Development Management – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/0215/17 Recommendation – Refuse

Site: 50 West Way, Lancing, West Sussex

Proposal: Rooms in roof with front dormer (side hip to gable roof extension, first-floor side window and rear dormer to be built as permitted development).

Date of site visit: 14.03.17

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

The application property is a semi-detached hipped roof bungalow located on the corner of West Way and Boundary Way. It has a prominent siting being on the corner and positioned at an angle. Although the general, surrounding built environment here comprises of dwellings which have been altered with various additions including roof additions this specific pair of semi detached dwellings remains as hipped roof with no dormers visible within the street scene. The matching pair of semis opposite also at the top of Boundary Way also has no roof extensions. Both these pairs are very prominent within the street scene. Also when standing in West Way opposite the site there are no large front dormers prominently visible along this stretch in the vicinity of the site.

Consent is sought here to build a hip to gable roof extension with flat roof front and rear dormer. Although these works form one single building operation to create space for three bedrooms and an en-suite the stance is taken here in considering this application that the front dormer only requires consent here. The hip to gable extension and rear dormer are considered here to be permitted development and therefore no for consideration here.

Originally plans were submitted showing a rooflight on top of the rear dormer which exceeded the height of the original roof, therefore deeming the rear dormer to require consent also. At this stage advice was also given that the application could not be supported. The front dormer was shown to be high up to the ridge and large and bulky in scale. Detrimental to the character and appearance of the street scene and out of scale with the existing bungalow.

Amended plans have been submitted which are for consideration here. The roof light was removed therefore the hip to gable extension and rear dormer became deemed permitted development. The front dormer was slightly reduced in scale and dropped down in the roof slope. The front dormer is shown as being 5.9 metres wide, 1.6 metres high and 2.4 metres in depth.

Representations

None received

Lancing Parish Council: - 16th March – Parish Council object to the planning application. The front double dormer is overbearing in nature and out of character of the area.

20th April – No objection

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'
Assessment of Saved Policies Against the NPPF (ADC 2013)
Adur Submission Local Plan Policy 15 (2016)
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

As stated above this particular site is very prominent and as existing has an unaltered roof slope, along with the attached bungalow. Also the adjacent pair of semi detached bungalows at the entrance to the cul de sac have unaltered, hipped roofs. In close proximity to the site on the main highway, West Way no front dormers are clearly visible within the context of the application site. It is acknowledged that within the wider area and adjacent in Boundary Way there are other front dormers visible within the street scene. Many of which are prominent and detrimental to the original character of the area. These dormers, some of which are likely to have been built for some time do not form justification for such a development at no. 50 West Way in this case. The dwellings within Boundary Way are not as significantly prominent as the application site. These are positioned within the context of a row of dwellings and not on a prominent corner site.

The applicant and their agent have made reference to no. 80 West Way. This is a similarly positioned bungalow to the west of the site, being on the corner at the entrance to the adjacent cul-de-sac, West Avenue. Consent was granted here for a front dormer under AWDM/0794/13, this has since been constructed. The dormer at no. 80 was a similar scale however it was positioned lower in the roofslope than this current application having a less ungainly appearance as a result. Yet the main differing feature here is that the dormer at no. 80 was built to match the existing dormer at the attached bungalow. It was therefore creating symmetry to match existing and not an alien feature at a prominent site that would be the case at no. 50. It should also be noted that the case officer for no. 80 stated the following in their

delegated report: - “The proposed dormer is box-like and will take up much of the front roofslope. However, it will match the dormer on the other half of this pair of properties and will not therefore appear out of character.” Therefore this does not justify a similar proposal at no. 50 which differs for the reasons set out above.

Residential amenity

The front dormer will not cause any serious harm to residential amenity, being at the front and facing dwellings on the other side of the street over 25m away. 50 Westway is angled and does not have a direct view over any neighbouring dwelling.

Recommendation

REFUSAL for the reason:-

The proposed front dormer extension by reason of its position on the roof slope, size, ‘bulk’, massing and design would be poorly related in visual terms to the scale and proportions of the existing bungalow and owing to the prominent siting of this dwelling on a wide corner would constitute an intrusive addition to the street scene, out of keeping with and harmful to the established character of surrounding development. It would therefore conflict with saved policies AG1 and AH7 of the Adur District Local Plan, Policy 15 of the Adur Submission Local Plan, the Council’s adopted SPG ‘Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings’ and the NPPF.

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

Case Officer: Hannah Barker Date: 24th April 2017

Authorised by: Jo Morin Date: 25.04.2017