ex 2/7/09

Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: ADC/0187/09 **Recommendation – Permit Application**

Site: **26 Abbey Road Sompting Lancing West Sussex**

Proposal: **Front dormer**

The Application

The site is located within the built up area of Sompting a semi detached bungalow within a street of bungalows of similar design. The loft has already been converted with a part hipped side gable, rear flat roof dormer and two front velux windows.

Permission is sought for a front flat roof dormer, 2.8 metres in width, 1.7 metres high, with a maximum depth of 2.7 metres. The dormer is to be built up to the ridge of the existing bungalow and will provide additional head room to the existing front, first floor bedroom.

Consultations and Representations

Third Parties: - No third party representations have been received.

Relevant Policies and Guidance

Adopted Adur District Local Plan 1993-2006 (ADC 1996) (saved policies): AG1, AH7 and Appendix II '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 of the Local Plan 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 or sympathetic design and materials to the original dwelling and the area in general.

Residential Amenity

It is not considered that the proposed front dormer will result in any loss of light or privacy in this case. The dormer will face onto the highway and the bungalows opposite there will be no greater level of overlooking than existing.

Visual Amenity

The bungalows within the street when viewed from the front appear to be mainly unchanged, although there are other examples of front dormers within the close proximity of the site and also elsewhere within Abbey Road. Amended plans have been received that show the dormer reduced down from the ridge slight to improve its appearance. It is not considered that a dormer of this scale and design in this location would warrant a refusal in this case.

Recommendation

APPROVE for reason that :- 1PPi

1. C1Ci
2. C12E3
3. C14Ai – 4th June 2009 – Policy AH7

Case Officer.... [redacted] .....Date.....4/6/09.

PB 5/6