

Recommendation Report for Planning Permission**REF NO:** AL/12/12/**LOCATION:** 2 Elm Cottages
Hook Lane
Aldingbourne**PROPOSAL:** Proposed extension (amendment to Planning Approval AL/82/11/ - change to lower roof line)**SITE AND SURROUNDINGS**

DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION	The application seeks consent for a single storey side extension and single storey rear extension incorporating a covered verandah, as an amendment to application (AL/82/11).
SITE AREA	Approximately 410 sq metres
RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT DEN	N/A
TOPOGRAPHY	Predominantly flat.
TREES	None of any significance affected by the proposed development.
BOUNDARY TREATMENT	The dwelling fronts directly onto Hook Lane with a low flint wall and mature hedging to the side front Hook Lane.
SITE CHARACTERISTICS	Semi-detached cottage with cream rendered elevations, slate tiled roof and front porch. Foundations for proposed single storey side and rear extension, permitted under application AL/82/11, under construction. Garden to the side with detached double garage and horse box.
CHARACTER OF LOCALITY	Predominantly rural with linear housing. The attached semi-detached cottage has extended to the side to provide a conservatory and two storey rear extension.

RELEVANT SITE HISTORY

AL/59/92	12' X 8' lean to conservatory and alterations to existing vehicular access	Approve Cond 20-11-1992
AL/40/11/	Proposed extension	Refused 20-06-2011
AL/82/11/	Proposed extension (Resubmission of AL/40/11)	Approve Cond 06-10-2011

AL/7/12/NMA	Application for a non-material amendment following a grant of planning permission AL/82/11/ for alteration to roof pitch	Refused 25-01-2012
AL/67/78	Rear extension bedroom ground floor realign bathroom roof at No 1 extension for bedroom first floor No 2	Approve Cond 30-08-1978
AL/5/80	Alterations to form additional first floor bedroom and porch	Withdrawn 21-02-1980
AL/4/80	Outline - one single storey dwelling	Refused 27-02-1980
AL/28/80	Two storey extension to form reception additional bedroom bathroom and porch	Approve Cond 26-03-1980
AL/97/80	Double garage and double pony stalls	Approve Cond 20-08-1980

REPRESENTATIONS**Representations received:**

Comments awaited.

Comments on Representations received:

Awaited.

CONSULTATIONS**Consultations responses received:**

None

Comments on Consultation responses:

None

POLICY CONTEXT

Designation applicable to site:
Class C Road
Outside built-up area boundary

DEVELOPMENT PLAN POLICIES

Arun District Local Plan:	GEN3 GEN7 DEV19	Protection of the Countryside The Form of New Development Extensions to existing residential buildings
---------------------------	---	--

PLANNING POLICY GUIDANCE

NPPF National Planning Policy Framework

POLICY COMMENTARY

The above policies combine to describe the criteria against which the application will be assessed particularly with regard to visual and residential amenity.

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 states:-

"If regard is to be had to the development plan for the purpose of any determination to be made under the planning Acts the determination must be made in accordance with the plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise."

The proposal is considered to conflict with relevant Development Plan policies in that it would have a materially adverse effect on the visual amenities of the locality and the established character of the surrounding area.

OTHER MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS

It is considered that there are no other material considerations to warrant a decision otherwise than in accordance with the Development Plan and/or legislative background.

CONCLUSIONS

The application is a re-submission of application AL/82/11/, which granted consent for single storey side and rear extensions, incorporating a covered verandah.

The current proposal seeks to increase the roof height of the side and rear extensions to a tiled, mono pitch roof with a maximum height of 4 metres. This is a maximum height increase of 1-1.2 metres from the scheme approved under application AL/82/11.

The main issue for consideration is whether the proposed revisions would materially harm the character and appearance of the surrounding open countryside, the amenities of neighbouring properties and the character of the existing cottage.

The existing property was originally a modest semi-detached agricultural workers cottage (basic two up/two down) which occupies an isolated location in open countryside. The roof will be finished in slate, in keeping with the existing cottage. However, the roofline of the extension will be positioned approximately 250mm beneath eaves level at the highest point and will project above the eil height of windows on the rear elevation. As a result, the increased roof height of the extensions appears contrived and out of scale with the modest character and appearance of the original cottage. The revisions to the proposed scheme are considered to unacceptably increase the height, scale, bulk and massing of the roofline of the extensions, appearing as a one and half storey extension that is disproportionately large in relation to the original cottage. The proposal is therefore considered to be contrary to policy DEV19 i) ii) which states that extensions should be visually integrated with and subservient to the main building.

With regard to the impact on visual amenity, the property is one of a pair of cottages that occupies an isolated location in open countryside. The site and surrounding area is flat and there are extensive views of open countryside. The increased scale, height and massing of the roof does not relate well to the modest character of the cottage and would appear visually prominent, particularly in views from the east along Hook Lane. As such, the proposal is considered to have an adverse visual impact on the character of the streetscene and surrounding countryside, contrary to policy GEN7.

With regard to residential amenity, the increase in the height of the roofline of the extension to 3.8 metres, is not considered to unacceptably harm the outlook or daylight to the neighbouring

property at No. 1. The proposal is therefore not considered to have an adverse impact on residential amenity.

It is therefore recommended that planning permission is refused on the following grounds.

HUMAN RIGHTS ACT

Human Rights Act:

The Council in making a decision, should be aware of and take into account any implications that may arise from the Human Rights Act 1998. Under the Act, it is unlawful for a public authority such as Arun District Council to act in a manner, which is incompatible with the European Convention on Human Rights.

Consideration has been specifically given to Article 8 (right to respect for private and family life), Article 1 of the First Protocol (protection of property). It is not considered that the recommendation for refusal of permission in this case interferes with applicant's right to respect for their private and family life and their home, except insofar as it is necessary to protect the rights and freedoms of others (in this case, the rights of neighbours). The Council is also permitted to control the use of property in accordance with the general interest and the recommendation for refusal is considered to be a proportionate response to the submitted application based on the considerations set out in this report.

DUTY UNDER THE EQUALITIES ACT 2010

Not applicable in this instance.

RECOMMENDATION

REFUSE

- 1 The proposal, by virtue of the increased height, scale, bulk and massing of the roofline of the side and rear extensions, fails to integrate visually with the modest character and appearance of the host dwelling and would have an adverse impact on the rural and visual amenities of the area. It therefore conflicts with policies DEV19 i) v) and GEN7 of the Arun District Local plan and the National Planning Policy Framework (2012).