Development Management - Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/0264/14 Recommendation – Approve

Site: 4 Mill Hill, Shoreham-By-Sea, West Sussex BN43 5TH

Proposal: Increase size of existing front and rear dormers

Date of site visit: 1 April 2014

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

The application relates to a detached bungalow located on the east side of Mill Hill close to the junction with The Street. The bungalow is set back from the road by over 30m and is perpendicular to 5 The Avenue, the rear garden of which adjoins the site boundary.

There are existing small dormers in the front and rear roofslopes and the application is proposing to increase the size of both dormers. At the front the dormer would measure 3.5m wide, 1.8m high and 2.3m deep. At the rear, the dormer would measure 9.3m wide, 2.6m high and 4m deep.

Relevant site history

None

Consultations

None

Representations

1 letter of objection received from the occupier of 5 The Avenue on the grounds of overlooking and loss of privacy.

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’
Assessment of Saved Policies (ADC 2013)
National Planning Policy Framework (CLG 2012)
Planning Practice Guidance (CLG 2014)

Planning Assessment

Principle

The proposal comprises upgrading of the existing housing stock located within the built up area and can be supported in principle. The relevant issues are the effects on the amenities of neighbouring residential occupiers and the effect on the character and appearance of the dwelling and its surroundings.

Visual amenity

The front dormer is increasing in size only slightly and will not have a significant visual impact, particularly as the property is set so far back from the street.

The rear dormer will be significantly larger and will dominate the roofslope. However, it will not be visible from public views. Consideration must also be given to the 'PD fallback' situation where it could be constructed without planning permission if the roof of the existing rear extension was removed and replaced with a flat roof with false pitch. This would arguably have a worse visual appearance and, on balance, it is considered that the current proposal, which retains the pitched roof over the existing extension, is acceptable.

Residential amenity

The front dormer extension will not increase overlooking to any material degree. The rear dormer will result in a bulkier, more intrusive form and an additional clear glazed bedroom window which will face towards the rear garden of 5 The Avenue, which is just 7.5m from the dormer. The occupier of No.5 has objected on the grounds of overlooking and there is some sympathy with this objection.

However, the garden is already overlooked by the existing dormer window at 4 Mill Hill as well as by other windows on neighbouring dwellings, albeit less directly. The larger dormer and new window will increase the sense of overlooking but, in light of the existing level of overlooking and the PD fallback position, the objection is not considered to be sustainable in this case.

Recommendation

APPROVE for the reason:-

The proposed development would not detract from the local environment and can take place without resulting in unacceptable detriment to the amenities of neighbouring properties. It would consequently not conflict with the saved policies of the Adur District Local Plan (AG1, AH7) or the policies of the National Planning Policy Framework

Subject to Conditions:-

1. Standard 3 year time limit
2. Materials to match existing dwelling
3. Approved plans

Is recommendation contrary to letter(s) of representation? Y

The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by assessing the proposal against all material considerations, including planning policies and any representations that may have been received and subsequently determining to grant planning permission in accordance with the presumption in favour of sustainable development, as set out within the National Planning Policy Framework.

Case Officer: Peter Barnett Date: 10 April 2014

Authorised by: Gary Peck Date: 14 April 2014