Expiry Date - 07-01-2015

Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/1602/15 **Recommendation – APPROVE**

Site: **53 Downside Shoreham-By-Sea West Sussex**

Proposal: **Single-storey side extension and roof extension to raise ridge and form gable ends with rear dormer.**

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: /N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

The proposal is for a single storey side extension, roof extension with raised ridge (forming gable ends and a rear dormer). The resultant building would measure (at max) 5.9 metres in height, 10.7 metres in length, and 9.1 metres in width.

The application property is a detached bungalow which has been extended by way of an unsightly side dormer. The building is part render, part exposed brick walls. There is an existing flat roof garage attached to its side. The surrounding area is residential in its character.

The land level of the application site drops from the highway so the buildings are set slightly lower than the highway.

Relevant Planning History
None

Consultations
Southern Water: *attach informative*

Representations
None

Relevant Planning Policies and Guidance
National Planning Policy Framework para 14
Saved Adur Local Plan policies: AG1, AH7

Planning Assessment

Principle

Upgrading of residential accommodation is acceptable in principle

Visual amenity

The extensions would retain the scale of the host building – it would still be identifiable as a bungalow due to the low eaves, despite the higher ridge. The resultant form would be of greater bulk and mass, but this would not be out of keeping with the street scene given the mix of building types along it (there is a two-storey house and a bungalow with a high ridge either side of application site). Sufficient distance between buildings would be retained to avoid the creation of a terracing effect.

The suggested form of a gable ended bungalow with a greater width would not be alien to the existing character and appearance of the street scene, given there would be sufficient separation distance between buildings.

The new dormer is large and would visually dominate the rear roof slope. However the outer edge of the dormer is set in off the perimeter edge of the roof, and the fenestration would be similar to that on the existing bungalow. It would be partially visible from the street to the south (Greenways Crescent) as the buildings to the south are bungalows. However, it would be viewed against the existing backdrop of similar roof extensions and filtered by shrubs and trees in the domestic gardens. Therefore, the new dormer would not be so conspicuously harmful as to warrant refusal for that reason alone.

It is worth acknowledging the existing side dormer is unsightly and its removal would be a visual betterment.

The exterior materials and finishes would match.

Residential amenity – *effect on* existing dwellings

It is the neighbours either side and at the rear who are principally impacted upon (it is physically removed from the remainder).

Neighbour at rear

Given the substantial separation distance between the extension and the neighbouring building at the rear, no adverse overshadowing or overbearing would occur.

Additional overlooking would occur but neighbours already experience a degree of this from the existing dormer, and the separation distance that is involved means invasive views would be filtered to avoid materially harmful loss of neighbour's privacy.

Neighbour to east

The increased bulk and mass of the roof would reduce some outlook and light onto the neighbour.

However the separation distance between the flank walls of the extension and the neighbouring building would negate the potential for adverse overbearing/overshadowing. The removal of the garage would benefit the neighbour's living conditions.

The removal of the existing dormer and ground floor fenestration on this side would be betterment in terms of enhanced privacy for the neighbour. No windows are proposed in this extension flank, so direct views would be avoided. Views from the dormer would be oblique onto the neighbour. Noise and disturbance from the door would be no worse than at present.

Neighbour to west

The increased bulk and mass of the roof would reduce some outlook and light onto the neighbour.

The distance between the building and extension flank is sufficient to ensure that, together with the low position of the eaves, the potential for adverse overbearing/overshadowing would be negated.

No windows are proposed in this extension flank above ground floor openings (which would be largely screened by existing boundary fencing). This means direct views would be avoided as views from the dormer would be oblique onto the neighbour, so invasive overlooking would not occur.

Recommendation

APPROVE

Subject to Conditions:-

1. Standard time limit
2. Approved plans
3. Materials and finishes to match
4. Notwithstanding "pd" no windows/openings in side elevations (other than shown)

Informatives

1) 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.

2) Southern Water

Is recommendation contrary to any representations? N

Case Officer signed: Matthew Porter Date: 12-2-2016

Authorised and signed by: Peter Barnett Date: 15 February 2016