Development Management - Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/0964/21 Recommendation – APPROVE

Site: 19 Downside, Shoreham-By-Sea

Proposal: Extensions to front (north) at ground and first floor

Date of site visit: 20th July 2021

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

The application site is a detached chalet bungalow with front hipped roof projection at ground floor and front, east and west side and rear flat roof dormers with a single storey rear flat roof extension. Consent was originally sought to square off the ground floor projection with an infill to the front and to extend the front dormer forward over the front projection. It was considered by officers that this could not be supported due to the prominence of the flat roof dormer increasing the bulk and scale of existing poor design.

Amended plans have been received which show the ground floor extension as originally submitted in line with the adjacent front ground floor projection with a central hipped roof. The existing front dormer is proposed to be increased in width infilling the section between the front and side dormer on the east side. The plans as amended are for consideration here.

Representations

None received

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 (July 2021)
WSCC Guidance on Parking at New Developments (Sept 2020).

Planning Assessment

Principle

The relevant issues are the effects on the amenities of neighbouring residential occupiers and the effect on the character and appearance of the area.

Visual amenity

The proposed extensions are to the front of the bungalow and will be clearly visible within the street scene. As existing the flat roof dormers are a prominent feature of the bungalow and do not comply with the Council's Guidelines on design yet there are many other similar dormers adjacent and surrounding the site. Some larger scale more comprehensive development has taken place nearby including adjacent at no. 17 where the roof has been extended forward with a full gable with increased ridge height. This gives rise to a dominant feature in the street scene with the application site with hipped roof being of a much more modest scale and subservient appearance.

The principle of bringing the ground floor forward is not harmful in this case the adjacent property has been set forward at ground floor and therefore a precedent has been set for the loss of the original part recessed frontage design. This will infill and bring the west side in line with the east side of the building frontage. A hipped roof to the ground floor will further limit the bulk and scale of the development.

The dormer extension to the front will be in line with the existing front dormer therefore projecting no further forward than existing at first floor. Despite adding to the existing poorly designed dormers representing further poor development which would not comply with the Council's Design Guidance. In this case, on balance it is considered to be acceptable. As mentioned the bungalow is limited in scale and prominence when viewed from the street in relation to its neighbours. The dormers already exist and this infilling is not, within this context, significantly harmful to the character and appearance of the existing bungalow or street scene. In this case it can be supported due to the existing development at the application site.

Residential amenity

The front extensions will be visible from the neighbouring properties either side and opposite. There will be no increased overlooking to the properties on the other side of the highway than currently exists as the current dormer faces north. To the west is a hipped roof bungalow with front projection away from the boundary. The infill at ground floor will bring the building further forward of the adjacent ground floor window. However there is spacing between the properties and this is not to a degree that would result in a significant loss of light or overbearing impact.

The first floor dormer extension is adjacent to the extended bungalow to the east. There are side velux windows serving a bedroom and a dormer serving a bathroom on the adjacent roof slope. The velux windows are secondary windows and therefore any potential loss of light to these windows will not warrant a refusal in this case. There are also no windows proposed on the side elevation so no potential for overlooking. A condition is attached to ensure that no openings are to be created on the east or west side of the proposed extensions. No adverse impact will result in terms of overlooking, loss of light or overbearing impact.

Recommendation

APPROVE

Subject to Conditions:-

1. Approved Plans
2. Standard 3 year time limit
3. No windows on the east or west side of the extensions hereby permitted.

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

1. Proactive with amendments.

Case Officer: Hannah Barker Date: 8th November 2021

Authorised by: Gary Peck Date: 9 November 2021