Expiry Date - 04/04/2011

Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: ADC/0021/11 Recommendation –

Site: **124 Greenways Crescent Shoreham-by-Sea West Sussex BN43 6HQ**

Proposal: **Front dormer (with hip to part-gable roof extension at side and rear dormer constructed as 'permitted development')**

The Application

The application property is a semi detached hip roofed bungalow located on the west side of Greenways Crescent. The application proposes to convert the roofspace into living accommodation with a side part-gable, rear dormer and front dormer. The hip-to-part gable extension and rear dormer are 'permitted development', having a volume of just less than 50 cubic metres (49.9 cubic metres), following the receipt of amended plans reducing the size of the dormer and adding a part-hip to the roof of the dwelling.

The front dormer is to be flat roofed and will measure 4.8m wide, 2.1m deep and 1.6m high.

Consultations and Representations

Consultations/Comments

None

Third Parties

Original Plans – 4 letters received from the occupiers of 122, 126 (2 letters) and 163 Greenways Crescent objecting to the proposal for the following reasons:

- Loss of privacy from rear dormer, which is too big and obtrusive
- Overdevelopment
- Loss of daylight and sunlight
- Loss of outlook
- Out of keeping and harmful to visual amenity
- Increased pressure on parking
- Loss of small dwelling
- Contrary to planning policies and guidance

NB – these objections largely relate to elements of the proposal which are permitted development

Expiry Date - 04/04/2011

Amended Plans – No representations received

Relevant Planning Policies and Guidance

Adopted Adur District Local Plan 1993 – 2006 (ADC 1996): AG1, AH7 and Appendix 11 ‘Supplementary Planning Guidance’ comprising Development Control Standard No.3 ‘Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings’
PPS1 ‘Delivering Sustainable Development (ODPM 2005)

Planning Assessment

Policies

Policy AH7 refers to residential extensions. It states that extensions and alterations should be designed so as not to result in an unacceptable degree of overlooking, a loss of natural light or an overbearing effect on neighbouring dwellings. They should be of sympathetic design and materials to the original dwelling and the area in general.

Dormers 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. Dormers should not "wrap-around" more than one face of a roof and should not normally be located on the side of a hipped roof. The appearance of roof lights will often be more acceptable. Where the existing roof space is of inadequate size to accommodate the rooms proposed without adding very large flat roofed dormers, permission will not normally be granted.

The windows in dormers should be similar in style and proportion to those on the original dwelling. On older-style properties small hipped or gable roofed dormers are usually preferable to flat-roofed dormers. Two small dormers will often be more acceptable than one large one, provided they are sufficient distance apart.

Government policy is set out in Planning Policy Statement PPS1 ’Delivering Sustainable Development’. Relevant paragraphs are 17, which refers to the commitment to protecting and improving the environment; 18 which states that planning should seek to maintain and improve the local environment and help to mitigate the effects of declining environmental quality through positive policies on issues such as design; and 34 which states that good design is indivisible from good planning and that design which is inappropriate in its context, or which fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area, should not be accepted.

Visual amenity and character

The front dormer would sit well below the ridge and up from the eaves and is of a size which will not dominate the roofslope. There are several examples of front dormers in the street and it is not considered that the dormer would be unduly out of character.

This pair of dwellings is currently unaltered from the front and the hip-to-gable extension and front dormer will unbalance their appearance. However, most of the alterations proposed can be carried out as 'permitted development' and the addition of the front dormer is not considered to be visually harmful and will not adversely affect the character of the pair of dwellings sufficiently to warrant a refusal of the application.

Residential amenity

The front dormer extension will have little impact on residential amenity.

The impact arising from the other alterations is noted but these can be carried out as permitted development. No. 124 is on lower ground than its neighbour to the north, which is separated from No.124 by a 3m wide shared driveway at its narrowest point. It is not considered that the light loss or impact on outlook would be such as to warrant refusal were permission to be required.

The rear dormer faces over the applicants' 35m long rear garden and, while some views over neighbouring gardens will be possible, it will be no worse than would usually occur from first floor bedroom windows.

Recommendation

APPROVE for reason that:-

1PPi

Subject to:

1. C1Ci
2. C1Ei
3. C12E3 AH7
4. This permission relates to the following approved amended plan date stamped received 4 April 2011:
   Block Plan, Proposed Plans and Elevations
   Reason– For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning

Case Officer Peter Barnett Date 4 May 2011