

Recommendation Report for Planning Permission for Works or Extension to a Dwelling

REF NO: AW/217/25/HH

LOCATION: 2 Apple Grove  
Aldwick  
PO21 4NB

PROPOSAL: Single storey rear and side extension and first floor extension with new dormers and front open porch with balcony above.

<b>SITE AND SURROUNDINGS</b>
------------------------------

DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION As above.

<b>REPRESENTATIONS</b>
------------------------

Aldwick Parish Council - No objection.

No representation received from nearby occupiers.

**CONSULTATION RESPONSES RECEIVED:**

None.

<b>POLICY CONTEXT</b>
-----------------------

Prone to Groundwater Flooding  
Tree Preservation Order  
Pagham Harbour Zone B  
2km Buffer for Site of Special Scientific Interest  
CIL Zone 4

**DEVELOPMENT PLAN POLICIES**

[Arun Local Plan 2011 - 2031:](#)

DDM1	D DM1 Aspects of form and design quality
DDM4	D DM4 Extensions and alter to exist builds (res and non-res)

**PLANNING POLICY GUIDANCE:**

NPPF	National Planning Policy Framework
NPPG	National Planning Practice Guidance

**SUPPLEMENTARY POLICY GUIDANCE:**

SPD13	Arun District Design Guide (SPD) January 2021
-------	---

<b>CONCLUSIONS</b>
--------------------

## DESIGN AND VISUAL AMENITY

The application site contains a chalet bungalow along Apple Grove. This application seeks planning permission for a single storey rear and side extension, first floor extension with front and rear dormers, front balcony, and porch. The works will be partially visible from the street scene.

The proposed materials are slate tiles to the pitched roofs and white painted render with white cladding to the dormers and gable ends. The windows and doors are charcoal PVC and aluminium. While the materials are different to those existing, similar modern materials are present to adjacent neighbour, 3 Apple Grove, as such the proposed materials would not be out of keeping with the street scene of Apple Grove.

The proposed single storey rear extension would measure 4.9m in depth, 9.6m in width and would have an eaves height of 2.5m. The eaves height would match the existing. The single storey rear extension would have a crown pitched roof with a maximum height of 3.5m. It is noted that the depth of the rear extension would exceed the 3.3m guidance depth for rear extensions to detached dwellings outlined within the Arun Design Guide (ADG), however given the garden would retain a depth of 31m, the depth of the extension is acceptable in this instance.

The proposed single storey side extension would adjoin the eastern flank and measure 9m in depth and 4.1m in width. It would be stepped in and would not exceed the width of the existing garage and would not be visible from the street scene. It would have an eaves height of 2.5m, matching the existing and would have a crown pitched roof with a maximum height of 3.5m.

The proposed first floor extension would extend over the existing garage and part of the proposed side extension. It would measure 3.2m in depth and 5.8m in width at its widest point. It would have a pitched roof and would adjoin the existing ridge line, extending the ridge line of the host dwelling, creating a gable end to the eastern flank. The extension respects the original roof ridge height, and it would not reduce the separation distance between the host dwelling and neighbouring properties in terms of footprint, although the bulk and massing of the host dwelling would extend closer to the neighbour to the east. It would be in keeping with the appearance of the host dwelling as such, the proposed first floor extension would not result in harm to the character or appearance of the host dwelling or street scene.

The proposed front dormer would measure 13m in width, 5.3m in depth and would have a crown pitched roof with a maximum height of 2.8m. The development would alter the bulk of the property, however the main roof ridge height of the dwelling would be retained, and the front dormer would be contained within the front roof slope of the dwelling which helps to minimise any visual harm upon the locality and complies with the Arun Design Guide (ADG). There are several examples of front dormers along Apple Grove, including the modern addition at the west neighbour 3 Apple Grove, therefore the proposed dormer would not appear out of character within the street scene.

The proposed rear dormer would measure 13m in width, 4.7m in depth and would have a crown pitched roof with a maximum height of 3m. The proposed rear dormer is in partial conflict with the Arun Design Guide (ADG), which states that dormers should be minor incidents on the roof plane. However, as the dormer is to the rear of the property thus will not be visible from the public realm, the proposed rear dormer is acceptable in this instance.

The proposed balcony to the front elevation would be enclosed by glass balustrading and would extend 1.7m from the front elevation and would have a width of 3.7m. There are several examples of front balconies in the vicinity, including at 8 and 5 West Drive. The scale and siting of the balcony would not detract from the character and appearance of the host dwelling and is acceptable in the instance.

