Expiry Date – 9/8

Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/0952/19 Recommendation – Refuse

Site: 3 Tarragon Way, Shoreham

Proposal: **Roof alterations including raising the ridge and rear dormer.**

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Date of Site Visit: 18/9

Site and Surroundings

This application relates to a semi detached house on the west side of Tarragon Way, which shares a junction with the Upper Shoreham Road. Built as one of 5 pairs of identical semis in the 1970's these properties sit well back from the road. They are simple red brick houses under shallow clay tiled gabled roofs with tile hanging front detail.

The site is not in a conservation area and is not listed.

Proposal

Because of the shallowness of these roofs it is not possible to create accommodation in the roofspace without lifting the ridge height. A height increase of 650mm is shown. In addition a large rear dormer is proposed.

Relevant Planning History

AWDM/0904/19 - Householder application for permitted development for prior approval for single-storey extension to rear of property measuring 4m from rear wall of the original house, maximum height 3.7m and height of eaves of the extension 2.57m. Prior Approval Not Required. 2.7.19

AWDM/1161/13 - Construction of single storey rear extension. Granted 27.11.13

Consultations

None underatken

Representations

None received.

Relevant Planning Policies and Guidance

The National Planning Policy Framework 2019
Adur Local Plan 2017 Policies 1, 2 and 15 including 'Development Management Standard No. 2 Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings'.

Planning Assessment

Principle

The principle of development can be supported as it upgrades a dwelling within the built up area boundary. For consideration is the impact of the proposals on the character and appearance of the area and the impacts of the development on neighbour amenity.

Character

Policy 15 of the adopted Adur Local Plan: 'Quality of the Built Environment and Public Realm' states:

'Development should be of a high architectural quality and respect and enhance the character of the site, and the prevailing character of the area, in terms of proportion, form, context, massing, siting, layout, density, height, size, scale, materials, detailed design features and landscaping. Development should:

- *Enhance the local environment by way of its appearance and character, with particular attention being paid to the architectural form, height, materials, density, scale, orientation, landscaping and layout of the development;*
- *Make a positive contribution to the sense of place, local character and distinctiveness of an area; and not have an unacceptable impact on adjacent properties, particularly residential dwellings, including unacceptable loss of privacy, daylight/sunlight, outlook or open amenity space;*

Adopted Development Management Standard No. 2 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings' includes the following pargraphs:

The appearance

2.5 The most important basic principle is that any extension should be in keeping with the appearance, scale, design and character of both the existing dwelling and the street scene generally. An extension which is acceptable in a low density modern development may not be acceptable in a town centre location. In particular, the proposal should not be allowed to over-dominate the house or clash with its appearance.

2.6 The following principles should also help to ensure that he criteria discussed able are met:

- Extensions should generally respect the architectural period and style of the existing dwelling and the area.
- External construction materials should usually match in colour and texture the materials of the existing dwelling.

Dormers and Roof extensions

3.11 Rear dormers and other roof alterations like hip-to-gable extensions may be able to be carried out as permitted development. Where permission is required, they should not be so large that they over-dominate the dwelling, resulting in a top heavy "box-like" appearance. They should be kept well below the ridge level of the existing roof and should not project as far as the walls of the house. A large amount of the original roof should still be clearly visible. Where the existing roof space is of inadequate size to accommodate the room(s) proposed without adding very large flat-roofed dormers, permission will not normally be granted.

3.14 Where permission is required, roof extensions should respect the scale, character and appearance of existing dwellings.
The cumulative effect of a combined roof extension and dormers is unlikely to be acceptable since the resulting works would probably be out of scale and proportion with the original dwelling.'

Raising the ridge of this semi detached house would unbalance this pair of houses and as a consequence would be harmful to their appearance. It would also set an unacceptable precedent for the other 4 pairs of semi's built at the same time and houses elsewhere. It does not respect local character and would not contribute to local distinctiveness. It would be an anomalous alteration.

The rear dormer is large and relies on the increased ridge height.

Neighbours.

The rear of this property faces the flank wall of No. 182 Upper Shoreham Road at a distance of 21 metres. Other neighbouring houses in Tarragon Way already overlook one another from first floor windows. The roof extension will not be harmful to neighbour amenity.

Recommendation REFUSE for the following reason:

The proposed roof alteration would by reason of its form and design, represent an incongruous and visually discordant addition to the streetscene harmful to the character of this pair of semi detached houses, the wider area and local distinctiveness. As such the proposal is considered contrary to policy 15 of the Adur Local Plan, adopted Development Management Standard No. 2 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Informative

The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by identifying matters of concern with the proposal and discussing those with the Applicant. However, the issues are so fundamental to the proposal that it has not been possible to negotiate a satisfactory way forward and due to the harm which

has been clearly identified within the reason(s) for the refusal, approval has not been possible.Is recommendation contrary to any representations?

Case Officer signed:	MOK	Date: 2.8.19
Authorised and signed by:	Jo Morin	Date: 05.08.2019