Expiry Date - 28-10-2015

Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/1301/15 **Recommendation – Refuse**

Site: **24 Overhill, Southwick**

Proposal: **Rooms in roof with side dormers, rear gable and front rooflight**

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: /N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

The proposal is for rooms in roof consisting of a dormer to each side roof slope (measuring 7 metres in length, 2.5 metres in width, 2. 5 metres in height), a rear half-hip roof extension (measuring 1.9 metres in height, 2.5 metres in length, and 6.5 metres in width) and front rooflight.

The application property is a detached bungalow in a row of similar buildings, in a residential street in an outer suburb of Southwick. It has painted brick and rough rendered exterior finish.

Relevant Planning History

None

Consultations (summarised)

Southern Water – attach informative

Representations (summarised)

Objection received from occupiers of 22 Overhill: *Loss of privacy and light. Side dormers will overlook our windows on north side of our property. Narrow distance between buildings which is a shared driveway, and due to the close proximity and height of dormers this will severely restrict amount of light which we receive in our dining room, toilet, front door and hallway and bathroom. Loss of privacy. Our windows face north.*

Relevant Planning Policies and Guidance

National Planning Policy Framework
Saved Adur Local Plan policies: AG1, AH7

Planning Assessment

Principle

Upgrading of residential accommodation is acceptable in principle

Visual amenity

The National Planning Policy Framework advises, at paragraph 64, that permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions.

Whilst there are examples of similar alterations as proposed to bungalows further north in the street, Overhill has a long length and in the immediate section of street around 24 Overhill the bungalow buildings that face onto it have retained their original architectural character and appearance; the atypical dual hipped roofs are predominant and front roof lights are largely absent. It is this which gives the street its local distinctiveness.

The proposed development would serve to increase the overall visual mass of the building and significantly change its architectural character, to the detriment of these qualities of the character and appearance of the street scene. It would appear visually incongruous and obtrusive, with bulky and over-dominant side dormers. It is the length of the dormers that results in excessive scale as much as the hipped roofs, so making the dormers flat roofed would not overcome the objection.

The rear roof extension is of an awkward design, introducing a half-hip roof form that would be somewhat unsightly. However its scale is subservient and as it is situated at the rear of the building, it would be less harmful to the street scene because it would less visible.

Notwithstanding this, the proposal by reason of the design of the dormers, would cause harm to both the character and appearance and local distinctiveness of the locality contrary to the objectives of the Framework, saved Policies AG1 and AH7 of the Adur District Local Plan (Adopted April 1996) (LP) and Adur District Local Plan Appendix 11- Supplementary Planning Guidance (Adopted April 1996) – Development Control Standard No.3 *Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings* (SPG), as they relate to the quality of design and the protection of the character and appearance and local distinctiveness of a locality.

Residential amenity

It is the neighbours to either side and at the rear who are principally impacted upon by the development (it is physically removed from the remainder).

Neighbour at rear

The distance between the development and the neighbouring building at the rear is sufficient to avoid intrusive overlooking and unacceptable loss of privacy.

Neighbours to either side

Both these neighbouring buildings have unadorned roof slopes facing the application site.

The proposal would add significant bulk to either side elevations, which would overbear to the detriment of the amenities of either neighbour. Both dormers would exhibit the window of either bedroom, serving as the principal light source for either bedroom with the future occupier being reliant upon this for outlook. Each of these windows would be in close proximity to the neighbouring buildings and would afford adverse overlooking onto either neighbour, with intrusive views into their private garden space.

Recommendation

REFUSE

For the following reasons:-

1. The proposal, by reason of the excessive scale, bulk and mass of the side dormers, would appear unduly prominent and visually incongruous with the prevalent architectural form of host dwelling and prevalent building style and design in the street, to the detriment of the locally distinctive character and appearance of the immediate street scene in conflict with Saved Adur Local Plan Policy AH7 contrary to the Council's adopted allied SPG Development Control Standard No. 3 Extensions and Alterations to dwellings, and paragraph 64 of the National Planning Policy Framework relating to design.

2. The proposal by reason of the location of principal clear glazed bedroom windows in the side dormers and proximity to the neighbouring buildings to either side (north and south), would result in an adverse overlooking and loss of privacy onto the occupiers of those neighbouring properties to the detriment of their residential amenities in conflict with Saved Adur Local Plan Policy AH7 contrary to the Council's adopted allied SPG Development Control Standard No. 3 Extensions and Alterations to dwellings, and core planning principle of the National Planning Policy Framework relating to residential amenity

Informatives

1) 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. However, the issues are so fundamental to the proposal that it has not been possible to negotiate a satisfactory way forward and due to the harm which has been clearly identified within the reason(s) for the refusal, approval has not been possible.

2) This refusal relates to the following drawing:-
Drawing No. 477/01 titled Roof Conversion date valid 02-09-2015

Is recommendation contrary to any representations? N

Case Officer signed: Matthew Porter Date: 22-10-2015

Authorised and signed by: Peter Barnett Date: 22 October 2015