Expiry Date – 11/9

Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/0988/18 Recommendation – Refuse

Site: 69 Overhill, Southwick

Proposal: Roof extensions with raised rear gable, raised front half gable, south side dormer and 3no. rooflights on the north slope.

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Date of Site Visit: 23/8 and 17/9

Site and Surroundings

This application relates to a hipped roof bungalow with projecting front gable detail on the west side of Overhill. The property has not been extended previously. It shares a driveway on its north side with No.71 both of whom have detached rear garages. Overhill climbs up from the south.

Many of these bungalows have extended into the roof in a variety of ways including side dormers, raising rear gables and raising front gables.

The property is not in a conservation area and is not listed.

Proposal

Planning permission is sought to extend into the roofspace to create 3 bedrooms and a bathroom. The extension involves a full rear gable, a half front gable, a south side dormer and rooflights to the north side. The application has been revised since first submitted to move the side dormer to the south side away from the neighbour at No. 71 who had objected to the original scheme. This was not at the request of the planning department.

Relevant Planning History

4281/59 – Garage. Granted

Consultations

None undertaken.

Representations

Representation received from No. 71 to the revised drawings as follows:

1. Central rooflight on north side needs to be to the left or right to avoid directly facing our bathroom rooflight

2. Bathroom rooflight needs to be obscurely glazed to avoid a loss of privacy.

Relevant Planning Policies and Guidance

The National Planning Policy Framework 2018
Adur Local Plan 2017 Policies 1, 2 and 15 including 'Development Management Standard No. 2 Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings'.

Planning Assessment

Principle

The principle of development can be supported as it upgrades a dwelling within the built up area boundary. For consideration is the impact of the proposals on the character and appearance of the area and the impacts of the development on neighbour amenity.

Character

The bungalows in Overhill have seen many roof alterations. Subject to conditions extending into the roof of these detached bungalows does not need planning permission when it adds less than 50 cubic metres to the roofspace and where the extension does not alter a roof plane fronting a road. In this case however, a front gablet is being created and the overall volume exceeds 50 cubic metres.

The revised plans show the side dormer moved to the south side. The applicant did this unilaterally in an effort to appease the neighbour at No. 71 who had objected to the original application. The scale of the development has otherwise not changed.

The property to the south, No. 67, is unoccupied. No. 67 sits on lower ground and so the southern roofslope of the application property is very visible in the streetscene. The side dormer is very large. It extends to the front wall of the raised front gablet and is also tight to the ridge and eaves. The applicant was asked to reduce the size of the side dormer so that it sat comfortably behind the original front hip and was less deep in relation to the proposed rear raised gable to be created. He has not done so. The proposed rear gable and front gablet in themselves are not objectionable in my view. But the scale, both in width and depth, and design of the proposed 'box like' side dormer is excessive, over dominant and visually intrusive in relation to the modest scale of the property. The addition of such a large side dormer would be highly prominent and unsightly in the streetscene given the rising ground level; particularly when approaching the property from the south.

The proposal is contrary to adopted Local Plan policy 15 which states:

Development should be of a high architectural quality and respect and enhance the character of the site, and the prevailing character of the area, in terms of proportion,

form, context, massing, siting, layout, density, height, size, scale, materials, detailed design features and landscaping. Development should:

- *Enhance the local environment by way of its appearance and character, with particular attention being paid to the architectural form, height, materials, density, scale, orientation, landscaping and layout of the development;*
- *Include a layout and design which take account of the potential users of the site;*
- *Make a positive contribution to the sense of place, local character and distinctiveness of an area; and not have an unacceptable impact on adjacent properties, particularly residential dwellings, including unacceptable loss of privacy, daylight/sunlight, outlook or open amenity space;*

When considering applications for extensions or alterations to dwellings, proposals will be expected to comply with the criteria contained in the Council's adopted Development Management Standard No.2 "Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings" (as amended or superseded by other Council guidance in force at the time an application is considered) or any other appropriate national standard.

