Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/0702/13 **Recommendation – Refuse**

Site: **5 Downsway, Southwick, Brighton**

Proposal: **Rooms in roof involving part-hipped gables to front and rear and dormer on south side**

Date of site visit: 31st July 2013

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

The application site is a single storey detached bungalow with hipped roof to front. There is a detached garage set back to the side with a driveway and hard standing to the side and front. The bungalow is on the west side of Downsway near to the bottom of the hill and the intersection with Old Shoreham Road. Many of the bungalows within Downsway remain unchanged when viewed from the street there are many examples of small front gablet extensions some of which appear to be original. Those that have been altered appear to be restricted to side flat roof dormers and velux windows only.

Permission is sought to extend the bungalow with a loft conversion. It is proposed that two bedrooms and a bathroom will be provided in the loft space. A hip to gable with barn hip is proposed to the front with a front window. The extension is set back from the existing eaves by 0.7 metres. It is to be the same height as the existing ridge continuing forward by 2.9 metres. To the rear a full hip to gable extension with barn hip is proposed full height internally opening doors are proposed with balustrade forming a Juliette balcony. This extension also extends the existing ridge to the back by 3.3 metres. To the southern side a hipped roof side dormer is proposed 5.55 metres wide, 2.1 metres high with a maximum depth of 2.6 metres.

Concern was expressed by the planning officer following full consideration of the proposal as submitted. It was advised that amendments should be made to reduce the overall scale and bulk of the proposal and improve the appearance of the development when viewed within the street scene. It was suggested that the side dormer should be reduced in width and the pitched roof removed to replicate other flat roof side dormers within the street and to reduce the bulk and scale of the extensions. It was also recommended that the front extension be reduced significantly and the window either removed or reduced. It was considered that if the works to the front and side where reduced satisfactorily that the rear extensions could remain as the increased scale and bulk could be considered to be acceptable.

The applicant advised that they would like to proceed with the application as submitted.

Representations: No third party representations have been 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)

Planning Assessment

Principle

The proposal comprises upgrading of the existing housing stock located within the built up area and can be supported in principle. The relevant issues are the effects on the amenities of neighbouring residential occupiers and the effect on the character and appearance of the dwelling and its surroundings.

Visual amenity

The main issue in this case is the impact of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the existing bungalow and street scene. The front extension and side dormer will be clearly visible within the street scene and prominent features in views from the south. Due to the changes in levels from south to north in Downsway the bungalows are staggered in appearance and this emphasises the uniform form of the roofs. The side dormers which do exist in close proximity to the application site are restricted to flat roof design which allows then to be limited in bulk and although they are visible within the street scene their impact is minimal. It should also be noted that many of these are likely to be permitted development and therefore not under planning control.

The combination of the large side dormer with pitched roof, with only a 0.25 metre set down from the main ridge, and the large front gable extension result in a development which is visually detrimental to the character and appearance of the street scene. The bulk and scale of the development combined with the unsympathetic design will not relate sympathetically to the appearance of the existing street scene. It would also set a precedent for additional development which would further degrade the appearance of the existing built environment in this locality.

Furthermore the combined extensions including the rear addition would represent over development of the site. The increased bulk and scale of development would not respect the scale of the existing bungalow and would not provide a subservient addition. Therefore the proposal as submitted cannot be supported.

Residential amenity

It is not considered that there will be any adverse impact with regards to neighbouring properties as a result of the proposed extension. There will be no increased over looking as the window in the proposed dormer will be fitted with obscure glazing with a top opening fan light. Due to the change in levels the side velux may result in some overlooking to the side of the bungalow to the north however as it serves the stairs a condition could be attached for the window to be obscurely glazed and fixed shut if necessary.

Recommendation

REFUSE for the reason:-

The proposal is unacceptable in that the size and form of the proposed roof extensions, in particular the proposed front gable, do not relate sympathetically to the scale or appearance of the existing bungalow. The development would detract from the character of the existing bungalow constituting a visually dominant and intrusive form of development that would be detrimental to the streetscene and make it difficult, if permitted, for the Local Planning Authority to prevent similar additions to other dwellings, the cumulative effect of which would detract seriously from the area. The proposal is therefore contrary to saved policy AH7 of the Adur District Local Plan and the NPPF.

Informative

The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by identifying matters of concern with the proposal and discussing those with the Applicant. Unfortunately, it has not been possible to resolve those matters within the timescale allocated for the determination of this planning application. However, the Local Planning Authority has clearly set out, within its report, the steps necessary to remedy the harm identified within the reasons for refusal - which may lead to the submission of a more acceptable proposal in the future. The Local Planning Authority is willing to provide pre-application advice in respect of any future application for a revised development.

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

Case Officer: Hannah Barker Date: 12th August 2013

Authorised by: Jo Morin Date: 13 Aug 2013