Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/1602/13 Recommendation – APPROVE

Site: 18 Herbert Road Sompting Lancing West Sussex

Proposal: Rooms in roof with raised ridge, hip to gable and front and rear dormers

Date of site visit: 21.01.2014

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

The site relates to a semi detached bungalow located on the east side of Herbert Road. This is a predominantly residential area comprising of similar semi detached bungalows. The ground level slopes steeply up from south to north with the bungalows stepped to accommodate the change in level.

Permission is sought for a raised roof, hip to gable roof extension, front and rear dormers and a 3m deep crown roofed rear single-storey rear extension 3.6m high where the ground is at its highest.

Relevant planning history none

Consultations

Sompting Parish Council*:* Supports the application.

Representations None received

Relevant Planning Policies

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' National Planning Policy Framework (CLG 2012)

Planning Assessment

Residential amenity

The volume of the dwelling would be substantially increased and the ridge raised by approximately 450mm. The rear addition would be 4.4m at its highest. The absence of side windows that would allow any overlooking to neighbouring property means there will be no loss of privacy.

The scale and form of the additions would not be so large as to appear unduly dominant upon the neighbouring homes and lying north of the neighbouring

house at no.16, no loss of direct light would result for this neighbour. Whilst this dwelling has side windows facing north, these receive very little direct light in any event and there is adequate spacing between the respective houses as to avoid any undue sense of enclosure and with the extension being limited to 3m in depth and finished in pale render, ambient light would still be adequate. There would be no loss of light to any significant degree for the neighbouring dwelling to the north at no. 20, the house on this side being set markedly higher up with the rise in topography.

Overall, therefore, the proposed extension is considered acceptable in terms of impact on residential amenity.

Visual amenity

The proposed extensions would be very similar in design to many other alterations to dwellings in the same locality and this has defined the current visual context. The front dormer would be flat-roofed and offset slightly from the ground floor window below it but this is a form of development common to the properties in the same area and overall, given the vertical alignment of the panels and matching materials as proposed, would not be out of keeping in terms of the public view. The rear dormer would be wide and with its position, its mode of construction would mean very little of its southern edge would be tiled. However, this would not be unduly prominent in the street scene and on balance, it is not considered that it would result in sufficient harm to the general visual amenities of the locality as to warrant refusal of permission.

Recommendation

Approve for the reason:-

The proposed development would not unacceptably 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 NPPF.

Subject to Conditions:-

1. Standard time limit 3 years
2. Matching materials
3. No side windows without permission (south side)
4. Permission relates to approved plans:
   Location plan, block plan, and drawing nos. 13/891/01 and received 27/12/13 and 13/891/02 Revision A received 5/3/14.

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 letter(s) of representation? N

Case Officer: L Simmons Date: 18 February 2014

Authorised by: Jo Morin Date: 7 March 2014