Development Management – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/0298/25 Recommendation: APPROVE

Site: 118 Downside, Shoreham-By-Sea, West Sussex

Proposal: Roof conversion with side gable, extension of front and rear dormers.

Date of Site Visit: Visited when considering no. 120 Downside 4th March 2025.

Neighbours Checked: Y

Additional neighbour notification: N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

The application site is a semi detached, hipped roof bungalow with front and rear, flat roof dormer and small rear lean to extension. Consent is sought for a hip to gable roof extension and extension to the front and rear dormers. As with no. 120 Downside the application also originally included a single storey rear extension which exceeded 3.5 metres in depth. A prior approval application has been submitted and approved for the extension AWDM/0541/25 and this has been removed from the application.

The front dormer is to be extended along the front of the roof to the boundary to be attached to the dormer permitted under AWDM/0150/25 at no. 120 Downside, both dormers will be of matching design, scale and finish. An enlarged flat roof dormer is proposed to the rear.

Representations: - None received.

Relevant Planning Policies

Adur Local Plan 2017 Policy 15
'Supplementary Planning Guidance' comprising: Development Management Standard No.2 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings''
National Planning Policy Framework (December 2024)
WSCC Guidance on Parking at New Developments (Sept 2020).

Planning Assessment

Principle

The relevant issues are the effects on the amenities of neighbouring residential occupiers and the effect on the character and appearance of the area.

Visual amenity

The hip to gable and front dormer will be clearly visible within the street scene. Downside comprises many front dormers and hip to gable extensions. Dormers of varying scale, design, height and with traditional and contemporary finishes are visible. Although the dormer extension proposed here is wide, it is set in from the edge of the building and it is centrally positioned in the roof slope. A dormer of limited height relative to other dormers, some of which are much greater in height spanning a much greater proportion of the roof slopes. The design matches that existing at the application site and matches the dormer at 120. The dormers are shown to be built to the boundary. The proposed development will bring symmetry and despite being prominent in the light of the existing development in the street a refusal would not be warranted. The materials to match will limit its prominence also. The existing hipped roof feature at the front will be retained.

The rear dormer will be enlarged; it is not visible within the street scene however it is a large addition. There are many similar rear dormers and this form of development could be constructed under permitted development, it would not be possible to resist this form of development in this case.

It is noted that the dormers are shown built up to the boundary on both properties. Ideally these would both be built together and adjoining. However as these are separate applications a condition cannot be attached to ensure this is the case. However it is considered that should the front dormers be constructed at different times that there would be no visual harm as a result.

Residential amenity

The increased bulk of the roof will be visible from adjacent, neighbouring properties. However there would be no significant loss of amenity in this case. There is a blank side gable at the adjacent bungalow. The proposed side gable will have no side openings in this case.

The rear dormer faces the rear of bungalows in Slonk Hill Road to the north. As stated above a rear dormer could be constructed under permitted development which would have the same impact as that proposed here. Therefore no refusal would be warranted on the grounds of overlooking. The front dormer will overlook the park opposite and the highway therefore no loss of privacy will occur.

Recommendation

APPROVE

Subject to Conditions:-

1. Approved Plans
2. Standard 3 year time limit
3. Materials to match existing
4. No openings on side gable.

Is recommendation contrary to letter(s) of representation N

1. Proactive with amendments

Case Officer: Hannah Barker Date: 12th June 2025

Authorised by: Peter Barnett Date: 16 June 2025