Expiry Date – 10/6 EOT to 21/6

Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/0619/19 Recommendation – Grant

Site: **17 Ullswater Road, Sompting**

Proposal: **Ground floor side and rear extensions; roof extensions involving new gabled roof with higher ridge to include 1no. side dormer and roof light to north elevation, two roof lights to south elevation and Juliet balcony to west elevation. New roof to front bay and canopied entrance. Front garden to be laid to parking area with permeable materials. (Resubmission of AWDM/0023/18).**

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Date of Site Visit: 5/6

Site and Surroundings

This application relates to a detached bungalow on the west side of Ullswater Road where it approaches the bend in the road with Thirlmere Crescent. The bungalows are arranged to suit the curvature of the road with each set further forward of one another the further north into the road such that the site sits further forward than 15 and 19 is further forward than the site.

The bungalow has a fully hipped roof with a prominent front gable and a flat roofed front bay window. It has a lean to extension on the rear and a drive way on its north side. It is finished in light coloured brick with a tiled roof and upvc glazing. Its rear garden backs on to open land.

The site is not in a conservation area and is not listed. The bungalows either side are each of a different design as are those opposite. There are examples of roof alterations in the vicinity, particularly front dormers. Side dormers are not typical.

Proposal

Planning permission is sought to add a north side ground floor extension, 1.4 metres in width and a rear extension measuring a maximum 4.4 metres in depth. It is also proposed to replace the roof over the extended width bungalow, lifting the ridge height by 1100mm and extending 2.4 metres deeper into the rear garden.

This application follows a refusal last year, dismissed on appeal, for the same increase in ridge height but also dormers on each side 5 metres in depth, (AWDM/0023/18 refers).

This latest proposal includes a single narrow and shallow pitched roof dormer on the north side plus a rooflight and a further two rooflights on the south side to create two bedrooms and a bathroom at first floor. Since submission the plans have been revised to show a half hip on the rear elevation.

It is also proposed to relocate the entrance door to the 'front' road side elevation and to add a mono pitched roof over the bay and extend it across to create a canopied new entrance.

Relevant Planning History

AWDM/0023/18 - Ground floor side and rear extensions; roof extensions involving new gabled roof with higher ridge to include 2no.side dormers. New roof to front bay and canopied entrance. Refused 8.5.18. Appeal dismissed 22.8.18

Consultations

Sompting Parish Council:

Customer objects to the Planning Application

- Design
- Overdevelopment

Cllrs considered the proposal un-neighbourly; inappropriate for the area; in-balance; too big

Representations

None received.

Relevant Planning Policies and Guidance

The National Planning Policy Framework 2012
Adur Local Plan 2017 Policies 1, 2 and 15 including 'Development Management Standard No. 3 Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings'.

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. The previous appeal decision letter is also a material consideration.

Neighbour amenity

No. 19, to the north has two high level secondary living room windows on the side elevation closest to the rear of the property and a dining room window nearer the front. The proposed side extension will take development to 1 metre of this shared boundary. The front dining room window will continue to receive light and an outlook to the front of

the application site. The secondary living room windows will experience a loss of light but as this room has its main outlook and windows in the rear wall this is not considered to be significant. The two storey element of the rear extension will not break a 45 degree angle when measured from the centre of no. 19's rear patio windows. The half hip revision improves this position marginally.

The single storey rear element does break the 45 degree angle with the patio windows at No. 19 as its rear wall will be nearly 6 metres beyond that of No. 19. This time it is flat roofed. In the appeal proposal this extension to the same depth had a pitched roof. In dismissing the previous scheme that scheme the Inspector said:

'The proposal includes for extensions to the existing property together with raising of the roof and installation of side dormers. The Council's decision notice only refers to the proposed side dormers and the Officer's report confirms that it raises no objection to the other parts of the proposal, including the raising of the main roof. From my site visit and all the information before me I have no reason to take a different view. Accordingly, the main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposed side dormers on the character and appearance of the existing property and on the street scene.'

Both 17 and 19 are 1 metre off the common boundary and No. 19 is on slightly higher ground. It is not considered therefore that the single storey element will cause a significant loss of light or outlook to the rear living room patio doors at No. 19. It is considered that the proposed side kitchen window and dormer window above should be obscurely glazed and non-opening below 1.7 metres to prevent a loss of privacy to No. 19. Rooflights on both elevations should also be set with a cill level 1.7 metres above finished floor level and obscurely glazed for the same reasons but in respect of both neighbours. As these windows are all secondary this should not be harmful to future occupation.

No. 15, to the south, sits deeper into its rear garden than the application site. It has a car port and driveway on its north side, the shared boundary with the site. It has a hall, WC and secondary kitchen window in its north wall and gable bedroom window. This bedroom is primarily served by the front dormer window. The two-storey rear extension proposed does not extend as deep as the secondary side kitchen window at No. 15. The additional single storey element does not extend as deep as 15's rear wall.

Character

This street has a varied character. No. 19, to the south, has a pitched roof with a higher ridge and large flat roofed front dormer. No. 15 has a similar roof to 19 but has a front projecting gable addition as built. Opposite houses are simpler again and further south are semi detached bungalows, some with front dormer additions

Lifting the ridge height by 1 metre will bring the site bungalow closer in height to both adjoining properties but still below them. The additional width will lose the side driveway, fairly typical of the spacing within the street, but will leave a gap of 1 metre to the north boundary.

Side dormers are not highly visible in the area, not least because most properties have gabled roofs.

The removal of dormers from the south side, the most visible elevation is a significant improvement to the appearance of this development. A single shallow side dormer on the north elevation, set so far back in the roofline, is far less bulky than previously proposed. Together with the closing of the gap between 17 and 19 and that 19 sits forward of the site the side dormer will not be very apparent in the streetscene.

The Inspector concluded in the previous appeal that:

'Although the proposed dormers on the appeal property would be set in from the roof edges, their scale in terms of both width and depth on both sides of the roof would, in my view, result in bulky and visually intrusive features and a top-heavy roof structure in relation to the modest scale of the property. The addition of dormers to both side roof slopes would maintain some symmetry to the property, but they would, and even taking into account the raised roof form, create a strong and dominant horizontal emphasis at roof level which would appear discordant with the more modest form and proportions of the property. The dormers would harm the character and appearance of the property. They would also be visually intrusive and incongruous in street scene views, including when approaching the property from either direction along Ullswater Road.'

It is considered that the revised proposal to extend this roof is much more modest. It results in a more sympathetic proposal which will not result in a visually intrusive or discordant development. This reduced scheme will not be harmful to the character of Ullswater Road

Recommendation: **APPROVE** subject to the following conditions:

1. Approved Plans
2. 3 years
3. Materials to Match
4. Rooflights, side dormer window, side kitchen window - obscure and cill 1.7 metres off floor level
5. No new windows

Informative

The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by identifying matters of concern within the application (as originally submitted) and negotiating, with the Applicant, acceptable amendments to the proposal to address those concerns. As a result, the Local Planning Authority has been able to grant planning permission for an acceptable proposal, 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? YES

Case Officer signed:	MOK	Date: 20.6.19
Authorised and signed by:	Peter Barnett	Date: 20 June 2019