Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/1458/16 Recommendation – APPROVE

Site: 200 Old Shoreham Road, Shoreham-by-Sea, BN43 5TE

Proposal: Room in roof with inverted dormer and balcony to front, west elevation.

Date of site visit: 20.10.2016

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Site and Surroundings

The application relates to 2 storey semi-detached residential property, situated next to the end of a run of terrace and split terrace properties. The rear garden, directly abuts the designated 'Old Shoreham Conservation Area'. The neighbouring site to the north is the 'Amsterdam' Public House, a Listed Building. To the rear of the site is a terrace of 2 storey residential cottages with small rear gardens, the middle 2no. (no.'s 461 and 463 Upper Shoreham Road), directly abut the application sites rear boundary.

Opposite the site directly to the west of the Old Shoreham Road, lies the River Adur, and directly to the west of the river, lies Shoreham Airport.

The site property itself is a modest sized dwelling with a modest sized garden which has a triangular end to it. The windows of the application site have been renewed to horizontal sliding opening windows. The front garden area has been gravelled, and there is an existing vehicular access from Old Shoreham Road

The neighbouring property, no. 198, has many brick sheds within the rear garden, vastly limiting the amount of usable garden area. It also has a single storey rear extension up to the side boundary with no. 200

Proposal

Permission is sought for an inverted dormer to the front roofslope. The new inverted dormer will comprise 3 no. rooflights within the existing roofslope, positioned above the larger of the first floor windows. Directly below the 3no. rooflights, and at an angle to them, will be a 3no. opening windows.

The inverted dormer will be contained within the existing floor area of the former loft, which will be converted into a bedroom.

To the front of the inverted dormer would be a glazed safety screen across the front and to each of the sides. This screen will be directly off of the roof proper. The front safety screen will measure approx. 2.4m wide x 1.1m high.

The side triangle sections of the safety screens will measure approx. 1.2m wide x 1.1m high.

Consultations:

Southern Water:
Require an informative to any approval:-

"A formal application for connection to the public sewerage system is required in order to service this development, plese contact Southern Water, Sparrowgrove House, Sparrowgrove, Otterbourne, Hampshire SO21 2SW (Tel: 0330 303 0119) or www.southernwater.co.uk". & "Any sewer found during construction works, the applicant is advised to call Southern Water to discuss.

Representations: Objections received from 459 Upper Shoreham Road; 461/463 Upper Shoreham Road; and 198 Old Shoreham Road.

- Not aesthetically in keeping with surrounding properties
- The front balcony will be more than obvious and not out of keeping
- The window in the rear extension will totally overlook my and neighbouring gardens, listed cottages and sheltered housing. Loss of privacy
- Concerns over the use of steel beams onto my property. Will the Party Wall Act etc. need to be applied?
- Will create a 3 storey edifice totally overlooking my property, looking into back windows and gardens, compounded by the floor length windows and the Juliet balcony
- The rear dormer will be excessively large and out of character
- Note that there is a large dormer some 8 properties down, but this has been there a long time and was probably permitted development
- Bad planning from the past should not form a precedent for further inappropriate development
- The plans still show a Juliet balcony on the rear dormer this is not permitted by the General Permitted Development Order which states that balconies
- Your letter to me has not allayed my concerns regarding the rear dormer, and I do not see that the dormer has been amended
- The applicants have created a mix and match application with the western dormer needing planning permission and the rear dormer relying on permitted development
- Concern if you permit the application you will be tacitly agreeing that both have planning approval. Were this approval given you and we will not have a leg to stand on should we need to evoke Planning Enforcement at a later dated. For the avoidance of doubt the plans should be treated separately

Relevant Planning Policies

Saved Local Plan policies (ADC 1996): AG1, AH7
Development Control Standard No.3 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings'
Submission Adur Local Plan 2016: P2, P15

National Planning Policy Framework (CLG 2012)
National Planning Practice Guidance

Planning Assessment

There is no objection in principle to the proposed inverted dormer which would upgrade an existing property within an established residential area. The key concerns are the effects on the residential and visual amenities of the locality.

Visual Amenity

The proposed inverted dormer to the front roofslope is largely contained within the existing roof, with the only external extension being the glazed safety balcony. The fact that the balcony will be glazed will limit its visual impact on the street scene.

The external platform of the balcony will be a floorspace that has been gained from the internal roof attic area, and the same situation will occur with regard to the vertical opening windows which will be positioned below the 3no. rooflights. Therefore, whilst persons can stand on this new platform area, the roof itself will act as a partial screen to the users.

In order to allow persons to be able to step onto the new platform, the 3no. rooflights will open outwards to form a horizontal 'roof'. Rooflights, and their openings, have become a common feature within roofslopes on residential properties, and the manner of the proposed rooflights opening is not uncommon.

It is considered that the inverted dormer to the front roofslope will thereby not result in a form of development which would give rise to demonstrable harm onto the character of the area in general or the neighbouring properties, including the Listed Building of the Amsterdam and neighbouring Conservation Area.

It should be noted that in order for the new 2nd floor bedroom to be constructed of the size indicated, the applicant will be constructing a large, flat roof, rear dormer. This dormer would have large patio sized windows with a Juliet balcony across them. This dormer and its associated Juliet balcony are to be constructed under 'Permitted Development' rights, and therefore are not being considered as part of this application.

For clarity, the fact that the rear dormer is shown on the plans is for information purposes only. Any permission granted under this application will be fore the front inverted dormer only.

Any grant of planning permission will not invalidate any future Enforcement of planning regulations if there is a need.

Residential Amenity

The new front inverted dormer will not result in unacceptable harm onto the neighbouring property no. 298 Old Shoreham Road. Indeed whilst users of the inverted dormer would be able to see to the sides of the inverted dormer,

because the front garden of the neighbouring property is largely a car parking area, and not a private garden area, no material harm would result.

Neighbouring properties have written in to express their concerns regarding the rear dormer and their existing residential amenities, however, as the rear dormer is to be constructed under 'permitted development' rights, the Local Planning Authority do not have any control over the rear roof dormer extension in any manner whatsoever.

Recommendation

APPROVE subject to the following conditions

1. Approved plans
2. Standard time limit
3. Any future change of design or materials of the front balcony screen will need to be agreed, in writing, by the LPA on an application in that behalf.

Informative

1. Approved following amendment
2. It should be noted that the rear dormer to no. 200 Old Shoreham Road, shown on the submitted plans for completeness, is identified as being constructed under permitted development rights, and therefore does not form part of this permission

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

Case Officer: Eve Hearsey Date: 08.12.2016

Authorised by: Jo Morin Date: 12.12.2016