Development Management - Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/0616/15 **Recommendation –** Approve

Site: 15 Bowness Avenue, Sompting, Lancing

Proposal: Dormers to east and west roof slopes and rear extension

Date of site visit: 16.07.2015

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: Y (Additional plans – Proposed Elevations & Revised First Floor Plan – 10 days)

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

The site relates to a detached bungalow located on the south side of Bowness Avenue. This is a predominantly residential area comprising of a mix of semi-detached and detached bungalows in the immediate vicinity of the site. St Peters Church and its lawn frontage is located opposite the site, on the corner with Arnside Close.

Three applications have been submitted on this site within the two years. Planning permission was granted in September 2013 for a single storey extension to the rear to replace existing conservatory (AWDM/0756/13 relates). A certificate of lawfulness for proposed dormers to the east, west and south of the existing roof was issued in June 2014 (AWDM/0490/14 relates). Planning permission was granted in February 2015 for a single storey rear extension incorporating hip to gable roof extension and proposed dormers to east and west elevation (AWDM/1738/14 relates). Following a further visit to the site it is noted that none of the extensions have been constructed.

This application is a revision to the scheme previously granted planning permission under AWDM/1738/14 and similarly seeks planning permission for dormers to east and west roof slopes and a rear extension incorporating accommodation within the pitched roof space. The main changes in comparison to the previous scheme comprise the following:

- Two smaller dormer extensions would be located further back within the western roof slope of the bungalow. Each would measure 3 metres in length, 3 metres in depth and 2.6 metres in height.
- One larger dormer would be located further back within the eastern roof slope of the bungalow. The dormer would measure 7 metres in length, 3 metres in depth and 2.6 metres in height.
- The proposed rear extension would increase in depth from 5 metres to 5.5 metres.

Consultations

Sompting Parish Council has objected to this proposal on the basis that the development would be out of scale and out of character to the existing dwelling and neighbouring properties. The Parish Council also considers that the development would be contrary to the character and appearance of the street scene.

Representations

One letter of representation has been received from the occupier of 14 Carnforth Road who has queried whether there would still be a first floor window in the rear elevation of the extension. The neighbour previously raised concerns on application AWDM/1738/14 regarding the potential overlooking from the first floor southerly facing window in the extension into their conservatory and rear garden.

Relevant Planning Policies

Adopted Adur District Local Plan 1993-2006 (ADC 1996) (saved policies): AG1, AH7 and Appendix 11 ‘Supplementary Planning Guidance’ comprising: Development Control Standard No.3 ‘Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings’ National Planning Policy Framework (CLG 2012)

Planning Assessment

There is no objection in principle to the proposed development which involves extensions to an existing dwelling house. The main issues for consideration are the impact of the proposed extensions on the visual amenities of the area, the amenities of neighbouring occupiers and the fall-back position in relation to the roof extensions that can be built under the properties permitted development rights (as considered under Certificate of Lawfulness application AWDM/0490/14).

Visual amenity

In the assessment of the previous scheme considered under application AWDM/1738/14 it was considered that the increased length of the bungalow created by the proposed rear extension and southerly gable end would not appear particularly prominent or out of keeping within the surroundings given the varied roof designs of bungalow properties within the road. This proposal would increase the length of the extension by an additional 0.5 metres. The property would therefore appear lengthier from the easterly and westerly side perspectives, however as the addition would incorporate matching brickwork/roof tiles and would extend in line with the ridge height and form of the existing roof it is considered that the proposed rear extension would still remain sympathetic to the design and appearance of the existing bungalow property.

The scale of the large box like dormers on the eastern and western roof slopes and their unsympathetic visual appearance in relation to the existing bungalow and visual amenities of the area was of concern on previous application AWDM/1738/14. Whilst a Certificate of Lawfulness application for two large dormers to the western and eastern roof slopes has been issued

under application AWDM/0490/14, the dormers were considered again under planning application AWDM/1738/14 as they could not be constructed under permitted development when combined with the accommodation within the roof space of the proposed rear extension. In the consideration of the previous scheme AWDM/1738/14 Officers nevertheless had to consider the fall-back position in that should this application be refused on the grounds that the proposed dormers did not relate sympathetically to the existing bungalow and detract from the visual amenities of the street scene then the dormer extensions could still have been constructed under the property's permitted development rights and therefore without the benefit of planning permission.

It was also noted in the consideration of the previous scheme that 27 Bowness Avenue was in the process of being extended with flat roofed box dormers being added to both the easterly and westerly sides and a hip to gable enlargement to the rear. These roof extensions are within the permitted development parameters for the property and have now been fully constructed without the benefit of planning permission. These dormers on the neighbouring property are highly visible from Bowness Avenue and do not relate sympathetically in terms of scale or appearance to the modest hipped roof proportion of the bungalow, yet are not as large as the dormer extensions proposed under this amendment.

