Expires 5/11/08

Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: ADC/0449/08 **Recommendation – Refuse Application**

Site: **21 Howard Road Sompting Lancing West Sussex**

Proposal: **Raising of ridge line, forming new gable and wall to side elevation, front and rear dormers**

The Application

The application site is the western half of a pair of split level semi-detached bungalows located on the north side of Howard Road, Sompting. The bungalow remains largely unaltered with a small wooden lean-to conservatory off the rear elevation and an old pre-fabricated garage also to the rear accessed by a single driveway. The attached bungalow at No.19 has extended its roof (S/39/80/TP) by raising the ridge to the rear and adding a gable and rear dormer. To the west is a detached bungalow with large extensions to the rear.
Permission is sought to extend the roof in a similar fashion. The ridge line is to be raised by continuing the front pitch to the rear and the hip is to be enlarged into a full gable end. As the roof is to be extended to the rear, the pitch of the rear roof plane will be sharper than that of the front roof plane such that the ridge line will be a further 0.9 metres to the rear than current. A large 5.7 metre wide dormer is to be added into the new rear roof plane whilst a 4.6 metre wide dormer is to be added to the front roof plane. A small shallow pitch is to be added atop an existing front box bay window.

Consultations and Representations

Third Parties

No.72 Sedbury Road have raised no objection but state a preference for Velux windows to the front instead of the dormer so as to protect their privacy.

Sompting Parish Council have Objected on the grounds that the raising of the roofline and the gable end treatment would be out of scale and out of character and detrimental to the existing property and with the neighbouring properties.

Contributors

No representations have been received.

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 11 'Supplementary Planning Guidance' comprising: Development Control Standard No.3 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings'

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. DC standard No.3 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings' states that roof extensions should respect the scale, character and appearance of existing dwellings. The acceptability of the lack of symmetry resulting from the enlargement of a hipped roof to a gable end would depend on the visual quality and character of the area. It also states that dormers should not be so large that they overdominate 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.

Visual Amenity
The applicant's bungalow as current remains in its original form, with a fully hipped roof and rear garage. The attached property sits on marginally lower ground and fully extended its roof in 1980 into a full gable with a rear dormer. To create the headroom for the dormer the ridge had to be raised accordingly by continuing the front pitch to the rear. This has resulted in a rear roof slope that is marginally steeper than the front (35° as opposed to 33°) and a ridgeline offset from the applicant's. The difference in the pitches is unnoticeable from the street.
This proposal seeks a similar alteration, with the ridge raised 0.9 metres to the rear and a full gable installed. The extent of this alteration is such that the new rear pitch will be significantly steeper than the front (45° as opposed to 33°). This creates an unsymmetrical profile that is visible from the street and considered poor design. In addition, its is noted that the raised ridge will not continue across to the party wall but will cease 0.5m short, in line with the flank of the proposed rear dormer. This will result in a visibly awkward and residual section of original ridge that will only exacerbate the unacceptable nature of this design.
The principle of the hip-gable extension and rear dormer is not in question given the nature of the extensions to the attached dwelling and similar

extensions to others in the immediate area. The front dormer is though considered inappropriate, despite there being many evident further to the west, as the attached property has no such dormer itself. DC Standard No.3 clearly states that roof extensions should respect the scale, character and appearance of existing dwellings. In this instance the nature of character and appearance of the existing dwellings is the intended symmetry of the semi-detached pair as originally built. In the spirit of good design, as promoted by Structure Plan policy DEV1, Local Plan policy AH7 and PPS1, an emphasis must therefore be placed on regaining the symmetry of the pair in some form. That a gross enlargement of No.19 has been undertaken in the past does not set a precedent for a differing enlargement of its attached neighbour.
In addition, it is considered that the cumulative effects of a combined roof extension and front and rear dormers would serve to visually overburden the roofspace and would be "out of scale and proportion with the original dwelling" (DC Standard No.3, para 3.14) and consequentially unacceptable. For these reasons the front dormer is considered an unsympathetic feature that should be removed from the plans.

The addition of a small section of shallow pitch to the front box bay window is not considered appropriate to its original flat roofed design (and that on the attached neighbour's) and is at odds with the pitch of the main roofslope. That it extends from the base of the proposed front dormer only adds to the cluttered appearance of this design.

Residential Amenity
The only impact this proposal will have is on the privacy of the attached neighbour. This property also has a rear dormer so it is considered that any overlooking potential will be mutual and therefore acceptable. Although No 72 Sedbury Road have raised concern over the impact of the front dormer on their privacy, there is more than adequate distance between the properties afforded by Howard Road.

Where possible it is the LPA's responsibility to exercise their control in ensuring the best design possible is promoted via its policies and supplementary guidances. It is considered that these roof extensions are contrary to the requirements of PPS1 guidance, Structure Plan policy DEV1, Local Plan policy AH7 and the attached DC Standard guidance, and should therefore be rejected. Although there are numerous examples of irregular roof extensions throughout North Sompting, it is not considered that these set an acceptable precedent for further poor quality extensions such as this.

Recommendation

REFUSE on ground that :-

B5BR: 'The proposed roof extensions, by reason of their.....'

Case Officer:.....

Date: 20/10/08

PB 21/10/08