Expires 12/2/07

Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: ADC/0770/07 **Recommendation - Refuse Application**

Site: **107 Manor Hall Road Southwick Brighton West Sussex**

Proposal: **Side extension and enlargement of roof with part-hipped side gable and rear dormer with balustrade (to create rooms in roof)**

The Application

The application site is a semi-detached bungalow located on the north side of Manor Hall Road, Southwick. The property has a west side garage and a large rear extension, and is bounded to the east by the adjoining bungalow and to the west by a further semi-detached pair. The pair form the central bungalows within a set of three identical semi-detached pairs, all of which are hipped with long frontal protrusions. The bungalow two doors to the east at No.103 has recently added a part hipped gable ended extension to its west side with an enlarged rear extension and a rear dormer.
This application seeks permission to demolish the garage and erect a 2.3 metre wide and 7.7 metre deep single storey side extension in its place. The extension will have a part hipped gable end, an 8.4 metre wide rear dormer and a small pitched front protrusion, and will provide an enlarged ground floor kitchen with a master bedroom and ensuite in the roof space. The dormer will feature central double doors opening onto a small ballustraded balcony.

Consultations and Representations

Third Parties

No.29 Springate Road object on the grounds of overlooking and loss of privacy from the proposed rear dormer and ballustraded balcony.

No.31 Springate Road object on the grounds that the dormer is too bulky and out of character with the building and area, and will cause a loss of privacy to their rear garden.

Contributors

No representations have been received.

Relevant Planning Policies and Guidance

Adopted West Sussex Structure Plan 2001-2016 (WSCC 2005): LOC1, DEV1
Adopted Adur District Local Plan 1993-2006 (ADC 1996) (saved until adoption of the new Adur Development Plan): AG1, AH7 and Appendix 11 'Supplementary Planning Guidance' comprising: Development Control Standard No.3 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings'

Planning Assessment

Policies

Structure Plan policies seek to protect, and where possible, enhance the character and distinctiveness of an area, requiring high standards of design, layout and construction (DEV1). Policy AH7 of the Local Plan states that extensions and alterations should be designed so as not to result in an unacceptable degree of overlooking, a loss of natural light or an overbearing effect on neighbouring dwellings. They should be of sympathetic design and materials to the original dwelling and the area in general. The Council's Development Control Standard 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings' states that dormers should not project as far as the rear walls of a dwelling and should be proportioned such that a large amount of original roofspace is still visible. The enlargement of a hipped roof into a gable on a semi-detached property would not usually be looked upon favourably due to the lack of symmetry that would be resultant.

Visual Amenity

This proposal will involve the removal of a poor quality side garage in order to create the space into which to extend the property. The hip to part gable roof extension mirrors that approved at No.103 to the west however it noticeably unbalances the pair when viewed from the road. The flank wall will sit 0.9 metres from the boundary with No.105 to the west however this dwelling has four windows in this elevation serving kitchen, utility, bathroom and study/bedroom rooms. It is considered that the part gable end would serve to overdominate these windows and would look particularly awkward close to the hip end of No.105 and when compared to the other full hips on the surrounding bungalows. It is noted that the only other similar part gable end in the immediate area at No.103 was approved as it sits well off the side boundary with no properties adjoining the site to the west to impact on.
The side extension will sit forward of the main recessed building line (excluding the long front protrusions) by 1.4 metres in order to align the interior kitchen walls and will have a small hipped pitched roof above. As this segment is recessed between the protrusions of this dwelling and the neighbours at No.105 it will not be immediately apparent within the streetscene, however when viewed from the front it will appear a cluttered and awkward feature against an enlarged part gable roof and the existing protrusion.
The rear dormer, at 8.4 metres in width appears overly large in relation to the surrounding roofspace. Although it is set below the ridge line and off the rear

wall, it sits on the crest of the pitched faēade of the rear extension, thus appearing cramped and too bulky. The dormer doors appear to open onto a small balcony above the rear extension, an arrangement that could facilitate the use of the flat roof as a larger balcony and cause excessive overlooking of neighbouring gardens. The Council's DC Standard for dormers states that they should be located off ridge and wall lines and with a clear area of original roofspace in the surrounds. This dormer is too large in relation to the surrounding roofspace and is thus deemed not to meet this requirement.

Residential Amenity

The main impact will be on the neighbouring property, No.105. This identical semi-detached bungalow has four side windows that will face the extension, serving a kitchen, bathroom, study and bedroom. As stated above it is considered that the part gable end of the extension will serve to overdominate these windows with a separation of just 2.4 metres between the flank walls. To the rear both No's 29 and 30 Springate Road have objected on the grounds of loss of privacy from the rear dormer. This dormer will sit 17 metres from the rear boundary separating the properties and a total of 36 metres from the rear extension of No.29 Springate Road. The DC standards state that a distance of 22 metres should be retained between facing windows whilst garden depths should be a minimum of 11 metres to avoid overlooking. It is clear that this property comfortably exceeds these requirements and so any refusal on the grounds of overlooking would be unsupportable. The additional objection that the dormer is too bulky and out of character with the property and area has been agreed with in the above evaluation.

It is therefore considered that the combination of the hip to part gable roof extension, the small front kitchen extension, and the large dormer combine to create an extension that is excessively out of keeping with bungalow as current. It would also be inconsistent with the surrounding bungalows and thus detrimental to the streetscene, contrary to local plan policy AH7 and the accompanying DC Standard.

Recommendation

REFUSE on ground that :-

1. B5~~B~~CR

~~B5BR~~

Case Officer:.....

Date: 12/2/08

CH