Expiry Date - 14/11/2024

Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/1199/24 **Recommendation – APPROVE**

Site: **4 Aster Vale Worthing West Sussex BN13 3FT**

Proposal: **Proposed new rear gable dormer (west) replacing existing triple rooflight**

Date of site visit: 30/10/24

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Site and Surroundings

The site is located to the west side of Aster Vale, a recently constructed estate within the planning boundary for Worthing. The property comprises an end of terrace two storey house within a small terrace of three. The building has brick elevations, white UPVC windows and a tiled pitched roof. The property is set back from the road behind parking spaces to the frontage. There is a small garden to the rear of about 7.3m deep and a parking area and garages to the rear of the garden.

The property is not within a conservation area, is not a listed building and there are no protected trees on site.

Proposal

Planning permission is sought for the replacement of three roof lights to the rear elevation with a pitched roof dormer.

The dormer would measure approximately 1.7m wide by 2.2m high and 3.15m deep and be finished in lead cladding with a tiled roof. The dormer would serve a bedroom at loft level.

The application has been amended to slightly reduce the size of the proposed rear dormer so that it exactly matches the dimensions of the front dormer approved under AWDM/0400/23, which has already been installed at the property. The proposed dormer would also match the design, form and materials of the front dormer.

Relevant Planning History:

AWDM/0400/23 - Proposed loft conversion consisting of front (East) gable dormer and roof lights to the front (East) and rear (West) elevations – Approved

AWDM/0582/22 - Proposed loft conversion consisting new front gable dormer (east) and rear box dormer (west) – Refused (due to rear dormer) – Dismissed at appeal.

AWDM/0575/22 - Application for Certificate of Lawfulness for construction of proposed rear box dormer to west elevation and loft conversion – Application Returned – Not permitted development as PD rights removed.

Consultations:

None required

Representations:

Four representations in support of the application:

- Dormer similar to others on road, would not look out of place, in keeping within the design of other houses on the estate.
- I understand that the reason previously was due to other properties being overlooked. This is a housing estate where families live in close communities, no matter where you are on this estate you're going to be close to other residents. We as neighbours back onto to 4 aster vale and we thoroughly support this.

One objection received due to:

- Not in keeping with adjoining properties

Relevant Planning Policies

Worthing Local Plan policies (WBC 2023): SP1, DM5
National Planning Policy Framework (DLUHC 2023)
National Planning Practice Guidance
SPG 'Extending or Altering Your Home' (WBC)

Planning Assessment

There is no objection in principle to extensions and alterations to residential dwellings within the built-up area. The key considerations are the effects on the visual and residential amenities of the locality.

Visual Amenity

The proposed rear dormer would match the existing front dormer in form, dimensions, design and materials. The front dormer was previously approved as this was considered to reflect other development elsewhere in the locality.

The current proposal differs significantly to the refused scheme dismissed at appeal under application AWDM/0582/22 which was for a large box dormer of

around 5.2m wide. This dormer was refused in relation to visual amenity for the following reason:

1. The proposed rear dormer due to its scale, design, bulk, form and position would be clearly visible in the street scene resulting in an alien, intrusive and dominant form of development that fails to reflect the prevailing character of the surrounding area, diminishing and diluting the original design of the estate and appearing as an uncharacteristic, visually discordant and incongruous addition to the property that would cause significant harm to the visual amenities of the locality. The proposal is therefore contrary to saved Policy H16 of the Worthing Local Plan, Policy 16 of the Worthing Core Strategy, Policy DM5 of the Draft Submission Local Plan (As Modified), Supplementary Planning Guidance 'Extending or altering your home' and the policies of the revised National Planning Policy Framework.

The proposed small gabled dormer to the rear would address the above concerns due to a substantial reduction in scale and bulk, a significantly improved design and form that reflects existing dormers in the area and on the application property and in terms of position, would no longer extend the full width of the property to the rear or dominate the roofscape. Whilst the proposed dormer would still be visible from some viewpoints (predominantly from the car park to the rear) the reduced scale of the dormer would limit its impact in the street scene and would not be considered an alien or intrusive addition and would not detract from the character of the area.

