Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/1027/19 Recommendation – APPROVE

Site: 9 Ravensbourne Close, Shoreham-by-Sea, BN43 6AD

Proposal: Proposed front dormer.

Date of site visit: 04.07.2019

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Site and Surroundings:
The application relates to semi-detached bungalow within a cul-de-sac which contains a mix of detached and semi-detached bungalows.

Works are currently under way implementing the previous planning approval for a porch next to the existing gable frontage facing onto the street; together with works to the roof under permitted development rights for a roof conversion.

The proposal seeks permission for a front dormer which has already been constructed. (It should be noted that section 73A of the Town & Country Planning Act 1990, allows the Local Planning Authority to determine applications for development carried out before the date of the application). The dormer has a hipped roof and is positioned on the west end of the front roofslope.

Consultations: None

Representations: Letters of objection from no.'s 1 and 4 Ravensbourne Close.

- Councils letter to residents arrived after the works had started
- I am astonished as the work for the dormer has started and would be finished but for the objections
- Have steps been taken to delay any further work until due process has been adhered to in line with democratic right
- Breach of planning laws if the Council advised the developers that they could commence works before advising nearby residents of the proposal
- Could compromise the adjoining semi-detached property
- My concerns are the design and appearance of the dormer, the appearance is out of character with the Close, and will produce an uneven lopsided aspect to the view of the frontage of no's 9 & 10

Response to representation:

As stated above, Section 73A of the Town & Country Planning Act 1990 allows for applications to be determined where the development has been carried out before the date of the application.

If a party undertakes work before gaining planning permission, they do so at their own risk.

Relevant Planning Policies

Adur Local Plan Policy 15
DC Standard No.2 SPG - Extensions and alterations to dwellings
National Planning Policy Framework (2019)
National Planning Practice Guidance

Planning Assessment
The proposal is acceptable in principle, subject to its effect on the visual amenities of the streetscene in general and the residential amenity of the neighbouring properties.

Visual Amenity

A site visit reveals that no. 5 Ravensbourne Close has a similar front dormer to the proposal, and no. 6 has a series of 5no. rooflights within their front roofslope. Further, there are other properties at the beginning of the Close (no.'s 4,6,8 & 10 Ravensbourne Avenue) that have dormers, these are actually rear dormers but are prominent within the visual amenities of the street, which is Ravensbourne Close.

At the time of the site visit, there were builders undertaking works to the roof, however, the main of these works are permitted development, and as such do not require planning permission to undertake them.

Whilst undertaking these works, the builders have constructed the small front dormer without the benefit of planning permission. However, it is not an offence to undertake building works without the relevant planning permission, it is unauthorised pending permission. Indeed the planning legislation has stated as such within the Town & Country Planning Act 1990.

It is not considered that the dormer will be out of keeping with the character and appearance of the Close given that there is already an existing small dormer relating to no. 5 that is satisfactorily integrated with the property. It is considered that the new dormer at no. 9 will integrate well within the new roof conversion and the streetscene.

Residential Amenity

The adjoining bungalow, no. 10 could be the most affected by the proposed dormer, but it is considered that as the resultant dormer will only have a window facing forward there will be no material overlooking of no. 10, and because of its location, on the roof, there will not be any overbearing or overshadowing to no. 10 that needs to be considered in this instance.

The property directly opposite the application site, no. 2, is located some 25m distant from no. 9, which in planning terms is considered to be of a distance not to result in unacceptable overlooking to that property.

Recommendation

APPROVE

1. Approved plans

Informative

1. Approved without amendment

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

Case Officer: Eve Hearsey Date: 07.08.2019

Authorised by: Peter Barnett Date: 12 August 2019