Adopted Development Management Standard No.2 "Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings" states:

3.11 Rear dormers and other roof alterations like hip-to-gable extensions may be able to be carried out as permitted development. Where permission is required, they should not be so large that they over-dominate the dwelling, resulting in a top heavy "box-like" appearance. They should be kept well below the ridge level of the existing roof and should not project as far as the walls of the house. A large amount of the original roof should still be clearly visible. Dormers should not "wrap-around" more than one face of a roof and should not normally be located on the side of a hipped roof. The appearance of roof lights will often be more acceptable. Where the existing roof space is of inadequate size to accommodate the room(s) proposed without adding very large flat-roofed dormers, permission will not normally be granted.

3.14 Where permission is required, roof extensions should respect the scale, character and appearance of existing dwellings. In some instances, the enlargement of a hipped roof into a gable or half-gable end may respect the proportions of a property more than adding dormers. However, the acceptability of the resulting lack of symmetry would depend on the visual quality and character of the area. In particular, the extension of a hipped roof into a gable end on a semi-detached dwelling would not usually be considered favourably, especially in the case of a two-storey house. The cumulative effect of a combined roof extension and dormers is unlikely to be acceptable since the resulting works would probably be out of scale and proportion with the original dwelling.

Neighbour amenity

Moving the dormer to the south side greatly reduces the impact of the proposed roof extension on neighbours at No. 71. The rear raised gable will have a small impact on the light received to a ground floor side bedroom window towards the rear of the flank wall of 71. But adequate separation exists and this room also has a rear aspect through a lean to addition. Proposed rooflights in the side roofslope will face No. 71. The

bathroom rooflight and middle rooflight can be conditioned to be high level and obscurely glazed only to avoid a loss of privacy.

No. 67, to the south is currently unoccupied. The large side dormer window which extends to almost the full depth of the rear raised gable will allow the private rear garden of No. 67 to be overlooked. This would be harmful to neighbour amenity. Under Class B windows erected in side walls or rooflsopes must be non opening below 1.7 metres and obscurely glazed to avoid a loss of privacy for neighbours.

The side dormer also fails the test of policy 15 and Development Management Standard No. 2 adoped as part of the new local plan in December 2017.

Adopted Policy 15 states:

・ *Make a positive contribution to the sense of place, local character and distinctiveness of an area; and not have an unacceptable impact on adjacent properties, particularly residential dwellings, including unacceptable loss of privacy, daylight/sunlight, outlook or open amenity space;*

DM Standard No.2 states:

2.2 Proposals will not be granted planning permission if they have an unacceptably adverse effect on neighbouring properties. The main detrimental effects could be related to:
 Privacy - the proposal should not result in direct overlooking of rooms in neighbouring properties, nor excessive amounts of overlooking of garden areas.

Conclusion

Notwithstanding the many and varied roof extensions added to a great number of the bungalows in Overhill it is considered that the side dormer now proposed is excessive in scale and would be harmful to visual and neighbour amenity.

REFUSE for the following reason:

1. The proposed side dormer would, by reason of its excessive size, design and positioning, constitute a visually discordant and dominant form of development, detrimental to the appearance of the bungalow and the wider area. The proposal is therefore considered contrary to policy 15 of the Adur Local Plan 2017, adopted Development Management Standard No.2 “Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings” and the relevant paragraphs of the National Planning Policy Framework relating to good design.

2. The side dormer would enable overlooking of No. 67’s private rear garden and lead to a loss of privacy for neighbours harmful to their living conditions. As such the proposal is contrary to policy 15 of the Adur Local Plan 2017 and adopted Development Management Standard No.2 “Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings”.

Informative

The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by identifying matters of concern with the proposal and discussing those with the Applicant. Unfortunately, it has not been possible to resolve those matters within the timescale allocated for the determination of this planning application. However, the Local Planning Authority has clearly set out, within its report, the steps necessary to remedy the harm identified within the reasons for refusal - which may lead to the submission of a more acceptable proposal in the future. The Local Planning Authority is willing to provide pre-application advice in respect of any future application for a revised development.

Is recommendation contrary to any representations? No.

Case Officer signed:	MOK	Date: 19.10.18
Authorised and signed by:	Gary Peck	Date: 19 October 2018