Expiry Date – 4/9

Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/1001/19 Recommendation – Refuse

Site: 2 Hadrian Avenue, Southwick

Proposal: Hip to gable roof extension with front and rear dormers.

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Date of Site Visit: 18/7

Site and Surroundings

This application relates to a hipped roof 1950's bungalow on the west side of Hadrian Avenue close to the junction with The Crescent. The property has been extended at the rear ground floor.

Numerous roof alterations have occurred in the street including some large front roof extensions.

The site is not in a conservation area and is not listed.

Relevant Planning History

AWDM/1151/13 - Householder application for permitted development for prior approval for single storey rear extension measuring 4m from rear wall of the original dwelling, maximum height 3.3m and maximum height of eaves 2.4m. No prior approval required.

Consultations

None.

Representations

None

Relevant Planning Policies and Guidance

The National Planning Policy Framework 2019
Adur Local Plan 2017 Policies 1, 2 and 15 including 'Development Management Standard No. 2 Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings'.

Planning Assessment

Principle

The principle of development can be supported as it upgrades a dwelling within the built up area boundary. For consideration is the impact of the proposals on the character and appearance of the area and the impacts of the development on neighbour amenity.

Character

These bungalows were originally built with hipped roofs. Many have gabled their roofs and added front and rear dormers, some of which are very large. The adjoining property is unextended at roof level.

Policy 15 of the adopted Adur Local Plan states:

Development should be of a high architectural quality and respect and enhance the character of the site, and the prevailing character of the area, in terms of proportion, form, context, massing, siting, layout, density, height, size, scale, materials, detailed design features and landscaping. Development should:

- *Enhance the local environment by way of its appearance and character, with particular attention being paid to the architectural form, height, materials, density, scale, orientation, landscaping and layout of the development;*
- *Make a positive contribution to the sense of place, local character and distinctiveness of an area; and not have an unacceptable impact on adjacent properties, particularly residential dwellings, including unacceptable loss of privacy, daylight/sunlight, outlook or open amenity space;*

When considering applications for extensions or alterations to dwellings, proposals will be expected to comply with the criteria contained in the Council's adopted Development Management Standard No.2 "Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings" (as amended or superseded by other Council guidance in force at the time an application is considered) or any other appropriate national standard.

Development Management Standard No.2 "Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings" includes the following advice for applicants.

The appearance

2.5 The most important basic principle is that any extension should be in keeping with the appearance, scale, design and character of both the existing dwelling and the street scene generally. An extension which is acceptable in a low density modern development may not be acceptable in a town centre location. In particular, the proposal should not be allowed to over-dominate the house or clash with its appearance.

2.6 The following principles should also help to ensure that he criteria discussed able are met:

- *Extensions should generally respect the architectural period and style of the existing*

dwelling and the area.

- *External construction materials should usually match in colour and texture the materials of the existing dwelling.*
- *Windows or other openings should be in scale with the extension and should be in line with and match the proportions and style of existing windows.*

Dormers and Roof extensions

3.11 Rear dormers and other roof alterations like hip-to-gable extensions may be able to be carried out as permitted development. Where permission is required, they 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. A large amount of the original roof should still be clearly visible. Dormers should not "wrap-around" more than one face of a roof and should not normally be located on the side of a hipped roof. The appearance of roof lights will often be more acceptable. Where the existing roof space is of inadequate size to accommodate the room(s) proposed without adding very large flat-roofed dormers, permission will not normally be granted.

3.12 The windows in dormers should be similar in style and proportion to those on the original dwelling. On older-style properties small hipped or gable roofed dormers are usually preferable to flat-roofed dormers. Two small dormers will often be more acceptable that one large one, provided they are of sufficient distance apart. In some locations, front dormers may not be acceptable if for example they would spoil the special character of a Conservation Area or if there are currently no other front dormers present in a particular street scene.

The proposed front dormer is excessively large, larger than any other front dormer in the street. The rear dormer is even larger. This particular bungalow is at the end of the row and extensions to the roof will be even more prominent as a result. In addition they will be more prominent because the adjoining bungalow is unaltered at roof level.

The applicant was invited to revise the application and reduce the size of the front dormer in particular. The most recent front roof extension in this street is believed to be the pitched roof pair of dormers at No. 22 approved in 2015. This extension was drawn to the applicant's attention. No such revision or discussion has been forthcoming.

The proposed front dormer is overly large and box like and will give the new roof a top heavy appearance. The addition of the rear dormer, visible from the side, adds to the top heavy appearance. The extensions do not respect local character and will not add to local distinctiveness. They will also dramatically unbalance this pair of bungalows. The proposed works are harmful to the appearance of this bungalow and the wider area.

Neighbour amenity

The raised gable and rear dormer are the more intrusive elements for neighbours as they are closer to boundaries and will give a first floor vantage point over private rear gardens. However, similar development can be achieved under permitted development. The front dormer is not harmful to neighbour amenity, other than in visual terms.

Recommendation: **REFUSE** for the following reason:

1. The proposed roof extensions would, by reason of their excessive size, bulk and positioning, constitute a visually discordant and dominant form of development, detrimental to the appearance of the bungalow and the wider area. The proposal is therefore contrary to policy 15 of the Adur Local Plan 2017, adopted Development Management Standard No.2 “Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings” and the relevant paragraphs of the National Planning Policy Framework relating to good design.

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 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 any representations? No.

Case Officer signed:	MOK	Date: 20.8.19
Authorised and signed by:	Peter Barnett	Date: 20 August 2019