Expiry Date – 5/10 EOT 13/10

Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/1517/21 Recommendation – Approve

Site: 1 Mill Avenue, Shoreham

Proposal: **Hip to gable roof extension with front rooflights, gable window and rear dormer. Alterations at 1st floor with crown top dormer to form Ensuite (within existing store area footprint)**

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Date of Site Visit: 8/10

Site and Surroundings

This application relates to a semi detached house on the south side of Mill Avenue close to the junction with The Drive. The side elevation is very exposed to the junction. As built the property has a cat slide side roof and has been extended with a side dormer and a flat roofed ground floor rear extension. The side dormer has a sunken crown roof, see submitted photos. These house also rear single storey additions with half width gable roofs on the outside edges.

The property is not in a conservation area and is not listed.

Proposal

It is proposed to gable the main roof and add a rear dormer. It is also proposed to extend the existing side dormer to the depth of the original outrigger and square it off to create a first floor ensuite. A Certificate of Lawfulness was granted earlier this year for the hip to gable element, see history below.

Relevant Planning History

AWDM/0721/21 - Application for Certificate of Lawfulness for hip to gable roof extension with front rooflights and gable window. Issued 6.8.21

AWDM/1395/20 - Non Material Amendment to approved AWDM/0785/20 to extend the approved detached garage length by 300mm and insert window to rear elevation. Granted

AWDM/0785/20 - Proposed detached garage in frontage. Granted.

AWDM/0260/16 - Single-storey rear extension to south elevation. Granted

Consultations

None.

Representations

None.

Relevant Planning Policies and Guidance

The National Planning Policy Framework 2021
Adur Local Plan 2017 Policies 1, 2 and 15 including 'Development Management Standard No. 2 Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings'.
WSCC Guidance on Parking at New Developments (Sept 2020).

Planning Assessment

Principle

The principle of development can be supported as it upgrades a dwelling within the built up area boundary. For consideration is the impact of the proposals on the character and appearance of the area and the impacts of the development on neighbour amenity.

Character

This property is in a prominent position with an exposed side elevation. Extending the side dormer as proposed to the full depth of the rear single storey gable roof will be very evident in the streetscene and will be very bulky. However, similar roof extensions have been added to properties nearby at 59, 63, 65, 69 and 73 The Drive, though no planning permission for these can be found. These properties are less prominently positioned too. However, there is no doubt that local character has been affected.

The proposed side extension will have a modest pitched roof to match the existing side dormer and this will reduce the 'boxiness' of the proposed addition. On balance, and in the local context, it is not considered that further significant harm to local character will be caused.

Planning permission was granted for a first floor rear extension to No.63.

Neighbour amenity

No. 75 The Drive faces south west across the rear garden of the application site. It is not considered that this extension will be overbearing to them.

No. 3 is to the west has a bedroom window adjoining the boundary. The proposed first floor extension is 2.1 metres deep and will not break a 45 degree line to the mid point of No.3's rear window.

No significant neighbour harm will occur.

Recommendation APPROVE subject to the following conditions:

1. *Approved Plans*
2. *3 years*
3. *Matching materials*
4. *No new side windows first floor*
5. *All side facing windows to be obscurely glazed and non opening below 1.7m*

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? No.

Case Officer signed:	MOK	Date: 11/10/21
Authorised and signed by:	Peter Barnett	Date: 11 October 2021