Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: **Recommendation – APPROVE**
AWDM/0067/13

Site: **30 Hammy Way, Shoreham**

Proposal: **Proposed front dormer**

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

The proposal is for a front dormer to measure (at max) 1.6 metres in height, 2.3 metres in depth, and 2.7 metres in width.

The application property is a semi detached bungalow, located on the south side of Hammy Way. The property has a hipped tiled roof and brick elevations. There is a flat roofed garage located to the rear on the west side, accessed via a concrete driveway, with a low front wall bounding part of the frontage.

A rear/side dormer extension are to be built under "permitted development" and are not under consideration within the scope of this application. This is shown on the drawings for completeness sake only.

Relevant Planning History

A replacement single storey extension was approved in 2006 (ADC/0269/06). There is a current application for a Lawful Development Certificate for a proposed rear/side roof extension running concurrently with this application.

Consultations: ***None***

Representations

- Comments received from occupiers of No 28 regarding:

  Noise and disturbance whilst work is carried out, will there be any restriction on the hours of work especially at weekends?

Relevant Planning Policies and Guidance

South East Plan (GOSE 2009): BE1, CC1, CC6

Adur Local Plan: AG1, AH7 and Appendix 11 ‘Supplementary Planning Guidance’ comprising: Development Control Standard No.3 ‘Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings’
National Planning Policy Framework (CLG 2012)

Planning Assessment

Principle

Upgrading of residential accommodation is acceptable in principle.

Visual amenity

The front dormer would be a prominent feature in the street. However precedent has already been set within the immediate street for front dormers. The design and scale of the proposed dormer would match an existing front dormer at No.32 Hammy Way and would appear suitably subservient to the parent building within the front roof slope. Its fenestration and exterior materials would be similar to that of its host.

The impact would not therefore be sufficiently materially harmful as to resist the granting of planning approval.

Residential amenity – effect on existing dwellings

The front dormer would be physically removed from the habitable rooms of immediate neighbours, such that any potential amenity issues would be avoided.

Outlook from the habitable rooms of immediate neighbours would not be unduly curtailed by the front dormer as it would be physically contained in the roof slope, away from the windows of such rooms.

The front dormer faces the public street, therefore views on to neighbours would not be any more intrusive in terms of overlooking and privacy than the existing situation.

A representation has been received from No.28 regarding noise and disturbance. This is not something that can be controlled with particular regard to this application, as there is significant building work that can be undertaken under permitted development which can not controlled by Planning Services.

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 saved Adur Local Plan policies AG1, AH7 and the South East Plan policies BE1, CC1, CC6

Subject to Conditions:-

1. Standard time limit
2. Approved plans – Existing and Proposed Plan dated Dec 2012 received 17th January 2013.
3. Exterior materials to match

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? Y

Case Officer signed: Joanne Sanderson Date: 12-2-2013

Authorised and signed by: Jo Morin Date: 13.02.13