Development Management - Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: **AWDM/1337/13** **Recommendation –** Approve

Site: 54 Howard Road, Sompting

Proposal: Room in roof with front and rear dormers, raise roof and form new gable end

Date of site visit: 3 December 2013

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings
The application site relates to a semi detached bungalow on the south side of Howard Road. This is a predominantly residential area comprising of pairs of semi detached bungalows that are stepped as the street slopes from east down to west, resulting in stepped roof heights. Several other bungalows have been extended into the roofspace with hip to gable extensions and front and rear dormer windows.

Permission is sought for a hip to gable roof extension, and alteration to the angle of the pitch resulting in an increased ridge height of approximately 0.5m, a front dormer window (measuring 2.4m in width 1.7m in height and 2.6m in depth approximately), and a rear dormer including juliet balcony (measuring 5.85m in width, 2.2m in height and 3.8m in depth approximately)

Relevant site history
None relevant at application site

No.52 - AWDM/1485/12 Construction of front and rear dormer extensions, front rooflights, windows, hip to gable extension and raised decking to rear. Approved January 2013

Consultations
Sompting Parish Council: *The Council did not support this but found there were no real grounds for objection*

Representations
None

Relevant Planning Policies
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’
National Planning Policy Framework (CLG 2012)

Planning Assessment

Residential amenity
Although the roof extensions are relatively large, particularly the rear dormer extension, given the relationship with neighbouring bungalows there would be no significant impact on residential amenity in terms of loss of light, outlook or privacy as a result of these works. The installation of a Juliet style balcony rather than a window, although may increase the perception of overlooking, would not cause any significant loss of privacy.

Visual amenity
Although it would not be readily visible in the streetscene, the design of the rear dormer is unsympathetic and would result in a bulky and top heavy appearance to the bungalow and the hip to gable extension would unbalance the appearance of the bungalow in relation to the adjoining bungalow. . However, these alterations or similar as well as rooflight windows could be carried out as permitted development and so this 'fallback' position needs to be taken into consideration and consideration should also be given to the larger dormer extension permitted at No.52 in January 2013.

The front dormer, although fairly box-like, is smaller and would be less dominant in the roofslope than the rear dormer and is similar in size and position to others in the street.

The raised ridge level would result in a much more pronounced step in levels between the application site and adjoining site, but as the existing step is relatively small and there appear to be a variety of heights and steps in the vicinity, it would cause any significant harm to the character of the recipient building or area in general.

Although the timber weatherboarding is not characteristic in this location, the applicant has confirmed that it would only be used for the gable and the rear dormer and that tile hanging would be used for the front dormer. This is considered acceptable and would not cause any significant harm to the visual amenities of the site or surrounding area.

There are many other examples of unsympathetic roof additions in the streetscene and wider area and these proposals would not be significantly harmful to the character of the area and so a refusal on design grounds could not be justified. Therefore on balance, and having regard to the permitted development fallback position, the proposed roof alterations are considered acceptable.

Recommendation

Approve for the reason:-

Having regard to the permitted development fallback position and taking into consideration the character of the local environment, on balance the proposed development is considered acceptable and can take place without resulting in significant harm to the visual amenities of the locality or unacceptable detriment to the amenities of neighbouring properties. It consequently would

not conflict with the saved policies of the Adur District Local Plan (AG1, AH7) or the policies of the National Planning Policy Framework

Subject to Conditions:-

1. Standard time limit 3 years
2. Front dormer materials
3. Permission relates to approved plans:
   Drawing number 898 – SK1 entitled 'Location Plan' deposited 22 October 2013
   Drawing number 898 – SK2 entitled 'Block Plan' deposited 22 October 2013
   Drawing number 898 -1 entitled 'Room in the Roof with Front and Rear Dormers Raise the Roof and Form New Gable End' deposited 22 October 2013
   Drawing number 898 -2 Rev A entitled 'Room in the Roof with Front and Rear Dormers Raise the Roof and Form New Gable End' deposited 22 October 2013
   Drawing number 898 -3 Rev A entitled 'Room in the Roof with Front and Rear Dormers Raise the Roof and Form New Gable End' deposited 22 October 2013
   Drawing number 898 -4 Rev A entitled 'Room in the Roof with Front and Rear Dormers Raise the Roof and Form New Gable End' deposited 22 October 2013
   Drawing number 898 -5 Rev A entitled 'Room in the Roof with Front and Rear Dormers Raise the Roof and Form New Gable End' deposited 22 October 2013

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? N

Case Officer: Rebekah Smith Date: 9 December 2013

Authorised by: Peter Barnett Date: 13 December 2013