Development Management – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/1981/20 Recommendation – APPROVE

Site: 11 Downside, Shoreham-by-Sea, West Sussex

Proposal: Raising of the roof ridge to create a first floor, with hip to barn end extensions at front and rear; roof lights to East and West roofslopes and first floor windows to South (with Juliet balcony) and North elevations; chimney removed

Date of site visit: 11th January 2021

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Site and Surroundings

The application relates to a detached bungalow located on the south side of Downside. It has been extended with a flat roof rear extension and conservatory to the rear. Many bungalows within the street have been extended with rear extension and/or roof extensions. Those directly either side of the bungalow have a similar roof form to the site however many have large scale box like dormers and there is some variation in ridge height within the street scene.

Ground levels vary considerably from north to south of the site. There is a long rear garden with properties in Greenways Crescent to the rear of the site. There are steps leading from the rear conservatory to the garden. There is also a flat roof detached garage to the side of the property.

Proposal

The application seeks permission to remodel the roof of the bungalow by increasing the ridge height by 1.1m, and adding a hip to barn end roof extension to the front and rear. The addition of rooflights to the sides and a Juliet balcony is proposed to the rear. The flat roof rear extension and conservatory are to remain at ground floor with the roof extension limited to the original front and rear walls. Two bedrooms and a shower room are proposed in the roof space.

Consultations: None undertaken.

Representations: None received

Relevant Planning Policies

Adur Local Plan (2017) Policy 15
Development Management Standard No. 2 ‘Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings’
National Planning Policy Framework (CLG 2018)

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 neighbouring properties.

Residential Amenity

The main properties to be affected by the development are those directly either side and to the rear. The Juliet balcony will not give rise to any loss of privacy to the property to the rear due to the distance being in excess of 30 metres. There would be no justification to request that the Juliet balcony be removed from the proposals.

To the east is no. 9 Downside. This bungalow is of matching design to the application site and has an existing blank side roof slope facing onto the application site. Similarly the bungalow to the west, no. 13 also has the same blank roof slope. The proposed side roof lights therefore will not result in any loss of privacy to the neighbouring properties. However a condition is attached for these rooflights to be non opening unless above 1.7 metres above finished floor level and obscurely glazed. It is considered this is a fair restriction as the rooflights are either secondary openings or serving a stairwell and bathrooms. It therefore will not in turn result in any overlooking to the adjacent rear gardens or preclude the properties either side from any potential future development.

The ground floor windows remain unchanged from existing and will be serving the same rooms therefore no additional impact than currently exists will occur.

The first floor front window will face onto the highway. Although overlooking to properties opposite will occur this is not any greater than the mutual overlooking which already occurs between properties on the opposite side of the road. This relationship is commonplace in residential areas such as this

The increased bulk of the roof as proposed is not considered to result in any loss of light or overbearing impact to the adjacent dwellings due to its position in relation to the dwellings either side and distance from the property to the rear.

Visual Amenity

The changes to roof of the bungalow will be clearly visible within the street scene and from surrounding properties. Although the height of the ridge will be increasing by just over 1m, and the overall bulk of the roof increased, it is considered acceptable here on balance. The direct street scene on this side of the road has much variation; some bungalows are as originally built with hipped roofs and modest scale, for example the bungalows to the east and north of the site. However many have been altered and extended. For example there are examples of large side dormers altering the roof forms of buildings significantly. No. 7, to the east, is taller with a two storey form.

The proposed development has been designed to match a similar development at no. 17 Downside which has been completed approved under AWDM/1201/18. This shows a matching ridge height and design to that proposed here; however in this case side dormers are not proposed. It is considered that the variation within the street scene justifies such development in this case. The row of properties on this side of the road are not all uniform in appearance. Although representing a difference in form and height from the properties directly adjacent, in the wider street scene it will not be detrimental to the character of the area. The bungalow form will be retained, with a low eaves height, and it will have a 'tidier' appearance than other bungalows further west which have awkward dormer additions.

Materials used will match existing in this case.

It is of note here that a development at no. 69 Downside was granted in 2016, AWDM/0684/16 which is similar to that proposed here, although the existing bungalow differed as it had originally a gabled roof design. However it represented the same amount of scale and bulk with a similar design proposed here.

As when considering the works at no. 17 reference should also be made here to an application at no. 32 Downside on the north side of the street. This was recently given consent under AWDM/1195/18 for roof extensions to the side and rear including a rear gable and side dormers. Prior to this consent AWDM/0409/18 was withdrawn as officers could not support the works to the front which removed the hipped design to the front of the bungalow and added increased bulk. Although the application site in this case is relatively close to no. 32, albeit on the southern side of the street, there are significant differences here. No. 32 is in a row of modest bungalows with matching front hipped roofs, they represent a row of uniform properties where the front hipped roofs are the clear dominant features. In this case although the properties do have hipped roofs to the front the prevailing character has been changed with large scale dormers and the changes at no. 17. There is no longer a prevailing character of hipped roofs. It is considered that this case is justifiably different from no. 32 and the front extension can be permitted here within this different context.

Recommendation

APPROVE Subject to conditions

1. Standard time limit
2. Materials to match
3. Approved plans
4. Roof lights to be obscurely glazed and non openable unless above 1.7 metres.
5. No additional openings on east or west roof slope.

Informative

1. Approved no amendments

Case Officer: Hannah Barker Date: 11th January 2021

Authorised by: Peter Barnett Date: 12 January 2021