**Expiry Date – 21/6 ppa to 11/7**

# Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

**Application Number: AWDM/0624/18 Recommendation – Grant**

**Site: 53 Underdown Road, Southwick**

**Proposal: Single-storey rear extension and front and rear dormers.**

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Date of Site Visit: 15/6/18

## Site and Surroundings

This application relates to a mid terraced Victorian house on the west side of Underdown Road in the established suburb of Southwick. The property is double storey bay fronted in a painted render finish under a tiled roof. It has a deep outrigger, typical of the terrace and small single storey rear addition off of it. There is off street parking for two cars on the front forecourt. The property has a long rear garden in excess of 23 metres in length. There is a backland bungalow, 49a, beyond.

Neighbours either side have front and rear dormer extensions.

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

## Proposal

The application has been revised since first submitted. Planning permission is now sought to replace a rear sun room off the outrigger and add 850mm to its length. The new roof height will be 3 metres high. Bi fold doors are proposed in the new side wall and rear wall. It is also proposed to convert the loft adding a large rear dormer and a modest pitched roof front dormer.

## Relevant Planning History

None.

## Consultations

None undertaken.

## Representations

No responses received to revised consultation. Objection received to original consultation from No. 49a – loss of privacy, increased overlooking.

**Relevant Planning Policies and Guidance**

The National Planning Policy Framework 2012
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.

Neighbour amenity

The ground floor rear extension is 4.1 metres deep but only 850mm deeper than the existing sun room. It will take the single storey extension out to the depth of the ground floor extension at No. 51. It increases the height to 3 metres, average. It is well removed from the boundary of No. 55. It will not be harmful to either neighbour.

The proposal also includes the installation of bi fold doors in the side wall of the extension. The shared boundary is 2 metres off the side wall of the extension and made up of fencing and trellising to a height of 2.15 metres. No. 55 has kitchen windows facing the boundary. It is not anticipated that significant overlooking will occur and that it is any worse than standing in this part of the garden.

Both neighbouring properties have roof extensions, including front dormers. The objector, 49a, is more than 30 metres from the rear dormer. It will not lead to excessive overlooking.

The roof extensions will not be harmful to neighbour amenity.

Character

There are many examples of box like rear dormers in the vicinity. Both adjoining properties also have front dormers as has No. 27. The front dormer at No. 51 is modest in appearance with a pitched roof. The revised front dormer proposed is based on this design. The revised scheme is acceptable in terms of character and appearance. The rear dormer could be constructed under permitted development.

**Recommendation APPROVE** subject to the following conditions:

1. Approved Plans
2. 3 years
3. Materials to Match

***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 any representations? Y.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Case Officer signed: | MOK | Date: 10.7.18 |
| Authorised and signed by: | Peter Barnett | Date: 10 July 2018 |