Expiry Date - 27/04/2011

Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: ADC/0077/11 **Recommendation – Refuse Application**

Site: **7 Slonk Hill Road Shoreham-by-Sea West Sussex BN43 6HX**

Proposal: **Re-positioning of existing front dormer and additional front dormer**

The Application

The application property is a detached bungalow which faces north towards a tree-lined bank separating Slonk Hill Road from the A27. Planning permission was granted in 2006 for a rear extension and rooms in the roof, involving a raising of the ridge and front and rear dormers, plus a front extension and enlargement of the garage (SU/4/06). During the course of that application various elements were amended, including a reduction in the width of the front dormer from 2.7m to 1.8m and its repositioning to be centred above the ground floor window.

This application seeks to construct an additional dormer on the front roofslope with the existing dormer repositioned further west. The proposed dormers would both measure 1.8m wide with pitched roofs stopping just below the ridge. The bottom of the dormers would be 1m above the eaves.

The property is within the built up area of Shoreham and, while formerly within the AONB, is not within the National Park.

Consultations and Representations

Consultations/Comments

None

Third Parties

No representations received

Relevant Planning Policies and Guidance

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

Policy AH7 refers to residential extensions but the principles are the same when considering extensions to non-residential buildings. It 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 proportion of the garden area taken up by a proposal should not be excessive.

Dormers should not be so large that they over-dominate the dwelling, resulting in a top heavy 'box-like' appearance. They should be kept well below the ridge level of the existing roof and should not project as far as the walls of the house. A large amount of the original roof should still be clearly visible. Dormers should not "wrap-around" more than one face of a roof and should not normally be located on the side of a hipped roof. The appearance of roof lights will often be more acceptable. Where the existing roof space is of inadequate size to accommodate the rooms proposed without adding very large flat roofed dormers, permission will not normally be granted.

The windows in dormers should be similar in style and proportion to those on the original dwelling. On older-style properties small hipped or gable roofed dormers are usually preferable to flat-roofed dormers. Two small dormers will often be more acceptable than one large one, provided they are sufficient distance apart.

Government policy is set out in Planning Policy Statement PPS1 ’Delivering Sustainable Development’. Relevant paragraphs are 17, which refers to the commitment to protecting and improving the environment; 18 which states that planning should seek to maintain and improve the local environment and help to mitigate the effects of declining environmental quality through positive policies on issues such as design; and 34 which states that good design is indivisible from good planning and that design which is inappropriate in its context, or which fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area, should not be accepted.

Visual amenity and character

The application property is the only dwelling in this part of Slonk Hill Road to have a front dormer and that dormer was subject to negotiation when first

submitted to improve its appearance and reduce its impact. The proposal to reposition the dormer and construct a second dormer adjacent is considered to be a retrograde step which will have a harmful visual impact. Neither dormer will relate well to the ground floor window while the overall width of both dormers will be 3.6m, which is in excess of the 2.7m for the single dormer which was previously considered to be unacceptable. They will be only 0.5m apart and will appear cramped in conflict with advice in DC Standard 3.

It is considered that the front roofslope should not contain more than the single dormer currently there as to introduce additional or wider dormers would have a more dominant visual impact on the roofslope to the detriment of the street scene.

Residential amenity

The property faces a line of trees with the A27 behind and the additional dormer will have no impact on residential amenity.

Recommendation

REFUSE for reason that:-

1. The proposed additional dormer and repositioning of the existing dormer would not relate sympathetically to the existing building and ……as per B5ER

Case Officer Peter Barnett Date 31 March 2011