Development Management - Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/0677/20 Recommendation – APPROVE

Site: 13 Springate Road, Southwick, Brighton

Proposal: Construction of dormer to north roofslope and replacement of first floor window to eat with door and Juliet balcony.

Date of site visit: Visited when assessing AWDM/1712/19

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

The application site is a hip roofed, detached bungalow with a rear gable projection within a street of bungalows which are mainly semi-detached. Consent was sought in 2009, ADC/0459/09 for a full rear gable projection with rear Juliet balcony. This was refused by officers due to the impact upon the adjacent neighbours, no. 11 Springate Road, loss of light and overbearing impact. An appeal was lodged and dismissed upholding the reason for refusal. Subsequently consent was sought for a smaller roof extension (which is as currently built) ADC/0136/10 reducing the rear gable and shifting it away from the boundary with no. 11.

More recently consent was sought for two side dormers, one on the existing rear gable and one to the side of the main roof slope, AWDM/1712/19. It was advised by officers that the application should be withdrawn as it could not be supported. The side dormer proposed in the main roof slope significantly altered the symmetry and simplistic form of the bungalow when viewed within the street scene, this was considered to be detrimental.

The current application shows a hipped roof dormer to the north side of the rear gable only, adjacent to no. 11. Also proposed is the replacement of the rear facing window in the rear gable with a Juliette balcony.

Representations

1 representation received from 11 Springate Road adjacent – concerns over loss of light to side kitchen window and loss of privacy.

Relevant Planning Policies

Adur Local Plan 2017 Policy 15
'Supplementary Planning Guidance' comprising: Development Management Standard No.2 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings''
National Planning Policy Framework (February 2019)

Planning Assessment

Principle

The proposal comprises 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 dormer is modest in scale and does not extend beyond the side roof slope of the bungalow. It is therefore not visible from the front of the bungalow and it does not alter the main roof form when viewed from the street (as the previous proposal did.) It allows the simplistic form of the bungalow to be retained by adding to the rear gable in a sympathetic way. Materials are proposed to match existing. The replacement of the rear window with a Juliette balcony does not alter the form of the building and is also not visible within the street scene.

Residential amenity

The main properties to be affected are those either side of the site, no. 11 to the north and no. 15 to the south. Due to the dormer being on the north side there is no impact to no 15 to the south as the bungalow screens the proposed works.

The dormer will face onto the side roof slope of the adjacent property. There are velux windows as existing adjacent. The proposed dormer will have two windows which are shown to be obscurely glazed, there is also spacing between the bungalows. The windows will serve a bedroom and bathroom. An objection has been received from no. 11 with concern that there will be loss of light to the side kitchen window and overlooking. The window referred to faces south and the limited bulk of the dormer and its set back on balance give rise to an acceptable development which would not warrant a refusal in this case in terms of loss of light and overbearing impact. As stated above no overlooking will occur due to the dormers being obscurely glazed.

Consideration is also given to the previous refusal and appeal above. A full rear gable was refused due to the impact to no. 11. This proposal is a much less bulky feature which will not have the same impact. It represents a compromise which is acceptable in residential amenity terms.

The proposed Juliette balcony replaces an existing window. This faces to the rear, east. There is a large distance between the rear of the application site and the properties to the rear, both have long gardens. It is not considered that the Juliette balcony will result in any significant overlooking which would warrant a refusal in this case.

Recommendation

APPROVE

Subject to Conditions:-

1. Approved Plans
2. Standard 3 year time limit
3. Materials to match existing
4. Dormer windows to be obscurely glazed and high level opening only.

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

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.

Case Officer: Hannah Barker Date: 14th June 2020

Authorised by: Peter Barnett Date: 15 June 2020