

Expiry: 23/3

Development Management - Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWD/0057/26

Recommendation – Refuse

Site: 21 Meadowview Road, Sompting

Proposal: Extension of rear dormers over rear extension

Date of site visit: 13/3

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

This application relates to a semi detached bungalow on the south side of the road. It has been extended into the roof with a raised side gable as well as front and rear dormers. It also has rear ground floor extensions half of which has a pitched roof.

The site is not in a conservation area and is not a listed building. There are no TPO's on the site and no known flood risk.

The site is on higher ground than its neighbour to the east, a hipped roof bungalow and also on higher than properties to the rear in Beeding Close.

Permission is sought to extend and join the rear roof extensions over the ground floor rear extensions, a depth of 2.7 metres.

Relevant Planning History

AWD/1111/20 - Conversion of roof space including hip to gable roof extension and front and rear dormers. Granted

Consultations

Sompting Parish Council objects: *'development is overdevelopment and unneighbourly.'*

Representations

4 neighbours have objected summarised as:

Overdevelopment, the roof is already extended.

Out of proportion with other bungalows

Loss of privacy, further overlooking of houses and gardens to rear which are on lower ground.

Loss of light.

Devaluing of Beeding Close properties.

Relevant Planning Policies

Adur Local Plan 2017 Policies 1, 2 and 15

'Supplementary Planning Guidance' comprising: Development Management Standard No.2 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings'

National Planning Policy Framework (December 2024)

Planning Assessment

Principle

The proposal involves upgrading the existing housing stock located within the built up area and can be supported in principle. The relevant issues are the effects on the amenities of neighbouring residential occupiers and the effect on the character and appearance of the dwelling and its surroundings.

Visual amenity

The proposed 'roof' extension is in effect a flat roofed first floor rear extension. No other property in view has extended over their ground floor rear extensions in this manner.

The proposal would create a top heavy, incongruous extension which would relate poorly to the character of this bungalow, as built, would relate poorly to its semi detached neighbour and would be out of character locally.

Policy 15 of the adopted local plan states:

Development should be of a high architectural quality and respect and enhance the character of the site, and the prevailing character of the area, in terms of proportion, form, context, massing, siting, layout, density, height, size, scale, materials, detailed design features and landscaping.

Development should:

- *Enhance the local environment by way of its appearance and character, with particular attention being paid to the architectural form, height, materials, density, scale, orientation, landscaping and layout of the development;*
- *Make a positive contribution to the sense of place, local character and distinctiveness of an area; and not have an unacceptable impact on adjacent properties, particularly residential dwellings, including unacceptable loss of privacy, daylight/sunlight, outlook or open amenity space;*

When considering applications for extensions or alterations to dwellings, proposals will be expected to comply with the criteria contained in the Council's adopted Development Management Standard No.2 "Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings" (as amended or superseded by other Council guidance in force at the time an application is considered) or any other appropriate national standard.'

Expiry: 23/3

Paras 2.5 and 2.6 of the adopted Development Management Standard No.2 "Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings" reiterates the need for development to be in keeping with local character in policy 15.

In para 3.11 relating to roof extensions it states:

Where permission is required, they should not be so large that they over-dominate the dwelling, resulting in a top heavy "box-like" appearance. They should be kept well below the ridge level of the existing roof and should not project as far as the walls of the house. A large amount of the original roof should still be clearly visible. Where the existing roof space is of inadequate size to accommodate the room(s) proposed without adding very large flat-roofed dormers, permission will not normally be granted.

In para 3.6 relating to 2 storey rear extensions it states:

'two-storey rear extensions should normally have a pitched roof to match the existing house.'

The proposed extension would not enhance the appearance of the property and nor would it make a positive contribution to local character.

Residential Amenity

The scale and proximity of the extension will be imposing for neighbours and overbearing to those either side.

Expanding on policy 15 para 2.2. of the adopted Development Management Standard No.2 "Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings" deals with any effects of development on neighbouring properties.

It states:

The main detrimental effects could be related to:

- Privacy - the proposal should not result in direct overlooking of rooms in neighbouring properties, nor excessive amounts of overlooking of garden areas.
- Daylight - any proposal should not reduce the daylight to neighbouring properties to an unacceptable extent.
- Outlook – the fact that a neighbour may be able to see an extension would not in itself make a proposal unacceptable, the outlook of neighbouring properties should not be dominated by the extension since this could be overbearing and oppressive.

2.3 The extent to which the above factors are affected will depend on the size and position of the extension, as well as its location and orientation relative to neighbouring properties. Clearly extensions to a large detached house or bungalow on a large plot are far less likely to affect neighbouring properties than ones to small terraced or semi-detached houses or bungalows. In addition, a single storey extension would be less likely to have an adverse effect on neighbouring properties than a two storey extension, which would be more likely to reduce daylight to neighbouring properties and lead to problems of overlooking. It should also be noted that the use to which an extension is to be put may affect its impact. For instance, a first floor

Expiry: 23/3

bathroom with obscured glass would not lead to problems of overlooking and may be acceptable where a bedroom would not.

The scale of the extension, its depth and proximity to the boundary would have an overbearing impact on neighbours, particularly at No. 23. Its depth also has the potential to affect afternoon light to the side and rear windows at No. 19. With the extra depth, overlooking of neighbouring properties and gardens would be more overt and intrusive than with the existing roof extensions not least because the extension includes two large windows both of which are to bedrooms.

Recommendation

REFUSE for the following reason:

The proposed extension by reason of its scale, depth, position and design would be out of character with this bungalow and its neighbours and as such would cause visual harm to the local area. In addition, the scale, depth and proximity to neighbouring boundaries would result in an overbearing impact and increased overlooking for neighbours and a loss of light to No. 19. The proposal is therefore contrary to policy 15 of the Adur Local Plan, adopted Development Management Standard No. 2 - Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings and the relevant paragraphs of the National Planning Policy Framework.

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

Informative

The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by identifying matters of concern with the proposal and determining the application within a timely manner, clearly setting out the reason for refusal, allowing the Applicant the opportunity to consider the harm caused and whether or not it can be remedied by a revision to the proposal. The Local Planning Authority is willing to provide pre-application advice in respect of any future application for a revised development.

Case Officer:

MOK

Date: 17/3

Authorised by:

Peter Barnett

Date: 17 March 2026