Expired 5.11.08

Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: ADC/0448/08 Recommendation - Refused

Site: **184 Downside Shoreham-by-Sea West Sussex BN43 6HD**

Proposal: **Loft conversion with part-hipped side gable and front and rear dormers**

The Application

The application property is the astern half of a pair of semi-detached, hipped-roof bungalows located on the north side of Downside, within the built-up area of Shoreham.

Permission is sought for a hip to part hipped gable roof extension with front and rear dormers. The front dormer would be 4.0m wide, by 3.5m in height, by 4.0m in depth. It would have a pair of double glazed doors with side lights and an ironwork balustrade. The rear dormer would be 3.5m in width, by 3.4m in height and 4.4m in depth, and would link into the existing dormer at the rear of No.186 to the west. The proposals would provide space for two bedrooms and a bathroom.

The pair of bungalows are sited directly opposite the junction with Ravensbourne Avenue, at the top of a steep gradient. The surrounding area is characterised by a number of semi-detached bungalows on the north side of Downside, many of which have previously extended at roof level, and houses in Ravensbourne Avenue leading south.

Consultations and Representations

Third Parties: There have been no third party representations on this application.

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 an area, requiring high standards of design, layout and construction (DEV1). 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 main concern with the proposals are whether the part-hipped side gable and front dormer would appear over dominant for the dwelling, resulting in a top-heavy appearance that would adversely affect the amenity of the area.

The pair of bungalows (No's 184 & 186) are both currently hipped. There are other bungalows which have gabled extensions, two of which have been recently granted planning permission (ADC/0061/08 at No.188 & ADC/0334/08 at No.150), however in both instances these were considered to be acceptable as they evened up a pair of bungalows, which had previously been unbalanced through one side being extended to a full gable under permitted development. As a result of the part hipped gable proposed here, the pair of bungalows would appear unbalanced.

The front dormer would be built off of the front wall of the bungalow and would not retain any roof tilling on the front or to the side (east) of it making it appear cramped and top-heavy. The dormer cheek would continue at the same level as the gable section of the roof extension and would form one continuous roof plane giving the impression of a larger box-like structure. Due to the large size of the dormer it would abut partway up the roof of the projecting front gable of the property, again making it appear cramped and overly large. The double doors in the front of the dormer would add to the overbearing appearance of the dormer.

The rear dormer would adjoin the rear dormer of the adjacent dwelling, it also would be built off of the rear wall of the dwelling, however in this instance it would not be visible from the street or from properties to the rear. The joining of the two dormers would form one large mass but it is considered that in this

instance there would be more balance if the two dormers were the same size rather than two which were separated by only a small gap and of differing heights.

The proposed part-hip would have only the very smallest of angled tiling which in itself would look odd, and with the overly large front dormer would result in the unbalancing of the pair of bungalows and would create a feature that has a top-heavy box-like appearance which given the prominence of the site would adversely affect the amenity of the streetscene and that of the host dwelling.

Residential amenity
The gardens to the rear of No's 38 & 45 Ravensbourne Avenue would ordinarily be at risk of being overlooked by the front dormer, however both are located on significantly lower ground and bounded by a 2.4m high wall which shields the dormer from view.

Recommendation

REFUSE for reason that :-
B5ER – amended

The proposed front dormer and part-hipped gable roof extension are unacceptable in that they are excessively large and ~~they~~ the development do not relate sympathetically to the existing building, ~~and~~ it would be out of keeping with and detrimental to the character and appearance of the area and would result in an unbalancing of the pair of bungalows, making 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. It would therefore conflict with the policies of the West Sussex Structure Plan (CH1, DEV1) and the Adur district local Plan (AG1, AH7)

Case Officer:
Date: 13.10.08

17/10