16 Croshaw Close
Lancing
BN15 9LE

Application no: AWDM/0669/23

This is an appeal against refusal of planning, for extending the dormers to the east and west elevations.

Reasons given for refusal:

The proposed extensions to the side dormers would, due to there size and scale in relation to the host dwelling, be harmful to the character and appearance of the bungalow, setting a harmful precedent and having a detrimental impact upon the visual amenities of the locality. They would also result in overlooking of the neighbouring properties detrimental to their residential amenity. The proposal is therefore contrary to policy 15 of the Adur local plan.

NB: for specific details of the reasons for refusal I have turned to the officer's report.

Officers report – planning assessment.

Visual amenity

The dormers as existing and previously approved are modest in scale and do not dominate the roof slope or the existing bungalow. The dormers as proposed run the full length of both sides of the bungalow and will be overly large and prominent. They will dominate the appearance of the bungalow representing incongruous features which would be harmful to the character and appearance of the bungalow and surrounding locality. They would set a harmful precedent for any future similar development which would have a significant detrimental effect.

The proposed dormers are an extension of the existing dormers. The appearance from the front of the property will therefore be much the same as existing.

This bungalow, as can be seen from the block plan, is tucked into the corner of the close on a tapering site being much smaller at the front. Thus, there is virtually no position from the road where the dormers can be seen.

With regard to the affect on the appearance of the bungalow being harmed this is a matter of opinion. There are numerous houses, some built as chalet style where the dormers are significant or effectively full length, and this is not considered a problem or detrimental in any way. We do not see the difference between a house built with long dormers and a property where they are provided afterwards. The character of the property is not affected and there is certainly no detrimental affect on the surrounding locality.

Appendix A:

We note the following selection of dormers in the immediate area (less than ¼ mile) there are others which we could have included;

1. 28 Croshaw Close – large front dormer



2. 30/31 Croshaw Close – front dormer to chalet style home
   32/33 ditto and large rear dormers to 31, 32 & 33.



3. 14 Croshaw Close – large front and rear dormers



4. 72 Sompting Road – large front dormer
   74 Sompting Road – ditto



5. 88 Sompting Road – full length side dormers much more prominent than those proposed for 16 Croshaw Close.



6. 94/96/98/100 Sompting Road – large prominent side dormers



7. 4 Elms Drive - large front and dormers



8 Elms Drive – large side dormers, much more prominent than those proposed for 16 Croshaw





We are regularly told by the LA that every house is different and thus alterations to one cannot be taken as a precedent to another. Thus, they cannot have it both ways, particularly as with this property it is set in the corner of a close with no passing traffic and the plot is such that there is only a very limited view from the road.

<u>Residential amenity</u>

The existing dormers have been conditioned to be obscure glazed and non opening to 1.7meters above finished floor level. There is a bedroom window proposed here which will be clear glazed and would overlook to the east. This would impact upon the residential amenities of the adjacent property.

We note on revisiting the plan that there was one side window that was not marked as being obscure glazed and fixed shut to 1.7m above floor level. This was an oversight and not intended. All first floor windows to the sides would be obscure glazed and fixed shut to 1.7m above the floor. This could easily have been corrected if it was pointed out or could easily have been conditioned.

Representations

The one private representation was from the neighbour to the east side.

The objection was mainly with regard to overlooking owing to the over site in not marking one side window as obscure glazed and fixed shut as mentioned above. Clearly this is easily overcome.

There is a suggestion that it will affect the light to no 17. However, any affect would be negligible even in mid winter, whilst in the summer any shadowing would not get above the fence between the two properties.

The planning officer does not mention the situation with light in her report and thus I assume she was not unduly concerned.

Parish Council.

The Parish Council had no objections and indeed supported the application.

Reason for the proposal

This application was made to overcome a problem that was not envisaged when the original application to extend the property was presented.

With the original application the height of the ridge was kept as low as possible to keep in character with the area. However, with the changes to building regulations in respect of additional insulation required, this has significantly affected the amount of floor space where my client's husband can stand upright.

Conclusion

This property will look the same from the front as it does now. There is virtually no one who can see the sides because of the site arrangement. It does not adversely affect the character of the area or provide a precedent. The windows to the first floor sides will all be obscure glazed and fixed shut to 1.7m above floor level, thus removing that concern.

We therefore hope that the planning inspector will agree with us and allow this appeal.