Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/0543/13 Recommendation – Refusal

Site: 85 Berriedale Drive, Sompting, Lancing

Proposal: Front dormers

Date of site visit: 20th March 2013 (site visit for previous application AWDM/0145/13)

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

The application site is a semi detached hipped roof bungalow within a street of similar properties, many of which have been altered and extended with alterations to the roof and rear extensions. There is an existing conservatory to the rear of the property.

Permission was granted under AWDM/0145/13 for a single storey rear extension in April 2013. The hip to gable extension and rear dormer shown on the approved plans was to be constructed under permitted development. Permission was originally sought under this application for flat roof front dormers also. These were removed from the application following officer's advice that the dormers were visually dominant and detrimental to the street scene and character and appearance of the existing bungalow. Advice was given that improvements could be made to the design and positioning of the front dormers to improve the visual appearance and impact on street scene. The main issue being the height of the dormers on the roof slope which is visually disproportionate.

Following approval for the single storey rear extension the new legislation was introduced which allowed the depth of the single storey extension to be increased and prior approval was not required under AWDM/0798/13.

The current application seeks consent for the two flat roof, front dormers (as submitted previously) the applicant was anticipating that the application would be called in to Planning Committee by a Local Council Member. No such correspondence has been received and therefore a delegated decision is to be made.

The dormers are 1.9 metres wide, 1.4 metres high and are set 10cm down from the existing ridge height. The rear flat roof dormer as shown on the previous plans is shown to be constructed under permitted development along with the hip to gable extension. The roof extensions are shown to provide two bedrooms and a shower room in the roof space.

Representations: - No third party representations have been received.

Sompting Parish Council: - The Council objects to this application as it considers the proposed development out of character and scale with the neighbouring properties.

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

Principle

The proposal comprises upgrading of 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 main issue in this case is the impact of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the existing bungalow and street scene. The two front dormers will be clearly visible within the street scene and prominent features. When viewing the existing bungalow within the context of the directly adjacent neighbouring bungalows the front roof slopes remain as original. It is accepted that the hip to gable extension will also impact on the character however this is to be carried out under permitted development and therefore cannot be controlled in this case. There are also other examples within the street of hip to gable extensions. Within the wider street scene there are also other examples of front dormers. For example a detached bungalow to the north has front pitched roof dormers and to the south of the site is a single front dormer. Front dormers are not however a common feature within the street scene and if permitted any proposal would be considered on its own merits and should be carefully designed and positioned appropriately in the roof slope.

The front dormers as proposed are inappropriately designed in scale and proportion and are positioned too high within the roof slope. They will be prominent within the street scene which as existing has a uniform appearance with original front roof slopes being the prevailing character.

Residential amenity

It is not considered that there will be any adverse impact with regards to neighbouring properties as a result of the proposed extension. There will be no increased over looking as the dormers front onto the highway where mutual overlooking between properties already exists.

Recommendation

REFUSE for the reason:-

1. The proposal is unacceptable in that the size, form and position of the proposed front dormers, do not relate sympathetically to the appearance, design or scale of the existing bungalow. The development would detract from the character of the existing bungalow constituting a visual dominant and inappropriate form of development. The works would be detrimental to the streetscene and make it difficult, if permitted, for the Local Planning Authority to prevent similar additions to other dwellings, the cumulative effect of which would detract seriously from the area. The proposal is therefore contrary to saved policy AH7 of the Adur District Local Plan and the NPPF.

Informative

The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by identifying matters of concern with the proposal and discussing those with the Applicant. Unfortunately, it has not been possible to resolve those matters within the timescale allocated for the determination of this planning application. However, the Local Planning Authority has clearly set out, within its report, the steps necessary to remedy the harm identified within the reasons for refusal - which may lead to the submission of a more acceptable proposal in the future. The Local Planning Authority is willing to provide pre-application advice in respect of any future application for a revised development.

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

Case Officer: Hannah Barker Date: 27th August 2013

Authorised by: Jo Morin Date: 3 Sept 2013