Expiry Date -

Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: **Recommendation – APPROVE**
AWDM/1163/13

Site: **106 West Way**

Proposal: **Side/rear garage extension and front dormers with hip to gable roof extension and rear dormer**

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

The proposal is for:

- Single storey side extension to measure (at max) 4 metres in height, 14 metres in length, and 4.6 metres in width
- 2 no. front dormers, each to measure (at max) 2.3 metres in height, 2.4 metres in length, and 2.2 metres in width
- Hip-to-gable roof extension with flat roof rear dormer, to measure (at max) 3.7 metres in height, 9.6 metres in length, and 5.9 metres in width

In practice all elements listed out above would be built as one single building operation, so fall within the scope of this planning application.

The application property is one of a pair of bungalows in a low rise cul-de-sac in an outer residential suburb of Lancing. There are several instances of front dormers in the immediate cul-de-sac and elsewhere.

Relevant Planning History

Consultations (summarised)

Lancing Parish Council:
Object as the proposed development was overly large and out of proportion to the rest of the building. It was also considered that the neighbouring property would suffer from a loss of light.

Representations
None

Relevant Planning Policies and Guidance

Adur Local Plan (ADC 1996) (saved policies): AG1, AH7

National Planning Policy Framework

Planning Assessment

Principle

Upgrading of residential accommodation is acceptable in principle.

Visual amenity

There are several instances of larger box dormers to the front roof slopes of bungalows in the street. The dormers currently proposed would be prominent visually. However their size and scale is not excessive as they would sit comfortably within the expanse of front roof slope without overly dominating it. They are of a better quality design that some of the other dormers that already exist elsewhere in the street.

The hip-to-gable roof extension would alter the appearance of the pair of bungalows. However the building pair is already unbalanced as the adjoining building has gained considerable bulk by way of an overly large box dormer that dominates its front roof slope. Since the original modest form of this bungalow and its balanced appearance has already been lost, the application property itself has the capacity to accommodate the additional bulk inherent in a hip-to-gable extension.

The side/rear extension is well recessed from the front face of the bungalow being positioned mainly within the rear garden, so the majority of it is concealed from public view. From street view, its roof would follow the same pitch as the new front dormer roofs, so it would appear as a visually integrated element to the main house from the public aspect. The extension would be of a long length but a good amount of it simply covers the footprint of the existing garage, which is to be demolished. Its new hipped roof would add some visual bulk. However it is single storey and even with a full hipped roof, the overall size of the side extension would still be sufficiently proportionate to the main building to be readily identifiable as an ancillary building to the main residence. Once built, a reasonable area of private rear garden would still be available for future occupiers to use.

The rear dormer is positioned at the rear of the building and would not be overly visible from the public viewpoints.

For these reasons, although large, this proposal is not overdevelopment of the site nor it is out of proportion or oversized, and no visual harm would arise from it.

Residential amenity - neighbours

It is the immediate neighbour to the west who is principally impacted upon by this development (it is physically removed from the remainder so as to avoid harm to the residential amenities of neighbours).

The neighbouring building has three windows in its elevation facing the application site, serving the entrance hall and kitchen. It also has windows at the rear facing into the garden.

The side extension would run a considerable length along the shared boundary, hard up against it. Its roof would protrude above the existing boundary fence. To a certain degree this would reduce the light and outlook currently received by the neighbour.

However a flat roof garage built against the same shared boundary exists in the neighbour's own garden. Therefore the majority of shadow cast by the proposed side extension would be onto this garage, rather than useable garden. Its length would also terminate before materially interfering with the outlook and light received by the neighbour's side windows. The side extension is single storey with a roof angled away from the shared boundary. The additional bulk of the hip-to-gable roof extension would be above eaves height and follow the pitched silhouette of the existing roof. The front dormers are physically removed from this neighbouring building to the west so avoiding undue overshadowing and overbearing. This circumstance would avoid undue overbearing and overshadowing, as the severity of any which results would not be adverse.

Windows/openings are absent in the elevation of the development which faces onto this neighbour. Although there is a large amount of glazing in the rear dormer, views from the new rear dormer would be limited to being oblique rather than direct. There is already mutual overlooking of rear gardens experienced by neighbours, and the front dormers would look out onto the public street. Given this circumstance, unacceptable overlooking and intrusively harmful loss of privacy onto the neighbour is therefore negated. This situation can be maintained by way of a planning condition.

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 Local Plan (AG1, AH7) and those relevant policies of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Subject to the following conditions:-

1. Standard time limit
2. Approved Plans
3. Exterior materials to match
4. No windows in west elevation (except as shown)
5. Accommodation to be ancillary
6. Bathroom window in west to be obscured and top hung

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 any representations? N

Case Officer signed: Matthew Porter Date: 8-11-2013

Authorised and signed by: Peter Barnett Date: 11 November 2013