Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/1860/16 Recommendation – APPROVE

Site: 1 Highview, Sompting

Proposal: Rooms in roof with 3 no. pitched-roof rear dormers to west elevation and three roof lights to front (east) elevation (re-submission of AWDM/1418/14).

Date of site visit: 19.12.2016

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

The application site is a corner plot situated to the east of Halewick Lane and the north of Highview. The property is a large detached two storey dwelling located within a cul de sac of two storey properties of similar design characterised by their brick built appearance, dark brown UPVC windows and two storey pitched roof projecting front features some of which incorporate timber cladding detailing.

In the roads surrounding the application site to the north, west and south there are a mixture of two storey properties and bungalow properties of varying styles. The application site slopes from south to north in line with the adjacent Halewick Lane to the west and there is a 2 metre high brick wall which lines the westerly rear and southerly side boundaries of the application site. A two storey southerly side extension and a single storey rear extension have previously been added to the property.

Planning permission is sought to extend the dwelling with a loft conversion with three dormers to the westerly rear roof slope and a sunpipe and three roof lights to the easterly front roof slope. It is proposed that two bedrooms and one en-suite bathroom would be provided in the loft space. The dormers would measure 1.6 metres wide, 1.6 metres deep and 1.6 metres high. The dormers would be hung in plain roof tiles and their pitched roofs would be covered in profiled tiles to match the main roof of the dwelling house. The proposed dormer windows and roof lights to the front roof slope would be dark brown UPVC to match the windows in the existing dwelling house.

Planning permission is required as there is a restriction on the original planning consent for this estate that removes permitted development restrictions in relation to roof extensions or alterations.

Consultations: None received

Representations: None received.

Relevant Planning Policies

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)

The Submission Adur Local Plan 2016 has been submitted to the Secretary of State and therefore the policies contained within it have assumed a degree of weight as a material consideration in the determination of planning applications. Policy 15 is considered relevant to the consideration of this application.

Planning Assessment

Planning Site History

1 Highview

Planning permission was previously refused in 2014 for a similar scheme seeking permission for three pitched roof dormers to the western roof slope and a sun pipe and front roof lights plus obscure glazed second floor window in south side (AWDM/1418/14 relates). Officers had concerns regarding number, scale, design and awkward high position of the rear dormer extensions which were considered to dominate the rear roof slope of the dwelling.

At this time none of the two storey dwellings within this close had been extended with dormer extensions in the roof space and there were concerns that the three dormers facing the road would not relate sympathetically to the scale or appearance of the existing dwelling or similarly designed properties within the area. Whilst it was acknowledged that there were other dormers on properties in Howard Road to the west they were on smaller bungalows and are restricted to flat roof design which limited their bulk and prominence within the road. At the time the neighbouring property to the south, 37 Highview had constructed a large flat roofed dormer to the rear roof slope without the benefit of planning permission which was being investigated by the Council's Planning Enforcement department.

A further application for one flat roofed dormer and six roof lights to the eastern roof slope and roof lights to the front eastern roof slope was refused in 2015 (AWDM/0128/15 relates). Officers considered that the large flat roofed dormer and proliferation of roof lights did not relate sympathetically to the original dwelling and would have had an adverse effect on the visual amenities of the area.

Planning approval was subsequently granted in 2015 for seven roof lights to the westerly rear elevation and three roof lights to the easterly front elevation

(AWDM/0524/15 relates). In determining this application Officers considered that whilst the proliferation of roof lights in the western roof slope would have appeared somewhat cluttered in terms of appearance they would be visually less intrusive than dormer extensions.

37 Highview

Planning Permission was subsequently refused by the Council in 2015 and dismissed at appeal for the large flat roofed dormer to the rear of the neighbouring property at 37 Highview (AWDM/1673/14 relates). The Inspector considered that the proposed dormer extension as a consequence to its bulk and siting appeared as a prominent and incongruous extension that was unsympathetic to the host property and the visual amenities of Halewick Lane and Highview. It was also considered that the dormer windows caused harmful overlooking to the neighbouring amenities of the occupiers to the rear.

Planning permission was subsequently granted at 37 Highview for two smaller pitched roofed dormers on the rear roof slope, hip to gable extensions and roof lights to the front roof slope (AWDM/0641/16 relates). The Planning Officer dealing with the application considered that the reduced scale of the two smaller dormers mitigated any obtrusive impact on the street scene.

Visual amenity

This scheme is similar to the scheme previously refused on the site by the Council in 2014 under application AWDM/1418/14. The main issue in this case is still the impact of the three westerly dormer extensions on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and street scene. The rear dormer extensions by reason of their number, scale, pitched roof design and high position would still dominate the expanse of rear roof slope. However, it has to be acknowledged that a precedent has to a certain degree now been set by the two approved pitched roof dormer extensions located on the rear roof slope of a similarly designed neighbouring property within the cul de sac, 37 Highview. These dormers are also openly visible from Halewick Lane and are similar to the proposed dormers in terms of their scale, placement within the roof slope and pitched roof design.

Discussions have taken place with the Agent and Applicant in relation to the omission of the middle dormer and the re-positioning of the dormers further down in the roof slope. The Agent has confirmed that the internal ceiling height within the dormers is already a minimum height of 2m so any further movement down the roof is not practical without considerable internal alteration. The Applicant has advised that the middle dormer is required for an increased height to the ensuite bathroom. Whilst the Applicant has confirmed he would be willing to omit the southerly most dormer he does not wish to alter the floor levels or proposed internal layout of the roof space accommodation.

The removal of the southern most dormer would create two dormer extensions unevenly spaced to one side of the existing rear roof slope which would not relate sympathetically to the appearance of the existing dwelling. The proposed three dormers are evenly spaced and uniform in terms of their design and appearance.

It is considered regrettable that removal of the middle dormer could not be negotiated, or the more even positioning of the dormers further down the roof slope as it is felt that this would have improved the overall design and appearance of the dormers in relation to the existing dwelling and other properties within the cul de sac. Nevertheless, the current proposal is an improvement on the previous refused scheme (AWDM/1418/14) insomuch that the 3 no. pitched roof dormers are all equally proportioned with hipped roofs positioned below the ridge of the main dwelling and the side extension. In the circumstances, given the approval of two similarly designed dormers on a neighbouring property 37 Highview, it is considered on balance that Officers could not justify refusing this proposal on the basis of adverse impact on the visual amenities of the area.

Residential amenity

It is considered that there would be no adverse impact with regards to neighbouring properties as a result of the proposed dormer extensions and roof lights and window. As the property is a corner property it is well distanced to the neighbouring dwellings located to the east, south and west by roads. There would be no windows located in the northerly wall of the rear dormer closest to No. 2 Highview and therefore the proposed roof extension would cause no direct overlooking into the northerly neighbour's rear garden. There is already a degree of overlooking from the first floor rear windows of the dwelling to the northerly neighbouring rear garden and the proposed rear facing dormer windows are not considered to cause any further harmful overlooking to the amenity of the northerly neighbouring occupiers.

Recommendation

APPROVE with the following conditions

1. Approved Plans
2. Standard 3 Year Time Limit
3. Matching Materials
4. No windows (northern side wall of dormer)

Informative

1. Proactive Statement – Approved (No Amendments)

Is recommendation contrary to letter(s) of representation? N

Case Officer: Rebecca Tier Date: 30.01.2017

Authorised by: Jo Morin Date: 01.02.2017