Development Management - Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: **AWDM/0913/14** **Recommendation – Approve**

Site: **38 Firle Road Lancing**

Proposal: **Loft conversion with front and rear dormer raising roof and new pitched roof over flat roof extension (re-submission of AWDN/0342/14)**

Date of site visit: 13.8.14

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

The difference between this amended proposal and that previously approved (AWDM/0342/14) is now it is proposed to extend the proposed rear dormer to bring its eastern outer edge in line with the plane of the existing bungalow roof.

The amended rear dormer (and raised building ridge to accommodate it) will now measure 2.8 metres in height, 4.5 metres in length, and 7.6 metres in width.

The new front dormer (measuring 1.2 metres in height, 1.7 metres in length, and 2 metres in width) and hipped roof onto an existing flat roof extension (measuring 1.1 metres in height, 7.6 metres in length, and 4 metres in width) are unchanged from what was previously approved.

The application relates to a semi-detached bungalow, elevated from the highway of Firle Road, with the front of the building accessed by way of a staircase. It has been extended at the side and rear by way of flat roof extensions.

The surrounding area is an outer suburb of Lancing, residential in character.

Relevant Planning History
AWDM/0342/14
Loft conversion with front and rear dormer raising roof and new pitched roof over flat roof extension
Approved Conditionally 07-05-2014

Consultations (summarised)

Lancing Parish Council: *No objections Mr Whitaker of 38 Firle Road explained that the planning application number AWDM/0913/14 was re-submission as original application was submitted without his consent. Mr*

Whittaker has subsequently applied to alter the pitch of the roof line, which he considered to have a more pleasing appearance.

Worthing & Adur Councils:

Environmental Health contamination officer: *No adverse comments*

Representations (summarised)
None

Relevant Planning Policies

Adopted Adur District Local Plan 1993-2006 (ADC 1996) (saved policies):
AG1, AH7
National Planning Policy Framework (CLG 2012)

Planning Assessment

Principle

Upgrading of residential accommodation is acceptable in principle.

Visual amenity

The bulk of the proposed development is around the back of the building, so would not impact upon the street scene visible to the public. The outer eastern edge of rear dormer would follow the pitch of the existing bungalow, so would not appear obtrusive.

As before, the introduction of a front dormer and raised ridge would disrupt some symmetry between the two bungalows. However there is already a staggered ridge to the pair due to the change in the level of the land, and a resultant lack of balance.

Like previously, front dormers are now an established feature on properties in the street, with that proposed sensitively proportioned to the rest of the roof slope.

Insufficient visual harm would arise from this proposal to warrant refusal.

Residential amenity

The neighbours principally impacted upon are those to either side of the application site (it is physically removed from the remainder).

Neighbour to the west

This neighbouring building adjoins the application property, which has no dormers in its roof.

Like before, the proposed rear dormer next door would take some outlook away from this neighbour. However the position of the dormer above the eaves line means its bulk would not be adversely overbearing or unduly

reduce the amount of light received. The new pitched roof and front dormer would be physically removed from this neighbour, so would not cause harm.

As previously, the rear dormer windows would not allow for direct views onto this neighbour, so harmfully intrusive overlooking and material harmful loss of privacy would not occur. The front dormer would overlook the public street.

Neighbour to the east

This neighbouring building has itself been extended by way of a flat roof rear extension. In this extension is a kitchen, which is served by a large picture window facing south and a glazed rear door facing west.

In the previous application this neighbour objected to the proposal. With this current application, a letter has been submitted purporting to be from the occupiers of 36 Firle Road raising no objection. This neighbour has not submitted comments on the latest proposal independent of this letter.

Extending the rear dormer so that it is line with the plane of the existing bungalow roof would bring some additional built form closer to the neighbour. The rear dormer so adjusted, and the new pitched roof to the existing flat roof extension, would both reduce light received by the glazed door serving the kitchen. However the principal source of light into that room (the window facing south) would be still remain unaffected.

Like before, outlook from the kitchen is already substantially curtailed by a wall along the shared boundary, and the new hipped roof is shallow and, together with the eastern flank of the dormer which will be angled away from the boundary, is set back from the boundary.

A limited area of garden immediately outside of the kitchen would also be impacted upon - but the vast remainder of it would be unchanged.

The front dormer would overlook the public street, and is physically removed from this neighbour.

In this circumstance although it is recognised there would be an impact, it would not be of such a severity as to warrant refusal – even accounting for the impact arising from the increased bulk and mass of the rear dormer.

Recommendation

APPROVE

Subject to Conditions:-

1. Standard time limit
2. Approved Plans
3. External materials/finishes to match
4. Notwithstanding “pd” no further windows/openings in side elevations

Informative

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.

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

Case Officer: Matthew Porter Date: 26-08-2014

Authorised by: Gary Peck Date: 26 August 2014