Development Management – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/1805/17 Recommendation – APPROVE

Site: 196 Old Shoreham Road, Shoreham-by-Sea,

Proposal: Inverted dormer and balcony to front, west elevation.

Date of site visit: 18.12.17

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Site and Surroundings

The application relates to 2 storey end of terrace residential property. It is on the northern end of a stretch of similar style dwellings. To the north are nos. 198 and 200 Old Shoreham Road with the 'Amsterdam' Public House, a Listed Building beyond. The rear garden of the property is long and narrow.

Opposite the site directly to the west of the Old Shoreham Road, lies the River Adur, and directly to the west of the river, lies Shoreham Airport.

There is off street parking to the front of the site.

Consent is sought for an inverted dormer to the front roofslope. The submitted plans show a new bedroom to be formed in the roof space. To the front roof slope a glazed balcony is to be formed, this is to match the existing development at no. 200 which was given consent in December 2016, AWDM/1458/16. The plans also show a flat roof rear dormer with Juliet balcony. This does not form part of this application and is subject to AWDM/1807/17 where consideration is given as to whether the rear element of the development is lawful or whether planning consent is required.

The inverted dormer will be contained within the existing floor area of the former loft, which will be converted into a bedroom.

To the front of the inverted dormer would be a glazed safety screen across the front and to each of the sides. This screen will be directly off of the roof proper. The front safety screen will measure approx. 2.4m wide x 1.1m high. The side triangle sections of the safety screens will measure approx. 1.2m wide x 1.1m high.

Consultations: None

Representations: None

Relevant Planning Policies

Development Management Standard No.3 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings'

Adur Local Plan 2017 - Policy 15
National Planning Policy Framework (CLG 2012)
National Planning Practice Guidance

Planning Assessment

There is no objection in principle to the proposed inverted dormer which would upgrade an existing property within an established residential area. The key concerns are the effects on the residential and visual amenities of the locality.

Visual Amenity

The proposed inverted dormer to the front roofslope is largely contained within the existing roof, with the only external extension being the glazed safety balcony. The fact that the balcony will be glazed will limit its visual impact on the street scene.

The external platform of the balcony will be a floorspace that has been gained from the internal roof attic area, and the same situation will occur with regard to the vertical opening windows which will be positioned below the 3no. rooflights. Therefore, whilst persons can stand on this new platform area, the roof itself will act as a partial screen to the users.

In order to allow persons to be able to step onto the new platform, the 3no. rooflights will open outwards to form a horizontal 'roof'. Rooflights, and their openings, have become a common feature within roofslopes on residential properties, and the manner of the proposed rooflights opening is not uncommon.

It is considered that the inverted dormer to the front roofslope will thereby not result in a form of development which would give rise to demonstrable harm onto the character of the area in general or the neighbouring properties, including the Listed Building of the Amsterdam and neighbouring Conservation Area.

It should be noted that in order for the new 2nd floor bedroom to be constructed of the size indicated, the applicant will be constructing a large, flat roof, rear dormer. This dormer would have large patio sized windows with a Juliet balcony across them. This dormer and its associated Juliet balcony are to be constructed under 'Permitted Development' rights, and therefore are not being considered as part of this application. (AWDM/1807/17 Lawful Development Certificate as mentioned above.)

For clarity, the fact that the rear dormer is shown on the plans is for information purposes only. Any permission granted under this application will be for the front inverted dormer only.

It should be noted that a precedent has been set for this form of development, the matching development at no. 200 was given consent and works have been completed. The glazing is visible within the street scene although not overly obtrusive. The vegetation and plants that have been positioned behind the glazing at no. 200 are clear features within the street scene and draw attention to the roof development. Consideration was given here when assessing the current proposal as to whether there could be the option of controlling the positioning of such plants, yet

it would be deemed over restrictive to attach such a condition and would only be applicable to the current application and not that at 200 therefore inconsistent .The scale of the plants used at no. 200 is unusual and it is that which draws attention, the glazed development is considered to be visually acceptable in this case.

Residential Amenity

The new front inverted dormer will not result in unacceptable harm onto the neighbouring property no. 194. Indeed whilst users of the inverted dormer would be able to see to the sides of the inverted dormer, this would only be to the property frontage therefore no material harm would result.

As mentioned above the rear dormer is not for consideration here and its impact upon the residential amenities of the occupiers of the adjacent dwellings are not relevant.

Recommendation

APPROVE subject to the following conditions

1. Approved plans
2. Standard time limit
3. Any future change of design or materials of the front balcony screen will need to be agreed, in writing, by the LPA on an application in that behalf.

Informative

1. Approved with no amendment
2. It should be noted that the rear dormer to no. 196 Old Shoreham Road, shown on the submitted plans for completeness, is identified as being constructed under permitted development rights, and therefore does not form part of this permission

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

Case Officer: Hannah Barker Date: 8th January 2018

Authorised by: Peter Barnett Date: 8 January 2018