Expires 27.04.09

Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: ADC/0074/09 Recommendation – Permit

Site: **21 Howard Road Sompting Lancing West Sussex**

Proposal: **Raising of ridge line forming new gable end wall to side elevation with front and rear dormers (revised resubmission of ADC/0449/08)**

The Application

The application property is the western half of a pair of semi-detached bungalows located on the north side of Howard Road. The property is sited on sloping ground, with the road rising towards the west and north.

The proposal is to extend the existing roof to provide additional accommodation in the form of two bedrooms and one bathroom. The roof would be extended with a hip to gable extension, and the ridge would be raised in height, with additional front and rear dormers. The ridge would be raised by 0.6m, the front dormer would be 3.2m wide, by 1.8m in height, the rear dormer would be 5.5m wide, by 1.5m in height.

The attached bungalow (No.19) has previously been extended with a similar roof extension (S/39/80), which has resulted in the ridges of the two properties now being misaligned, albeit now at the same height. And a rear elevation which has a tile hung section below the rear dormer.

The application is a revision to a previously refused scheme to extend in a similar fashion. However the original application defined the roof line of the existing pair of bungalows incorrectly and in addition showed a larger front dormer, with a rear dormer which left an incongruous gap between the two attached properties.

The application (ADC/0449/08) was refused for the grounds that the roof extensions, by reason of their large size and unsympathetic design, would be out of keeping in scale and appearance with the existing building and would detract to an unacceptable extent from the visual amenities and residential environment of the locality.

Consultations and Representations

Sompting Parish Council: An objection has been raised by the Parish Council on the grounds that the raising of the roofline and the gable end treatment would be out of scale and out of character and detrimental to the existing property and with the neighbouring properties.

Third Parties: The owner of No.72 Sedbury Road to the SE of the site, has concern that the front dormer window will be obtrusive and would overlook the lounge, bedroom and side garden.

Relevant Planning Policies and Guidance

Adopted West Sussex Structure Plan 2001-2016 (WSCC 2005) (saved policies): LOC1, DEV1
Adopted Adur District Local Plan 1993-2006 (ADC 1996) (saved policies): AG1, AH7 and Appendix II 'Supplementary Planning Guidance' comprising: Development Control Standard No.3 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings.'
PPS 1 'Delivering Sustainable Development' (ODPM 2005)

Planning Assessment

Policies
Structure Plan policies seek to protect and, where possible enhance the character and distinctiveness of areas, requiring high standards of design, layout and construction (DEV1). Policy AH7 of the Local Plan, relation specifically to extensions and alterations to dwellings, states that they should be designed so as not to result in an unacceptable loss of light or privacy or have an overbearing effect on the neighbouring dwelling and be sympathetic to the original dwelling. Supplementary Planning Guidance in DC Standard No. 3 'Extension and Alteration to Dwellings' 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. The windows in dormers should be similar in style and proportion to those on the original dwelling.

Visual amenity
The proposed design is a variation on the original refused scheme, and now has been drawn so that the relationship between the two buildings is correctly represented.

The attached bungalow has had a roof extension by way of extending the front roof plane further to the rear, and at the same angle of pitch. This has resulted in a ridge which is set back from that of the application property, although now at a similar height. Whereas originally the ridges between the two properties stepped up with the gradient of the hillside location, now this stepping has been lost. The hip to gable extension of No.19 has unbalanced the pair of dwellings and exacerbates the discordance between the roof designs, as a result of the original extension (S/39/80).

The application seeks to address many of the deficiencies of the originally refused proposals and the discordance between the roofs of the two attached dwellings which currently exists.

The roof is proposed to be increased in height in the same manner as No,19, by following the angle of pitch of the roof and continuing it towards the rear by 1m. This will result in two improvements to the relationship between the bungalows. Firstly the roof ridges will be aligned as they were when the dwellings were originally built, and secondly the stepping up between the two dwellings with the gradient of the road will be restored.

The proposed hip-to-gable roof extension on the north side will further redress the appearance of the pair which currently is unbalanced.

The rear dormer will be smaller than originally proposed and is consistent with the size of many within the vicinity, and that of No.19. The tile hung rear elevation below the rear dormer also matches the attached bungalow, and is considered to be acceptable.

The proposed front dormer is vastly reduced in scale from the original refusal, and although No.19 does not have a front dormer it is not out of keeping for the area, which is notable for the volume of many of its roof extensions. There are other front dormers of similar size within the vicinity at No's 31 & 35, and given such features form part of the established character of the area, on balance it is not considered that it would be particularly detrimental to the amenity of the area.

Residential amenity
The property directly to the SE (72 Sedbury Road) is located on lower ground, and at 90 degrees to the application bungalow. It has a large side extension and side garden to the north. The proposed dormer would be 21m from the closest corner of the garden of No.72, and a total of 28m from the actual dwelling. It is considered that front rooms are generally expected to have less privacy than those to the rear of properties due to the proximity to public areas etc., and given the distances between the proposed front dormer and habitable accommodation / side garden it is unlikely that there would be any loss of privacy that would warrant refusal in this case.

Recommendation
APPROVE for reason that :-

1PPii

1. C1Ci
2. C14Aii – (09.04.09 AH7 Of the ADLP and DEV1 of the WSSP)
3. C12Eii
4. C18C3 – ...west side elevation of the roof extension...

Case Officer: [redacted]
Date: 15.04.09

Planning Services Manager: [redacted]
Date: [redacted]

Development Control Committee Chairman: [redacted]
Date: 27/04/09