof and ensures that the extension does not appear alien or intrusive in the street scene. While the extension will bring the bungalow closer to its neighbour to the west, the hipping of the roof will maintain a visual gap between the properties and will avoid a cramped appearance.

The small area of flat roof will not appear as a particularly prominent feature as it will be set back from the front of the bungalow.

At the rear, the proposed dormer will be quite a large addition but it will be set down from the ridge and will not be as dominant a feature as previously proposed. The windows within the dormer are more in keeping with those in the existing bungalow which, together with the removal of the central door, results in a more acceptable appearance. The overall bulk and massing of the roof has been reduced as a result of the hipped design and the resulting reduction in dormer size and it is now considered to be acceptable visually.

Residential Amenity

The main impact will be on the neighbouring property, No.105. This identical semi-detached bungalow has four side windows that will face the extension, serving a kitchen, bathroom, study and bedroom. The hipping of the roof significantly reduces the impact on both the outlook from and light to these windows and there is not considered to be any adverse impact on those occupiers as a result of this revised proposal.

To the rear, both Nos.29 and 31 Springate Road have objected on the grounds of loss of privacy from the rear dormer. This dormer will sit 17 metres from the rear boundary separating the properties and a total of 36 metres from the rear extension of No.29 Springate Road. The DC standards state that a distance of 22 metres should be retained between facing windows whilst garden depths should be a minimum of 11 metres to avoid overlooking. It is clear that this property comfortably exceeds these requirements and so any refusal on the grounds of overlooking would be unsustainable. The Inspector had objected to the balcony and doors, which would have been likely to result in overlooking, but the removal of this feature now overcomes any previous objections on this ground.

The occupiers of Nos. 29 and 31 have requested that the windows within the dormer (serving a bedroom and ensuite) should be obscure glazed and fixed shut. However, for the reason above, at 36m distance between properties there are no reasonable grounds to require such a measure. The request to restrict hours of working is noted but this is covered by other legislation and should not be subject of a planning condition.

It is therefore considered that, for the reasons stated above, the revisions to the design have resulted in a more successful proposal which better respects the character and appearance of the existing bungalows and which has less impact on adjoining residential amenity. The application can therefore be supported.

Recommendation

APPROVE for reason that :-

1PPi

Subject to

1. C1Ci
2. C12Ei
3. C18Eii west side

Case Officer..... Date. 2/3/09

Planning Services Manager..... Date ..3/3/09

Chair of DC Committee. Cllr Angela Mills Date. 2/03/09.