The proposed western dormer has now been split into two dormers which have been set back further to the rear of the property. The proposed eastern dormer has also been set back towards the rear of the property, yet has increased in length from 5.5 metres to 7 metres and by 0.2 metres in height. In order to lessen the visual impact of the large eastern dormer from the street scene perspective and reduce any overbearing impact to the occupiers of the easterly neighbouring bungalow, Officers have sought a reduction in the size of the easterly facing dormer. The Applicant has however confirmed that they would not be willing to reduce the size of the eastern dormer as it would be set further back and therefore less visible from the road and the windows would be obscure glazed to ensure no overlooking to the neighbouring properties.

It is considered a shame that the Applicant has not been willing to reduce the size of the eastern dormer. The proposed dormers would be set back further towards the rear of the property, yet due to their size they would still be highly visible within the street scene perspective and would not sympathetically in appearance to the original bungalow. However, when taking into account the planning fall-back position with regard to the proposed side dormers and the flat roofed box dormers that have been added to the neighbouring property in the road under permitted development, it is still considered difficult to argue refusal of the enlarged dormers on the basis of the impact of the proposed roof additions on the visual amenities of the area.

Residential Amenity

The increase in the size of the rear extension and the revised set back position of the proposed eastern and western dormer extensions would make the additions more visually prominent to the occupiers of the neighbouring bungalows located either side of the application site. Having re-visited the site it is however noted that the neighbouring bungalows to the east and west are

distanced to the application property by their brick built garages which provides some screening of the application property at a single storey level. However, being at first floor level and set back towards the rear of the property the proposed dormers would face the neighbouring gardens of the easterly and westerly neighbouring properties and it is therefore acknowledged that the proposed dormers, particularly the larger easterly facing dormer may increase the sense of enclosure and overbearing to the easterly and westerly neighbouring bungalows. However, in light of the fact that that no letters of representation have been received from these neighbouring occupiers and that all the side windows within both side dormers would still be required to be obscure glazed and fixed shut above 1.7 metres by planning condition it is considered that the dormer extensions would not be so harmful in terms of loss of neighbouring light or amenity in order to warrant refusal of the application.

As the proposed rear extension would measure an additional 0.5 metres in length the first floor southerly facing bedroom window would be distanced from the southerly neighbour's rear garden by approximately 14.5 metres and from the southerly neighbour's conservatory by approximately 27.5 metres. Given the separation distance between the proposed southerly facing window and the southerly neighbouring property/garden it considered that the proposed window would not cause any harmful overlooking to the private amenity of the southerly neighbouring property. It is therefore still considered that imposing an obscure glazing condition on this first floor southerly facing window would not therefore be considered to be reasonable or relevant to planning and would not meet the tests for conditions.

Recommendation

Approve

Subject to Conditions:-

1. Standard time limit 3 years
2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:-

   Title: Location Plan, Received on 22nd May 2015.
   Title: Block Plan, Drawing No. 15.BA/001/APRIL/FPA/D, Received on 22nd May 2015.
   Title: Existing Ground Floor Plan, Drawing No. 15-BA-011-EX-14, Received on 22nd May 2015.
   Title: Existing South, East & West Elevations, Drawing No. 15-BA-010-EX-14, Received on 22nd May 2015
   Title: Existing Roof Plan & Northern Elevation, Drawing No. 15.BA/012 EX, Date received: 22nd May 2015
   Title: Proposed Ground Floor Plan & Roof Plan, Drawing No. 15.BA/004/APRIL/FPA, Received on 22nd May 2015.
   Title: Proposed South, East & West Elevation Plans, Drawing No. 15.BA/002/APRIL/FPA, Received on 24th June 2015.
   Title: Proposed First Floor Plan & North Elevation, Drawing No. 15.BA/007/APRIL/FPA, Received on 24th June 2015.

Reason: *For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.*

3. Matching materials
4. Side (east & west) windows to be obscure glazed
5. East and west windows in dormers fixed shut above 1.7m
6. No additional windows (east & west)
7. The east and west side dormers hereby permitted shall be erected so that a gap of 37mm shall be maintained between the bottom edges of the side dormers and the eaves of the existing roof.

   Reason: *In the interests of visual amenity and to comply with saved policy AH7 of the Adur District Local Plan.*

Informative

Proactive Statement – Approved (No Amendments)

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

Case Officer: Rebecca Tier Date: 21st July 2015

Authorised by: Jo Morin Date: 22.07.2015