Expiry 28/05/07

Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: ADC/0195/07 Recommendation - Refuse

Site: **12 Cokeham Lane Sompting Lancing West Sussex**

Proposal: **Rooms in roof (with part-hipped side gables, front dormers and flat-roofed first-floor rear extension)**

The Application

The application site is located on the north-western side of Cokeham Lane. The site comprises a detached single storey two bedroom bungalow with a hipped roof and a gabled entrance porch in the centre, set back approximately 12 metres from the street frontage. The building has previously been extended through a flat roofed 'L' shaped rear extension, projecting out from the original building by a maximum of 5 metres.

The applicant proposes to create rooms in the roof and undertake extensions to the side, front and rear elevations in order to achieve this. The ridge line of the building will be extended by 2.1 metres in each direction to form part-hipped gable ends on both side elevations. Two hipped roof dormer windows will be installed in the front elevation, each with a width of 1.6 metres and a height of 2.25 metres. The existing pitched roof porch will be removed and replaced with a new entranceway. At the rear of the building, the applicant proposes to construct a 7.2 metre wide, 2.4 metre high flat roofed rear extension projecting out from the roof of the dwelling by 3 metres. This will contain two sets of French doors with 'Juliet' balconies associated with each of the bedrooms and three other rear facing windows.

The plans now being considered are a second amendment with respect to the roof extension and rear extension. The plans originally submitted showed the flat roofed rear extension projecting out from the building by 4.5 metres and to the edge of the rear extension. The applicant was requested to amend the plans to reduce this extension back to a conventional 'dormer' design, including reducing its width and setting it back from the rear wall of the dwelling. The first amendment retained the same proportions for the rear extension but extended the main roof out towards the rear, resulting in a flat roofed section at the ridgeline. The applicant was advised that this amendment was still not acceptable and has subsequently submitted the current plans.

The street scene in this area comprises of detached dwellings (mostly bungalows) on the north-western side of the street and pairs of semi-detached bungalows on the south-eastern side. The application dwelling is one of three dwellings in a row immediately to the south of the intersection with Osborne Close which were originally of the same style and proportion but slightly different design. The neighbouring dwelling to the north, No. 10 was

extended in 2001 (S/52/01) with part hipped side gables and one hipped roof front dormer (located in the centre of the roof space) and two hipped roof rear dormers.

Consultations and Representations

Consultees

The Sompting Parish Council has no objection to the application.

Third Parties

Letters of objection have been received from the residents of two neighbouring properties to the rear, Nos. 3 and 5 Osborne Close. The main issues raised are:

- There will be overlooking from the first floor rear extension and would reduce privacy to habitable rooms and rear gardens of the bungalows at the rear.
- There will be noise in excess of normal day to day life which would be very disturbing.

Relevant Planning Policies and Guidance

Adur District Local Plan: AG1, AH7
Development Control Standard No. 3 "Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings"
West Sussex Structure Plan: DEV1, CH1

Planning Assessment

Policies

The Local Plan states that improvements to dwellings by way of appropriate extensions will generally be permitted within the built up area. Of relevance to this application, Policy AH7 requires that extensions to existing houses and bungalows will be expected to be designed so that they will not result in unacceptable adverse effects on neighbouring dwellings, the design and materials are sympathetic to the original dwelling and the area in general and the proposal accords to the standards adopted by the Local Planning Authority. The standards in DC Standard No. 3 "Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings" give specific guidance in determining the scale and style of different types of extensions which may be considered appropriate.

Policy DEV1 of the WSSP states that development will not be permitted unless the construction, layout, scale and appearance are of high quality taking into account the need to integrate with and enhance adjoining land uses and minimise potential conflicts between land uses and activities and having regard to the local context including the use of materials and building styles.

The Appearance
The existing building is a relatively small scale single storey bungalow, retaining its original hipped roof line.

The extension of the roof line to create part hipped gable ends is acceptable in principle as an extension of this nature has already been undertaken on the adjoining dwelling which was originally of the same general style and proportion. This extension was approved under S/52/01 with "half hips" 2.7 metres long which were amended from originally proposed part hips 1.3 metres long. The reporting officer noted that the smaller hips would have an excessively bulky appearance and would be out of keeping with the existing bungalow and character of the area. The longer "half hips" were considered to satisfactorily reduce the mass of the roof and retain more of the character of the existing hipped roof.

The hips proposed in this case are 1.8 metres long which falls in between those originally proposed and finally approved at No. 10. The applicant states that he is unable to increase these any further and still maintain adequate head room in the bedrooms. While it would be preferable that the hips are lengthened further to match those on the neighbouring building, it is considered that the appearance as proposed would still be acceptable as it retains elements of the character of the original roof line and is not considered to be such a visual mismatch with the neighbouring dwelling as to warrant refusal on these grounds.

The front dormer windows are an appropriate style and scale for the front elevation and sufficiently spaced apart. While they are located high on the ridgeline (which conflicts with the guidance in the DC standard), the height would be consistent with the dormer window of the same style approved at No. 10.

Following the amendments made, the rear extension proposed is now effectively a flat roofed dormer which extends out to the rear wall of the original dwelling. The guidelines relating to dormers are therefore considered appropriate to use to determine the acceptability of the proposal.

The DC Standards states that "*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. A large amount of the original roof should still be visible ... 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.*"

Despite the amendments made to the design, it is not considered that the proposed rear extension/dormer sufficiently accords to these standards. The scale is such that it completely dominates the rear of the small bungalow and is not in keeping with its character. While the depth has been reduced so that it no longer extends out over the rear extension, it still extends right out to the rear wall of the original dwelling and appears 'box-like' and sitting on top of

the roof of the ground floor rear extension. While it is kept well below ridge level, it will cover over 80% of the (extended) roof space and extends right out to the edges of the hips in the side of the roof.

As such, the design of the proposed extension is not considered to be sympathetic to the original dwelling and, as there are no other dormers or first floor rear extensions of this scale in the area, out of character with the surrounding area.

Effects on Neighbours
It is not considered that any of the extensions will result in unacceptable effects on amenity of neighbouring properties as the surrounding dwellings are all detached with good separation. The dwelling immediately to the north (No. 10) is set level on the site but extends much further to the rear than the proposed extension so will not be affected by loss of light to any rear windows.

The objections received from neighbours mostly related to overlooking from the windows at first floor level in the rear extension. It is acknowledged that large principal windows and doors are proposed for this elevation. However, the main overlooking will occur over the applicant's own rear garden only. The DC standard requires that there is a minimum separation between principal windows on extensions and principal windows on dwellings to the rear of 22 metres. The separation between the proposed rear extension and the rear of the dwellings of the two objectors is over 35 metres. It is also noted that there are trees on the boundary which would provide a reasonable degree of screening.

The balconies proposed are 'Juliet' balconies which will restrict egress from the bedrooms onto the flat roof which could have potentially led to overlooking of the two side neighbours.

The other concern of one of the neighbours to the rear is noise. As the building would still remain as a single residential unit, it is not considered that the extensions would result in a significant increase in noise levels emanating from the property.

Recommendation

REFUSE on ground that :-

B5BR "The proposed flat roofed rear extension,..."

Case Officer: .....

Date: 8/05/07

15/5