Development Management – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/0577/17 Recommendation – APPROVE

Site: 90 Hillrise Avenue, Sompting, Lancing

Proposal: Rooms in roof with side hip to gable roof extension, rear dormer to east elevation and front dormer and rooflight to west elevation.

Date of site visit: 16.05.17

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Site, Surroundings and Proposal

The application relates to a semi-detached bungalow which is sited at the top of Hillrise Avenue where the road terminates. The pair of semi-detached bungalows are currently hipped and the northern most of the pair no. 92 has a rear flat roof dormer.

Consent is sought for a hip to gable extension with flat roof rear and front dormer. The rear dormer was reduced in width following a request from officers that is was overly large and close to the southern side of the roof. The rear dormer as amended is 5.6 metres wide, 2.5 metres high and 3.5 metres in depth.

The front dormer is 3.7 metres wide, 1.5 metres high and 2 metres in depth. A request was made initially to the applicant's agent to position the flat roof dormer more centrally on the roof slope. A concern was expressed by officers, following a further site visit it was considered that the front dormer as submitted was acceptable on balance and could be supported as set out below.

Consultations:

Sompting Parish Council: - Support for the application.

Representations: None received.

Relevant Planning Policies

Saved Local Plan policies (ADC 1996): AG1, AH7
Development Control Standard No.3 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings'
Adur Submission Local Plan Policy 16 (2016)
National Planning Policy Framework (CLG 2012)
National Planning Practice Guidance

Planning Assessment

There is no objection in principle to the proposed extensions and alterations 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

Although the hip to gable extension will unbalance the symmetry between the pair of semi-detached bungalows, this form of development is common place within the street scene and comprises of works which can be carried out under permitted development. In the light of the current street scene and other examples of hip to gable extensions it is not considered that such development would warrant a refusal in this case.

It is acknowledged that the rear dormer is large. It is however to the rear of the bungalow and not prominently visible within the street scene. It replicates the proportions of the existing rear dormer at no. 92. Its reduction from the southern side of the roof improves its position within the roof slope. There are other examples of similar scale dormers within the locality. The bungalows within Hillrise Avenue and the surrounding area show examples of extensions and alterations to roof forms no dissimilar to that proposed here.

The front dormer will be clearly visible within the street scene. Other front dormers are visible to the south of the site within Hillrise Avenue. Officers initially requested that the proposed front dormer be amended to be more centrally located within the roof slope and in scale with the ground floor window. The applicant's agent did not wish to make such amendments and a further site visit was carried out. It was concluded that on balance the proposed front dormer could be supported. Although it is acknowledged that to reduce the size of the dormer move it down and align with the existing ground floor window would be preferable. Yet there are other dormers to the south of the site which do not align with the ground floor and are not centrally positioned. There is no uniform style of dormers here to match or to set a precedent. Other proposals for front dormers have also been permitted within the vicinity of the site, for example AWDM/1406/16 at Trotters, Hillbarn Avenue.

Further justification for such a development can also be made due to the position of the bungalow being at the top of the road in a less prominent site which the front dormer would not be overly visible within the wider area. Other properties to the south with front dormers are much more prominent. On balance the harm caused is not significant to justify a refusal in this case.

The plans initially sought to clad the roof with Cedral cladding to give a contemporary appearance. Officers considered that this could not be supported in the light of this being a semi-detached bungalow. The differing use of materials would not relate sympathetically to the existing property or its attached neighbour. Materials to match are proposed on the amended plans and a condition secures this.

Residential Amenity

The proposed hip to gable extension and front and rear dormer do not result in any loss of light, privacy or overbearing impact to any adjacent occupiers. Roof

extensions which overlook neighbours at first floor exist within this street and surrounding area and overlooking to this degree is commonplace here. It would not be such to warrant a refusal in this case.

Recommendation

APPROVE

1. time limit
2. materials to match
3. Approved plans

Informative

1. Proactive, amendment

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

Case Officer: Hannah Barker Date: 12th June 2017

Authorised by: Jo Morin Date: 14.06.2017