Development Management - Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/0165/22 Recommendation – APPROVE

Site: **55 Hill Farm Way, Southwick**

Proposal: **Rear dormer window with juliette balcony plus roof alterations including raising of the roof ridge and proposed front dormer, single storey rear extension.**

Date of site visit: 21st March 2022

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

The application site is a semi detached bungalow within a street of similar properties within a residential area of Southwick. The ground level increases to the east and the design of the bungalow is staggered with its attached neighbour which is at a higher level. The application site is slightly set forward and the neighbouring ridge is higher, there are similar examples replicated on adjacent pairs of bungalows on both sides of the road with variation in heights, projection and overall building design.

Plans were originally submitted for a rear single storey extension with first floor rear extension above, including the raising of the ridge and front dormer. Officer's could not support the proposals as the first floor addition to the bungalow represented over development and a bulky detrimental feature which would be out of keeping with the existing bungalow and street scene. Amended plans were therefore received which showed the first floor addition removed and a rear dormer with juliet balcony to the rear, front dormer and a single storey extension (increased in size from that previously submitted.)

Consultations

South Downs National Park Authority: - No comment

Representations

Representations received from the owner/occupier of no. 57 Hill Farm Way: -

Original Plans: - The extension would block light from rear bedroom and patio, Overlooking from first floor windows, loss of privacy, roof excessively high, plans should be more sympathetic to the area.

Amended Plans: - The Party Wall Agreement would be required. The revised plans show the ground floor rear extension to come further out than the original plan; this would block light from the rear bedroom. To retain privacy in the garden I would suggest obscure glass to the north facing dormer windows.

Relevant Planning Policies

Adur Local Plan 2017 Policy 15
'Supplementary Planning Guidance' comprising: Development Management Standard No.2 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings''
National Planning Policy Framework (July 2021)
WSCC Guidance on Parking at New Developments (Sept 2020).

Planning Assessment

Principle

The relevant issues are the effects on the amenities of neighbouring residential occupiers and the effect on the character and appearance of the area.

Visual amenity

The raising of the ridge by approximately 0.7 metres will increase the height of the bungalow however when viewed within the street scene the 'step' between the ridge on the application site and the attached bungalow will still exist. There is some variation in the street scene and as the ridge will not increase beyond the height of the neighbour this change is considered acceptable. The front flat roof dormer will also be clearly visible within the street scene. There are other examples nearby of large flat roof front dormers and rear dormers are also visible. This will therefore not be to the detriment of the existing built environment and could not be resisted in this case.

The rear dormer will cut through the new eaves, due to the raising of the ridge and eaves height. This is not considered to be of concern and the dormer is limited to the rear roof slope and does not extend beyond the original rear wall of the bungalow. The single storey extension proposed is shown increased in depth from that originally submitted. It is however considered to be subservient to the main dwelling and does not represent over development. The juliette balcony proposed is not considered to be visually harmful in this case. It will be visible from the National Park however the proposed works represent reasonable development within the context of the existing bungalow in keeping in scale and a vast improvement on the original scheme. There are other similar developments within the street scene.

Tile hung dormers are proposed with tiles to match the existing roof. The rear extension is proposed to be rendered. This is considered acceptable in this case.

Residential amenity

The main properties to be affected by the proposed development are those either side of the site. The front dormer and raising of the ridge will be visible from the properties opposite however there will be no increased overlooking than already exists and the ridge height increase will have no impact from the opposite side of the highway.

To the west is the neighbouring bungalow at a lower ground level with a double driveway in between separating the properties. Although the extension is deep and the side wall will be visible from the rear garden adjacent, due to the distance inbetween it is not considered that the extension will result in a significant loss of light or overbearing impact which would warrant a refusal in this case. There is a side kitchen window proposed facing toward the driveways. Although there is a boundary fence it does appear that the window will partially exceed the height of the fence and there may be some unneighbourly impact. However due to the spacing between the properties and this window not facing directly into adjacent windows this on balance is acceptable. Views into the neighbouring property will be oblique and limited.

To the east is the attached neighbour; this property is at a higher level than the application site and has an existing rear extension adjacent to the boundary of the site. The proposed extension will extend 2.2 metres beyond the rear of the neighbouring extension. Although the extension is large at 6.3 metres it is not considered that the depth in relation to the adjacent development would warrant a refusal in this case. Development Management Standards state that an adjacent extension could go beyond the rear of a neighbouring attached property by 3.5 metres. In this case it is 2.2 metres, therefore the single storey extension can be supported, despite the neighbouring objection, as the impact is not considered to be harmful as a result of its lower height and limited projection beyond the neighbouring extension. Reasonable garden area will remain.

There is also concern with regards to overlooking as a result of the rear dormer. It is noted that no overlooking currently occurs to the rear garden due to the single storey nature of the properties, however it would be difficult to resist the rear dormer in terms of overlooking. Generally a rear dormer can be built on a bungalow under permitted development resulting in first floor windows facing down adjacent gardens. Consequently, in this case a refusal could not be warranted on this basis.

Recommendation

APPROVE

Subject to Conditions:-

1. Approved Plans
2. Standard 3 year time limit
3. Materials to match with white render to the rear extension.
4. No additional windows on east or west side elevation.
5. No use of flat roof as a terrace

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

1. Proactive with amendments

Case Officer: Hannah Barker Date: 10th May 2022

Authorised by: Peter Barnett Date: 10 May 2022