Development Management – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/0122/25 Recommendation: Refuse

Site: 28 Wembley Avenue, Lancing

Proposal: Proposed front dormer

Date of Site Visit: 13 February 2025

Neighbours Checked: Y

Additional neighbour notification: N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings:

The application relates to a mid terrace dwelling on the west side of Wembley Avenue. It is proposed to construct a large front dormer which will take up most of the roofslope.

Planning History:

AWDM/0120/25 - Householder application for permitted development for prior approval for single storey extension to rear of property measuring 5m from rear wall of the original dwelling, maximum height 3.2m and height of eaves of the extension 3m - granted

AWDM/0121/25 - Application for Certificate of Lawfulness for proposed rear dormer - granted

Consultations:

Lancing Parish Council: No comments received

Representations

None received

Relevant Planning Policies

Adur Local Plan 2017 Policy 15
'Supplementary Planning Guidance' comprising: Development Management Standard No.2 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings''
National Planning Policy Framework (December 2024)
WSCC Guidance on Parking at New Developments (Sept 2020).

Planning Assessment

Principle

The relevant issues are the effects on the amenities of neighbouring residential occupiers and the effect on the character and appearance of the area.

Visual amenity

Wembley Avenue has few roof alterations visible from the street. Within the same stretch of road there are only two front dormers, both of which are on the other side of the road to the application site. Permission appears to have only been granted for one of them, back in 1982. The two existing dormers are on the east side of the street and there are none on the same side as No. 28, resulting in an unaltered roofscape on the west side.

Where there is a street with few dormers, particularly where there is a run of terraced houses with no roof alterations, the Council will seek to resist any application for a front dormer as it will set a precedent which will ultimately change the character and appearance of the terrace and street. DM Standard No. 2 states:

3.11: (dormers) should not be so large that they over-dominate the dwelling, resulting in a top heavy "box-like" appearance. They should be kept well below the ridge level of the existing roof and should not project as far as the walls of the house. A large amount of the original roof should still be clearly visible

3.12: In some locations, front dormers may not be acceptable if for example they would spoil the special character of a Conservation Area or if there are currently no other front dormers present in a particular street scene

3.14: Where permission is required, roof extensions should respect the scale, character and appearance of existing dwellings

The proposed dormer at No. 28 is large and dominates the roofslope, contrary to the advice above. Introducing such a feature within a terrace which is otherwise unaltered, and where the wider street scene on that side of the road also contains no roof extensions, would result in visual harm to the detriment of the character of the area and the appearance of the street.

A lawful development certificate has already been granted for a rear dormer at the same property and that, together with front rooflights, should provide sufficient floor space for additional accommodation.

Residential amenity

The front dormer will not cause harm to neighbouring properties.

Recommendation

REFUSE

For the following reason:-

The proposed dormer, by reason of its large size and dominant appearance, would result in visual harm to the detriment of the character of the area and the appearance of the street scene. The proposal is therefore contrary to policy 15 of the Adur Local Plan, Development Management Standard No.2 ‘Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings’’ and the NPPF

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 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.

Case Officer: Peter Barnett Date: 19 March 2025

Authorised by: Louise Prew Date: 19/03/2025