Expiry Date - 12/01/2015

Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/0655/17 **Recommendation –Approve**

Site: **12 Norman Crescent Shoreham-By-Sea West Sussex BN43 6AH**

Proposal: **Dormer to roof on side (west) elevation.**

Site visit 10.5.17

Site and surrounds

The application property is a large detached inter war two storey house in an estate of similar in a pleasant residential suburb of Shoreham.

The house displays characteristic period features with main hipped roof, catlside at the side above an integral garage and front gable; bays, portal windows and faced in brick and render with tiled roof and bonnets on the hip.

The roof has not been extended or altered save for one rooflight in the west elevation.

The houses are set back on a common building line but relatively tightly packed (driveway width between) , despite the deep rear gardens.

To the west is a similar house (No 10) whose east facing roof slope contains no windows, though the eat elevation contains a couple of windows at upper floor level serving a bathroom/WC.

To the east is a bungalow.

Opposite are similar houses to No 12.

There are a couple of precedents for side dormers within the estate but the vast majority of roofs are unextended.

Proposal

The scheme has been revised to address officer concerns over the width of the dormer.

The dormer sits in the mid part of the catslide roof and has a hipped roof. It serves a bedroom created and contains one west facing window.

It is faced in tiles materials to match the house tiles.

Expiry Date - 12/01/2015

Relevant Planning History

AWDM/0177/13 - Single storey rear extension to replace conservatory, and rear decking.
STATUS: APP 18th April 2013.

Representations

None received

Consultations

None

Planning Policy Framework

Relevant Planning Policies and Guidance

Submission Adur Plan policies 2,11,15 ;
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)
Site Layout Planning for daylight and sunlight : A guide to good practice ; second edition Paul Littlefair BRE

Planning Assessment

Principle

The proposal enlarges and upgrades a modestly sized house in the urban area in a sustainable location.

The chief governing policy is saved Adopted Adur District Local Plan;

Extensions and alterations to existing houses and bungalows will be expected to be designed so that:-
(a) proposals would not result in an unacceptable degree of overlooking, loss of natural light or overbearing effect on neighbouring dwellings;
(b) design and materials are sympathetic to both the original dwelling and the area in general;
(c) the proportion of the garden area taken by the proposal would not be excessive having regard to the character of the area;
(d) access and car parking provision is acceptable under Policy AT12, and
(e) proposals accord with the standards adopted by the District Planning Authority

Development Control Standard No.3 ‘Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings’ provides further guidance ;

THE EFFECT ON NEIGHBOURING PROPERTIES
2.2 Proposals will not be granted planning permission if they have an unacceptably adverse
effect on neighbouring properties. The main detrimental effects could be related to :-
(i) Privacy
The proposal should not result in direct overlooking of rooms in neighbouring properties, nor excessive amounts of overlooking of garden areas.
(ii) Daylight
Any proposal should not reduce the daylight to neighbouring properties to an unacceptable extent.
(iii) Outlook
The fact that a neighbour may be able to see an extension would not in itself make a proposal unacceptable, the outlook of neighbouring properties should not be dominated by the extension since this could be overbearing and oppressive. However, the loss of a distant view would not normally be considered a valid reason for refusing an application.
THE EFFECT ON NEIGHBOURING PROPERTIES
2.2 Proposals will not be granted planning permission if they have an unacceptably adverse
effect on neighbouring properties. The main detrimental effects could be related to :-
(i) Privacy
The proposal should not result in direct overlooking of rooms in neighbouring properties, nor excessive amounts of overlooking of garden areas.
(ii) Daylight
Any proposal should not reduce the daylight to neighbouring properties to an unacceptable extent.
(iii) Outlook
The fact that a neighbour may be able to see an extension would not in itself make a proposal unacceptable, the outlook of neighbouring properties should not be dominated by the extension since this could be overbearing and oppressive. However, the loss of a distant view would not normally be considered a valid reason for refusing an application.

Visual amenity

The dormer extension will be visible from the street but, in it is relatively recessed position and , now, reduced scale will not be overly assertive or incongruous.

It will be important to ensure that bonnet tiles are used on the hips to safeguard the period character and this may be secured by condition.

Expiry Date - 12/01/2015

Impact on neighbour amenity and living conditions

The extension is relatively modest in scale and, given the arrangement of windows at No 10, would not would impact on outlook, privacy or natural light of this neighbour.

Recommendation

Approve

Subject to conditions

1. Implement within 3 years
2. Build in accordance with approved drawings.
3. Materials to match existing house and only use bonnet tiles on the hips

Is recommendation contrary to any representations? N

Case Officer signed : PD Date: 12.7.17

Authorised and signed by: Gary Peck Date: 12 July 2017