Expiry Date - 12-09-2017

Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: **Recommendation – APPROVE**
AWDM/1010/17

Site: **53 Downside Shoreham-By-Sea West Sussex**

Proposal: **Front dormer; alteration of fenestration to previously approved rear dormer and hip to gable roof enlargement under AWDM/0372/16**

Neighbours checked: Y
Additional neighbour notifications: /N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

The proposal is for:-

- a flat roof front dormer to measure 2 metres in height, 3.7 metres in length, and 3.1 metres in width
- a flat roof rear dormer to measure 6.6 metres in width, 2.5 metres in height, 4.5 metres in length
- Gable ends to existing hipped main roof, with resultant gabled roof to measure 3.6 metres in height, 11.3 metres in length, and 7.3 metres in width

The application property is a detached bungalow which has been extended by way of an unsightly side dormer. The building is part render, part exposed brick walls. There is an existing flat roof garage attached to its side. The land level of the application site drops from the highway so the buildings are set slightly lower than the highway. The surrounding area is residential in its character.

Relevant Planning History

AWDM/1602/15
Single-storey side extension and roof extension to raise ridge and form gable ends with rear dormer
Approved Conditionally 15-02-2016

AWDM/0429/17
Addition of first floor to create a two-storey house with rooms in the roof with rear dormer to south elevation and two rooflights to front (north) elevation
Withdrawn 11.04.2017

AWDM/0372/16
Formation of rooms in roof with hip to gable roof extensions to either side, raising of ridge, and rear flat roof dormer
Approved Conditionally 21.06.2016

Consultations
None

Representations
None

Relevant Planning Policies and Guidance
National Planning Policy Framework para 14
Saved Adur Local Plan policies: AG1, AH7
Emerging Adur Local Plan policies: 2, 15

Planning Assessment

Principle

Upgrading of residential accommodation is acceptable in principle

Visual amenity

Although the silhouette of the host dwelling would change significantly and the ridge would be raised, the development would still retain the scale of a bungalow building (albeit with a deeper and larger expanse of roof), mostly because the position of the eaves is unchanged. The new roof shape would not be untypical of a bungalow building nor out of character with the other various roof forms in the street (a 2-storey house and bungalow with a high ridge are either side of application site).

The suggested form of a gable ended bungalow with a greater width would not be alien to the existing character and appearance of the street scene, given there would be sufficient separation distance between buildings.

The new rear dormer is large and would visually dominate the rear roof slope. However the outer edge of the dormer is set in off the perimeter edge of the roof, and the fenestration would be similar to that on the existing bungalow. It would be partially visible from the street to the south (Greenways Crescent) as the buildings to the south are bungalows. However, it would be viewed against the existing backdrop of similar roof extensions and filtered by shrubs and trees in the domestic gardens. Therefore, the new dormer would not be so conspicuously harmful as to warrant refusal for that reason alone.

The front dormer is in proportion to the rest of front roof slope. Front dormers are the established feature of the street. Its window does not conform to the hierarchy of fenestration on the building, but this alone is not reason to refuse the application.

All the exterior materials and finishes would match the existing building. The design of the fenestration would be similar to the rest on the host dwelling.

It is worth acknowledging the existing side dormer is unsightly and its removal would be a visual betterment.

Residential amenity – effect on existing dwellings

It is the neighbours either side and at the rear who are principally impacted upon (it is physically removed from the remainder).

Neighbour at rear

There is already a degree of overlooking from the existing dormer which neighbours already experience. The separation distance between facing rear windows from the new rear dormer means invasive views would be filtered to avoid materially harmful loss of neighbour's privacy.

Given the substantial separation distance between the extension and the neighbouring building at the rear, no adverse overshadowing or overbearing would occur.

Neighbours to either side

The increased bulk and mass of the roof would reduce some outlook and light onto the neighbour. However the separation distance between the neighbouring buildings and extension flank is sufficient to ensure that, together with the low position of the eaves, the potential for adverse overbearing/overshadowing would be negated. The removal of the garage would benefit one of the neighbour's living conditions.

The removal of the existing dormer and ground floor fenestration would be betterment in terms of enhanced privacy for the neighbour. The single upper floor side glazing would serve a landing and is to be obscured and non-opening. Ground floor openings would be largely screened by existing boundary fencing. The rear dormer would introduce more overlooking but this would be oblique in nature onto neighbour's gardens rather than intrusive views into their private rooms.

Recommendation

APPROVE

Subject to Conditions:-

1. Standard time limit
2. Approved plans
3. Materials and finishes to match
4. Notwithstanding "pd" no windows/openings in side elevations (other than shown)
5. Upper floor glazing be fixed shut and obscure glazed

Informatives

1) The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by assessing the proposal against all material

considerations, including planning policies and any representations that may have been received and subsequently determining to grant planning permission 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? N

Case Officer signed: Matthew Porter Date: 12-09-2017

Authorised and signed by: Peter Barnett Date: 12 September 2017