The proposed front porch would be open in style and would be facilitated by the proposed balcony

servicing as a canopy. A similar example is shown at 3 Apple Grove. As such, the proposed porch would not result in any harm to the character of the dwelling or the surrounding area.

Although there is some conflict with the ADG, the proposal would not result in harm to the character and visual amenity of the dwelling or the wider area. As such, the proposed development is in accordance with policies D DM1 and D DM4 of the ALP.

#### NEIGHBOURING RESIDENTIAL AMENITY

Part M of the ADG states that householder extensions should protect neighbouring amenity in terms of privacy and overshadowing, considering the positioning of neighbouring buildings and respond to existing elevations through the size and positioning of doors and windows.

The property has neighbours to either side. The host dwelling sits forward of its neighbour to the west, number 3 Apple Grove, and the proposed extension would not extend beyond the rear elevation of this property, with spacing of 2.4m retained between the proposed extensions and the boundary, as existing. The property is set back compared to its neighbour to the east, number 1 Apple Grove which is sited further forward in its plot. Whilst the proposed rear extension would extend beyond the rear elevation of this property, a spacing of 1.2m is retained between the proposed extension and the east side boundary. Therefore, given the spacing maintained between the proposed built form and neighbouring properties, the proposed extensions would not result in overbearing or overshadowing impacts to neighbouring properties.

The proposed first floor side extension would increase the bulk and massing of the dwelling closer to the neighbour to the east. Notwithstanding this, it is noted that the host dwelling is set in approximately 1.2m from the eastern side boundary, and there is a flank-to-flank distance of 7m, and as such, given the spacing retained between the roof extension and the neighbour to the east, the proposed roof extension would not result in overbearing or overshadowing impacts to this neighbour.

The proposed front dormer would replace an existing small-scale dormer and would be mostly contained within the existing roof slope and would be sited approximately 4m from both side boundaries. As such, the front dormer would not result in any overbearing or overshadowing impacts. The proposed front dormer would contain 2 additional windows and replace the existing window with double doors. The fenestration would give rise to views to the front garden and Apple Grove with a distance of 11m to the boundary with the highway. Views would not be significantly different to those currently available from the existing front dormer. As such, the proposed front dormer would not result in harm by way of overlooking.

The rear dormer introduces 3 additional windows on the rear elevation at first floor level, which will result in some increased views of neighbouring rear gardens. However, these aspects of the proposal are similar to those that exist as well as those that could be constructed under permitted development, and the resultant level of overlooking would not be unusual for a residential area, nor would it result in unacceptable harm to neighbouring amenity.

The proposed balcony will be separated from the boundary with the highway by 11m and will offer no significant harm by way of overlooking of either the neighbouring properties or the street scene.

The proposed front porch, by nature of its design would not result in any overbearing, overshadowing, or overlooking impacts.

The proposals are in accordance with policies D DM1 and D DM4 of the ALP in that they do not result in unduly harmful impacts on neighbouring amenity by way of overbearing, overshadowing, or overlooking.

#### SUMMARY

The proposed development is in accordance with relevant Development Plan policies and as such is recommended for approval subject to the following conditions and informatives.

**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 private and family life) and Article 1 of the First Protocol (protection of property). It is not considered that the recommendation for approval of the grant of permission in this case interferes unreasonably with any local residents' right to respect for their private and family life and home, except insofar as it is necessary to protect the rights and freedoms of others (in this case, the rights of the applicant). The Council is also permitted to control the use of property in accordance with the general interest and the recommendation for approval 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**

In assessing this proposal the following impacts have been identified upon those people with the following protected characteristics (age, disability, gender reassignment, marriage and civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex or sexual orientation).

The proposal would have a neutral impact on the protected characteristics.

**CIL DETAILS**

This application is not CIL liable.

**RECOMMENDATION**

**APPROVE CONDITIONALLY**

- 1 The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of 3 years from the date of this permission.

Reason: To comply with Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).

- 2 The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:

- Location and Site Plan
- Proposed Front and Side Elevations
- Proposed Rear and Side Elevations
- Proposed First Floor Plan
- Proposed Ground Floor Plan

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of amenity and the environment in accordance with Arun Local Plan policies D DM1 and D DM4.

- 3 Based on the information available, this permission is exempt from the requirement to provide a biodiversity gain plan under Paragraph 13 of Schedule 7A to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. The following exemption applies:

This planning permission is for development which is a householder application within the meaning of article 2(1) of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015.

Reason: In accordance with Schedule 7A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).

- 4 **INFORMATIVE:** Statement pursuant to Article 35 of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015 (as amended). 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 NPPF.