There would be no significant harm to the visual amenities of the locality as a result of this application.

Residential Amenity

The most affected properties are the neighbours opposite the site, to the rear at No.14 and 16 Sunflower Street and to the north side at No.6 Celandine Road

The previous rear dormer application AWDM/0582/22 was refused due to its impact on residential amenity due to the following reasons:

2. The proposed dormer due to its scale, form, position and close proximity to No.6 Celandine Road would appear dominant and oppressive in outlook and overbearing to the occupiers of this property, representing an intrusive form of development and having a significant and highly detrimental impact on neighbour amenity. The proposal is therefore contrary to saved Policies H16 and H18 of the Worthing Local Plan, Policy 16 of the Worthing Core Strategy, Policy DM5 of the Draft Submission Local Plan (As Modified), Supplementary Planning Guidance 'Extending or altering your home' and the policies of the revised National Planning Policy Framework.

3. The addition of a dormer window to the rear would provide elevated views of the rear gardens of No.14 and 16 Sunflower Street and exacerbate existing levels of overlooking to an unacceptable level, resulting in a loss of privacy for these occupants and having a detrimental impact on their amenity. The

proposal is therefore contrary to saved Policies H16 and H18 of the Worthing Local Plan, Policy 16 of the Worthing Core Strategy, Policy DM5 of the Draft Submission Local Plan (As Modified), Supplementary Planning Guidance 'Extending or altering your home' and the policies of the revised National Planning Policy Framework.

Reason for refusal 2 is considered to have been overcome as the proposed dormer is positioned further away from the edge of the roof, both to the side and from eaves level and is significantly reduced in scale. A gable dormer of the scale proposed is not considered to appear dominant or oppressive in outlook to the occupiers of No.6 Celandine Road.

Reason for refusal 3 of AWDM/0582/22 concerned overlooking and loss of privacy to No.14 and 16 Sunflower Street due to the elevated views of the rear gardens of these properties. The Inspectors decision concluded that;

The proposed rear dormer would lead to additional windows at higher level, allowing new and more elevated views towards houses. This increase in windows would lead to a material loss of privacy, as well as an appreciable perception of more overlooking in the area. This impact upon the living conditions of existing occupants would be combined with an increase in massing at high level which, with the close spacing of houses and gardens, would be dominant to outlook for properties.

The situation on site now is different to that which existed at the time of this decision. Four roof lights were added to the rear elevation utilising permitted development rights and following a revised application (for a front dormer) in 2023. Therefore there are at present existing openings (roof lights) to the rear which have already introduced opportunities for overlooking at this level and although due to the angle of roof lights these views are more restricted than from a standard window, the fact that there are now windows at this level is a material consideration. The identified impact in relation to Reason 3, was previously compounded by the mass of the large box dormer that was considered dominant in outlook and would increase the perception of overlooking. The current proposal is for a much smaller gable dormer with only 2 small windows and this would not result in the same oppressive outlook or level of overlooking that would have occurred as a result of the large box dormer.

By virtue of the fact that rooflights were installed under permitted development and therefore there are existing openings at roof level, a small dormer such as that proposed would not significantly alter the current situation in terms of the potential for overlooking.

No objections have been received from neighbours to the rear

The revised proposal for a small gable dormer to the rear to replace the existing rooflights to the same elevation is not considered to have a significant detrimental impact on the residential amenities of adjacent occupiers.

Expiry Date - 14/11/2024

Recommendation

APPROVE subject to Conditions:-

1. Drawing Numbers
2. Standard time limit
3. Materials as specified
4. Rear dormer to match existing front dormer at property

Informative

The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by identifying matters of concern within the application (as originally submitted) and negotiating, with the Applicant, acceptable amendments to the proposal to address those concerns. As a result, the Local Planning Authority has been able to grant planning permission for an acceptable proposal, in accordance with the presumption in favour of sustainable development, as set out within the National Planning Policy Framework.

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

Case Officer: Amanda Haslett Date: 12/11/24

Authorised by: Jo Morin Date: 13.11.2024