Expires 29/8/07.

Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: ADC/0402/07 **Recommendation – Permit Application**

Site: **12 Cokeham Lane Sompting Lancing West Sussex**

Proposal: **Rooms in roof including two pitched dormers to the front and one flat-roofed dormer to the rear**

The Application

The application site is a detached bungalow located on the west side of Cokeham Lane, Sompting. The property features a pitch roofed entrance porch, a large 'L' shape flat roofed rear extension, and a large rear garden. It is bounded to the north by a similar detached bungalow (which has added front and rear dormers on a part gable roof under S/52/01/TP), to the south by another detached bungalow of differing design, and to the rear by the rear gardens of a semi-detached bungalow pair at Nos 3 and 5 Osbourne Close.
The proposal is similar to the above extension at 10 Cokeham Lane in that the applicants wish to extend the hipped roof into a part hipped gable with two front pitched dormers and a larger flat roofed rear dormer. This alteration will house two new bedrooms that feature rear facing doors with 'Juliet' style balconies. A similar application was refused under ADC/0195/07 due to the bulky design of the rear dormer.

Consultations and Representation

Third Parties

No.12 Cokeham Lane raise no objection to the development proposal but are concerned with the project management of the scheme as it appears the applicant will be undertaking the work himself. They are thus worried about the duration of the project, noise created if working out of hours and the general disruption that will be created.

Nos.3 and 5 Osborne Close raise concern over the level of overlooking into their properties that will be afforded by the proposal.

Sompting Parish Council raise No Objection.

~~Contributors~~

~~No representations have been received.~~

Relevant Planning Policies and Guidance

Adur District Local Plan: AG1, AH7
West Sussex Structure Plan: DEV1
Development Control Standard No.3: 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings'

Planning Assessment

The main consideration with this application is the acceptability of the revised design of the rear dormer.

This proposal is an adjustment to a previous application ADC/0195/07 that was refused due to the excessively bulky design of the rear dormer. This dormer was considered to be too large within the roof plane as it extended out to the rear eaves line with a width that met the extended part hips of the main roof. This revision has reduced the width of the dormer by 0.5 metres and its depth by 0.2 metres so that it now sits more comfortably within the rear roof plane and does not encroach on hips or the rear eaves. It thus now corresponds more closely with the Council's DC Standard for dormers.
The rear fenestration remains the same as the previous application with two double doors with 'Juliet' balconies and three further windows serving a master bedroom, the stairwell, and a shower room. It is not considered that these windows and doors will offer any overlooking or privacy concerns to neighbouring dwellings. The immediate neighbours are both detached bungalows featuring good separation from the applicant's dwelling. To the rear the semi-detached pair at Nos 3 and 5 Osborne Close have raised concern over potential views into their properties, however a separation of over 35 metres will exist between their windows and those of the proposal. This is far in excess of the 22 metre minimum required by the Council's DC Standard.
The use of 'Juliet' balconies with doors opening at the same level as the flat roof of the rear extension raises the possibility that the roof could be converted into a balcony in the future. This would undoubtedly result in greater overlooking into adjacent rear gardens

and so the balustrades should thus be restricted by condition to be permanently fixed shut.
To the front, the two pitch roofed dormers will sit off the ridge line in contrast to the DC standard that requires dormers to sit proportionately below ridge lines. This is considered acceptable however as the neighbouring bungalow was permitted a single dormer in the same position under S/52/01/TP.

The issues raised by No.12 Cokeham Lane concerning the construction period and disturbance that will be generated are acknowledged but are not material planning considerations that could impact on any decision. Any issue that could arise out of building during unsocial hours is a matter for environmental health to consider whilst any building work will require regular inspection and approval by a qualified building control expert as standard. The concerns of Nos 3 and 5 Osborne Close are dealt with above whilst their worry that the rear trees could be removed is not an issue that can be restricted by planning control. Likewise it would not be possible or justifiable to insist on new trees being planted as part of any approval.

Recommendation

APPROVE for reason that :-

1PPi

Subject to:

1. C1Ci: (standard time limit)
2. C12Ei: (external materials to match existing)
3. 'The balustrades hereby permitted on the two rear doors ~~of the dormer extension~~ shall be permanently ~~fixed shut~~ retained in place.
   Reason: To prevent overlooking and to comply with policy AH7 of the ADLP and DEV1 of the WSSP'

Case Officer:.....

Date:....8/8/01....

(CONT.)

for Head of Planning and Community Division:.....[signature]

Date:....9-8-07..

Chairman of Planning and Regulatory Committee:...A. L. Mills

Date:..10/08/07.....