Expiry Date - 30/12/2013

Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/1390/13 Recommendation – REFUSE

Site: 5 Downsway Southwick Brighton West Sussex

Proposal: Front and rear roof extensions to create gable ends to dormer to South elevation with Juliet balcony to rear elevation

Date of site visit: 13.11.13

Neighbours checked: Y

Application Site

The application property is a detached brick built bungalow with a fully hipped roof in a street of very similar properties and wherein the land rises towards the north. The dwelling has a small detached garage to the rear south side, hardstanding to the frontage and a garden to the rear/west. The dwelling fronts onto the street facing east. The boundary to the south is open where a driveway is shared with the neighbouring property on this side, which is a doctor's surgery. The other side / rear boundaries are defined by fencing and vegetation.

Proposal

The proposal is for the conversion of the front and rear hipped roof pitches to gable ends each with a new window; erection of a dormer on the south side roof pitch of 5.7m in depth; and the creation of a Juliet balcony on the rear elevation roof extension window. A new window is proposed for each of the roof additions and the existing north side roof slope. Materials are proposed to match those in the host dwelling.

Relevant site history

AWDM/0702/13 Rooms in roof involving part-hipped gables to front and rear and dormer on south side. Refused

Representations: No third party representations have been received.

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 2012

Expiry Date - 30/12/2013

Planning Assessment

Visual amenity

The main issue is the impact of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the existing bungalow and the resultant impact upon the street scene. The front extension and side dormer will be clearly visible in the street scene from public vantage points. Due to the rise in land levels from south to north in Downsway, the roofs of the bungalows in the street form a prominent feature and underscore the uniformity of their design, their hipped form setting a distinct and consistent visual context to the street. Whilst some roofs have side dormers, these are of relatively modest volume compared with that proposed for the application site, minimising their visual impact upon the general street scene. It is acknowledged that many of these would have been permitted development and thereby outwith planning control.

The large proposed side dormer on the flank roof pitch together with the front gable extension would result in a form of development that would be unduly prominent and therefore visually discordant set against the prevailing roof formations in Downsway and thereby disruptive and detrimental to the character and appearance of the street scene. There is also the concern that such a development would set an unfortunate precedent for further similar extensions in the same street thereby eroding the current appearance of the existing built environment in this locality.

Furthermore the extensions as proposed, together, by reason of their scale, form and size, would not appear adequately subservient to the host dwelling, resulting in a ‘top-heavy’ form of expansion on this otherwise modestly but currently well-proportioned bungalow, thereby failing to respect its present design, scale and form.

In reaching these views, it is accepted that the side and rear additions may be permitted development but the proposed component within planning control, namely the front gable is a significant cause of concern.

Residential amenity

The extensions are not considered to be of a scale and position that would lead to any significant loss of light for the purposes of neighbouring properties. Lying north of the surgery, no serious overshadowing will be caused to this building and whilst the hip to gable conversions would cause some increased shadowing to no. 7 Downsway, the neighbouring dwelling to the north, beyond that currently caused, it is not considered that this will be to such a degree as to materially harm its amenity.

The proposed window positions would ensure that there would be no material increase in overlooking to any neighbouring property such as to justify objection. Again, the proposed south facing window being obscure glazed would be permitted development whilst that in the northern roof slope would be unlikely to lead to overlooking. To guard against any risk of loss of privacy

from this window, however, it would be possible to attach a condition for it to be designed to be obscurely glazed and fixed shut.

The dwelling lying lower than no. 7, it would not appear unduly dominant upon this neighbouring property. However, it is considered that the roof extensions would combine to appear to overpower the building to the south.

As a consequence of the above considerations and findings, therefore, the proposal as submitted cannot be supported.

Recommendation

REFUSE for the reason:-

By reason of the size and form of the proposed roof extensions, in particular the proposed front gable extension, the proposal is unacceptable in that fails to relate sympathetically to the scale or appearance of the existing bungalow. The development would detract from the character of the existing bungalow constituting a visually dominant and intrusive form of development that would be out of keeping with and 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 main issues of concern thereby enabling clear identification of 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: Lawrence Simmons Date: 3rd December 2013

Authorised by: Jo Morin Date: 3.12.2013

Expiry Date - 30/12/2013