Development Management - Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/0643/15 Recommendation – Approve

Site: 4 Cromleigh Way, Southwick

Proposal: Proposed two storey rear extension, extension to existing front dormer and front porch

Date of site visit: 28 May 2015

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

The application relates to a semi-detached bungalow on the south side of Cromleigh Way, close to the junction with Overhill. There is currently an attached pair of flat-roofed dormers at the front of the semi-detached buildings and it is proposed to extend the dormer at No.4 across the entire front roofslope, measuring 4.8m wide, 1.7m high and 2m deep. A flat-roofed front porch is also proposed measuring 2.6m wide, 1.6m deep and 2.5m high.

At the rear, the attached neighbour has a two storey flat-roofed extension constructed in the 1970s. No.4 is proposing to construct an identical extension, measuring 1.8m deep, 7.4m wide and 5.4m high.

Relevant site history

None relevant

Consultations

None

Representations

None received

Relevant Planning Policies

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 (March 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 street scene is characterised by pairs of small dormers centrally placed within the front roofslope, as currently exists at Nos 2 and 4. However, directly opposite at Nos 1 and 3 there is a pair of wider dormers similar to that now proposed at No.4. While the proposal will result in an imbalanced appearance, it is not considered that a wider dormer would appear unduly out of character in the context of the development opposite.

The proposed porch would also be a little out of keeping, as the majority of properties along the street have simple canopies over the front door. However, the attached neighbour, No.2, does have an enclosed porch and, while larger than that at No.2, the proposed porch would not be harmful as it would be seen in conjunction with its attached neighbour.

At the rear the proposed extension would not normally be deemed to be acceptable due to its scale and unsympathetic form. However, the existing identical extension at No.2 is considered to be a material consideration in this case. That extension is clearly visible from Overhill and, while the proposed extension at No.4 will also be visible to some extent, it would not be as prominent. It is considered that it would be difficult to justify a refusal of the proposed 2 storey extension in the light of the existing extension at No.2 and, exceptionally and for this reason only, permission can be granted.

Residential amenity

The front dormers would face towards the street and the properties opposite and would not result in loss of privacy.

At the rear, the first floor windows would face towards the rear garden of 78 Overhill, which is at a lower level than the application site. Overlooking of that property is already possible from the raised decking at No.4 and from the existing windows at No.2 and, on balance, it is not considered that serious loss of amenity would occur, particularly as a rear dormer could potentially be constructed as permitted development.

There is reasonable separation between No.4 and the property to the east, No.6 to prevent any significant loss of light or outlook from the rear extension. At 1.8m deep, the extension will not be unduly overbearing to its neighbours and will be in line with the extension at No.2.

No loss of residential amenity will occur as a result of this proposal.

Recommendation

APPROVE

Subject to Conditions:-

1. Standard 3 year time limit
2. Materials to match existing dwelling
3. Permission relates to approved plans

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

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.

Case Officer: Peter Barnett Date: 9 June 2015

Authorised by: Gary Peck Date: 9 June 2015