PC ~~21/8/08~~
Expiry
15/9/08

Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: ADC/0369/08 **Recommendation – Refuse Application**

Site: **19 Erringham Road Shoreham-by-Sea West Sussex BN43 5NQ**

Proposal: **Front dormers and Juliet balconies on rear dormers (amendment to ADC/0065/08)**

The Application

The application property is a detached two storey house occupying a position on the inside bend on the south side of Erringham Road, opposite its junction with The Avenue. There is hard standing at the front and an existing flat roof garage to the side of the property.

There is a previous permission for various extensions and alterations which was granted in April 2003, (SU/51/03). This comprises a first floor addition on the north-west side above the existing flat-roofed garage/rear utility room, plus a single storey rear extension 9.2 metres wide and 1.3 metres deep with a lean-to roof and rear conservatory.

Following this application a further development was permitted in March 2008 (ADC/0065/08) to raise the ridge height by 1 metre and extend it over the proposed first floor extension on the north-west side (above the existing flat-roof). Permission was granted for the resultant roof space to be converted, with proposed rear dormers and velux windows to the front. The application as originally submitted sought permission for two pitched roof front dormers and two larger pitched roof rear dormers with Juliet balconies. The plans were amended prior to approval being given as it was considered that the dormers to the front were out of keeping and unsympathetic to the street scene and existing building and the rear dormers were overly large and dominated the roof slope.

The current application seeks permission to amend the prior consent as previously submitted to include the front and rear dormers. The front dormers are 1.3 metres wide, with a maximum height of 1.5 metres. The rear dormers are1.8 metres wide with a maximum height of 2.5 metres. The dormers meet the ridge height.

Consultations and Representations

Third Parties: - One letter of objection from 9 The Avenue

- Front dormers were turned down by committee.
- Applicant has gone back to original plans.

- Design would spoil the character and appearance of the area.
- Previous objection still stands.
- Spoil the approach to Old Shoreham

Relevant Planning Policies and Guidance

Adopted West Sussex Structure Plan 2001-2016 (WSCC 2005) (saved policies): LOC1, DEV1
Adopted Adur District Local Plan 1993-2006 (ADC 1996) (saved policies): AG1, AH7 and Appendix II 'Supplementary Planning Guidance' comprising: Development Control Standard No. 3 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings.'
PPS1 'Delivering Sustainable Development' (ODPM 2005)

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.

Government policy is set out in Planning Policy Statement PPS1 'Delivering Sustainable Development'. Relevant paragraphs are 17, which refers to the commitment to protecting and improving the environment; 18 which states that planning should seek to maintain and improve the local environment and help to mitigate the effects of declining environmental quality through positive policies on issues such as design; and 34 which states that good resign is indivisible from good planning and that design which is inappropriate in its context, or which fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area, should not be accepted.

This application is for an amendment to the previously approved scheme ADC/0065/08, the only matter for consideration in this case is the proposed front and rear dormers which differ from the previously approved plans. The plans are as originally submitted under the previous application however amendments were sought by officers and it was considered that the removal of the front dormers and reduction in size of the rear dormers was necessary to allow the application to be supported.

Residential Amenity

The proposed rear dormers are shown with glazed doors with balustrades. Due to their greater height they give a wider angle of view than the existing first floor windows over the rear of the adjacent properties.

The front dormers however are smaller and due to the distance of the properties to the north of the site on the other side of the road there is not considered to be any over looking or loss of privacy to these properties.

Visual Amenity

The proposed increase in height and width of the building plus front and rear dormers, would increase the mass and prominence of the building and, due to the sloping ground, the height would exceed that of the directly adjacent properties. The general increase in height and scale as a result of the previously approved extensions is considered to be acceptable in this case and not excessive. However the proposed front dormers combined with the rear dormers add to the effect of height and bulk of the building and would be too dominant and are therefore considered to be detrimental to the character and appearance of the existing building and surrounding build environment.

It is acknowledged that permission was granted for a rear dormer with balustrade at Durhamside to the west of the site, ADC/0151/07. However this proposal was for a rear flat roof dormer with one Juliet balcony. It did not include the raising of the ridge height and the overall height of the doors was 1.7 metres as opposed to 2 metres in this case. The current case is also a more prominent location and would be more so due to the combination of the increased ridge height, and front and rear dormers. The proposal is therefore unacceptable and the previously approved development does not set a precedent in this case.

Recommendation

REFUSE on ground that :-

B2R – amended – The proposed front and rear dormers are unacceptable in that they do not relate sympathetically in design, form and scale with the existing character of the locality and would be detrimental to the residential amenities of the adjacent dwellings, therefore conflicting with the policies of the approved West Sussex Structure Plan (CH1, DEV1) and the Adur District Local Plan (AG1, AH7)

Case Officer..... JBaker .....Date... 22/8/08

PB 22/8/08