Development Management - Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: **Recommendation – Approve**
AWDM/0048/12

Site: **176 Downside, Shoreham-by-Sea, West Sussex BN43 6HD**

Proposal: **Proposed front dormer window**

Date of site visit: 19.10.11.

Neighbours checked: Y

Proposal
The application property is the eastern half of a pair of semi-detached bungalows on the northern side of the road, on an elevated site. The road is mainly characterised with semi-detached bungalows on the north side of the road, opposite Buckingham Park, many of which have some form of roof extension.

Permission is sought for a flat-roof front dormer that would be 2.3m wide, by 1.9m high, by 2.3m in depth. The dormer is proposed to be tile hung to match the existing roof.

Relevant site history
A certificate of proposed lawful development has been granted for a loft conversion to include a hip to part-hip gable side roof extension and rear dormer. AWDM/0934/11 permitted on 16.12.11.

Representations

Third Parties: There have been no third party objections to the proposals.

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’
PPS1 ‘Delivering Sustainable Development (ODPM 2005)

Planning Assessment
Policies
Policy AH7 of the Local Plan 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.

Development Control Standard No.3 states, amongst other things, that roof extensions should respect the scale, character and appearance of existing

dwellings, and that the acceptability of lack of symmetry as a result of a hip to gable extension would depend on the visual quality and character of the area.

In relation to roof dormers it states that they should not appear 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.

Visual amenity

The applicant proposes to build the side gable extension and rear dormer extension under permitted development as a separate operation, and as such there would be no planning control over the appearance or effect on the attached property. Consequently the only consideration is now whether the front dormer, on its own, would be visually acceptable, or result in a loss of amenity to the neighbouring sites.

The proposed front dormer is modest in size, and would be located so that a large amount of the original roof plane is on view. It is not considered that the front dormer would be unsympathetic in scale, and given there are a number of other front dormers in the vicinity it is considered that it would not be out of character for the area.

Residential amenity

Directly opposite the site, on lower ground is the rear garden of No.1 Downside Close. There is a separation of 39m between the proposed front dormer and rear wall of No.1, whereas its rear garden is 18m from where the dormer would be. There is a steep incline to the garden of the bungalow opposite which steeply rises to the north. It is bounded by a 2.4m high brick wall and as such it is considered that there would not be an unacceptable loss of privacy to the garden area.

The other nearby dwellings in Downside Close and No.38 Ravensbourne Avenue are on view from the surrounding Downside properties, and as such a loss of privacy is not a concern in this case.

Recommendation

The proposed front dormer would not detract from the local environment and can take place without resulting in unacceptable detriment to the amenities of neighbouring properties. It would consequently not conflict with the saved policies of the Adur District Local Plan (AG1, AH7).

Subject to:

1. Standard 3 year time limit.
2. Tile hanging match existing dwelling.
3. Permission relates to approved plans:
   Drawing No: 1846/1 Date received: 11.01.12

Drawing No: 1846/3	Date received: 11.01.12
Drawing No: 1846/4	Date received: 11.01.12
Drawing No: 1846/5	Date received: 11.01.12

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

Case Officer: C. Hone Date: 15.02.12.

Authorised by: P Barnett Date: 15.02.12