Expiry Date -

Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: **Recommendation – APPROVE**
AWDM/0158/14

Site: **128 Downside**

Proposal: **Loft Conversion**

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

The proposal is for:-

- Flat roof rear dormer to measure (at max) 2.8 metres in height, 3.6 metres in length, and 7.4 metres in width
- Flat roof front dormer to measure (at max) 2 metres in height, 2.6 metres in length, and 4.2 metres in width
- Hip-to-gable roof extension to measure (at max) 4.1 metres in height, 9.7 metres in length, and 4 metres in width

The application property is one of a pair of bungalows, with a front gabled bay. It is elevated from the highway. The physically adjoining bungalow has built a front dormer, with a flat roof dormer off its side.

The site is situated in an outer residential suburb of Shoreham, opposite the north end of Buckingham Park.

Relevant Planning History
None

Consultations
None

Representations
None

Relevant Planning Policies and Guidance

Adopted Adur District Local Plan 1993-2006 (ADC 1996) (saved policies): AG1, AH7 and Appendix 11 'Supplementary Planning Guidance' comprising:
Development Control Standard No.3 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings'
Assessment of Saved Policies (ADC 2013)
National Planning Policy Framework (CLG 2012)

Planning Practice Guidance (CLG 2014)

Planning Assessment

Principle

Upgrading of residential accommodation is acceptable in principle

Visual amenity

The proposed rear dormer is large and it would be a highly visible feature on the rear roof slope. However such dormers are now an established feature in the street scene, having been built onto many surrounding properties - so much so that the addition of a further one would not be out of character. It would also not be conspicuously visible from public vantage point.

The front dormer is a visual match to the existing front dormer on the adjoining bungalow, in terms of its size and fenestration arrangement. Accordingly, it would not be unsympathetic to the existing form of the pair of bungalows.

The hip to gable roof extension would unbalance the pair of bungalows to a certain extent. However the pair is already unbalanced by way of the existing flat roof side dormer on the adjoining bungalow. Therefore the hip-to-gable would make this situation no worse. Hip-to-gable roof extensions are evident elsewhere in the street.

Insufficient visual harm would arise from this proposal.

Residential amenity

It is the neighbours either side and to the rear who would be principally impacted upon by this development (it is physically removed from the remainder).

Neighbours to rear

The rear dormer would introduce first floor views onto these neighbours. However there would be sufficient distance between it and neighbouring buildings to the north to avoid intrusive views into the private rooms of those neighbours.

Accordingly, unacceptable loss of privacy would be avoided and as it is physically removed, no adverse overbearing and overshadowing would occur.

Neighbour to west

This neighbouring building exhibits a single first floor window and two ground floor windows in its flank. The ground floor windows are obscure glazed.

The roof extensions would add additional bulk to the roof. However the dormers are to be set off from the shared boundary and the hip-to-gable would follow the silhouette of the existing roof. This means adverse overbearing and

overshadowing would not result - the outlook from the first floor window is already curtailed.

The sole window in the gabled flank of the proposed extension to the roof serves a bathroom and is to be obscure glazed and top hung, so the nature of overlooking resulting from this proposal would be oblique rather than direct. Intrusive loss of privacy would be accordingly avoided.

Neighbour to east

The dormers are physically removed from the habitable rooms of this neighbour, so would not adversely overbear and/or overshadow. Overlooking would be oblique in its nature, with intrusive loss of privacy avoided.

Recommendation

APPROVE for the reason:-

The proposed development would not detract from the local environment and can take place without resulting in unacceptable detriment to the amenities of neighbouring properties. It would consequently not conflict with the saved policies of the Adur District Local Plan (AG1, AH7) or the policies of the National Planning Policy Framework

Subject to Conditions:-

1. Standard time limit
2. Approved plans
3. Exterior materials to match
4. Notwithstanding “pd” no further windows/openings in side elevation
5. First floor side window serving bathroom to be obscure glazed and top hung

Informative

The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by assessing the proposal against all material considerations, including planning policies and any representations that may have been received and subsequently determining to grant planning permission in accordance with the presumption in favour of sustainable development, as set out within the National Planning Policy Framework.

Is recommendation contrary to any representations? N

Case Officer signed: Matthew Porter Date: 25-3-2014

Authorised and signed by: Peter Barnett Date: 26 March 2014