

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

REF NO: AW/294/21/HH

LOCATION: 59 Marlborough Court
Aldwick
PO21 5QJ

PROPOSAL: Erection of single storey side extension, involving demolition of attached garage, single storey side extension to other side to create garage and utility room and loft conversion with 1 x rear dormer

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION	The proposal seeks to remove an existing garage and construct two side extensions and a rear dormer.
----------------------------	--

REPRESENTATIONS

Aldwick Parish Council provided an objection.

- It does not sympathetically relate to the existing building.
- It is not subservient.
- Adverse overshadowing, overbearing, overlooking.
- It conflicts with D DM4 and the Design Guide.

5 letters of objection from 4 nearby occupiers.

- Overdevelopment of the property.
- The proposed rear dormer is out of place.
- It is out of character with the estate.
- The description doesn't include an annexe.

CONSULTATION RESPONSES RECEIVED:

None.

POLICY CONTEXT

Built up area boundary.

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

DSP1	D SP1 Design
DDM1	D DM1 Aspects of form and design quality
DDM4	D DM4 Extensions&alter to exist builds(res and non-res)

PLANNING POLICY GUIDANCE:

NPPF	National Planning Policy Framework
------	------------------------------------

SUPPLEMENTARY POLICY GUIDANCE:

SPD13 Arun District Design Guide (SPD) January 2021

SPD10 Aldwick Parish Design Statement

CONCLUSIONS**PRINCIPLE**

The key policies considered are D DM1 and D DM4 of the Arun Local Plan and the Arun Design Guide.

Aldwick does not have a Neighbourhood Plan although does have a Parish Design Statement with the property located within Area 15.

DESIGN AND VISUAL AMENITY

The property forms a detached bungalow with an attached garage to the west side. The proposal seeks to demolish the garage and construct a side extension which will form an annexe. To the east there will be a two storey extension with a rear dormer which extends the full roof slope.

The property is to the end of a small cul de sac and is partially visible from the wider area. The eastern side fronts the road at West Meads Drive with some grassed verges and a brick wall to help separate.

The garage and porch entrance will be removed and replaced with a side extension, with a width of 3.85m. This extends slightly forward than the existing garage and porch however does not extend beyond the principal elevation or established development line. It has a flat roof and retains around 0.85m to the west boundary and sits slightly higher than the eaves of the dwelling, although is well integrated.

A large dormer is proposed however due to its positioning at the rear of the dwelling, views are limited and therefore it will not result in adverse harm upon the street scene.

The two storey extension will be to the east side and is considered to adversely impact the character and visual amenity of the area of West Meads which predominately, comprises semi detached and detached dwellings of a similar design and style. The addition increases the width of the dwelling by approximately 3.5m, with the roofline extending over the extension adding bulk to the side elevation, resulting in a property of a larger scale than its neighbours, out of character with the wider area.

Section M of the Arun Design Guide relates to householder extensions and states 'Side extensions should be set back from the front of the house in order to play a subservient role to the original building'. 'Extensions should also in most cases be set down from the existing roof ridge height by a minimum of 0.5 metres.' The addition is not set back from the principal elevation and extends the roofline which does not create subservience, in conflict with the Guide. The scheme should also 'Respond to existing elevations through the size and positioning of doors and windows.' The positioning of the entrance doors and windows to the front elevation is not considered to respond to existing elevations by way of their size or location. This is out of character with other properties in the area which feature 2 large windows to the front elevation.

The Aldwick Parish Design Statement states 'New or replacement buildings or extensions should be visually subservient and relate to the existing building and not vary significantly in height or bulk from those nearby.' The proposal varies from those nearby and conflicts with the statement.

The two storey extension to the east elevation due to its size and location, results in development out of

character with the wider area, resulting in a dwelling that appears in contrast to its surrounding properties, harmful to the appearance of the street scene in conflict with D DM1 (1), D DM4 (b) and (e) and Section M.01 of the Arun Design Guide.

RESIDENTIAL AMENITY

The single storey extension to the west will be in close proximity to the boundary, running along the fenceline and rear elevation of No.57 and beyond the rear elevation of the dwelling by 1.3m. The extension has a height of 2.95m. Whilst No.57 has a relatively shallow rear garden with a depth of approximately 7m, the extension is not considered to result in adverse overbearing or overshadowing, being single storey and largely replacing an existing structure.

The single storey addition is proposed as an annexe. However as this is joined with the host dwelling, it is not considered to result in additional harm upon amenity or adversely increase movements to and from the property.

The two storey extension to the east is also not considered to result in harm upon amenity with a road to the east and a large rear garden, neighbours are a sufficient distance in which not to be adversely impacted.

A dormer is proposed which will run along the full rear roof slope extending across the proposed two storey extension. This is large, extending from the top of the ridge and will have a depth of 3.75m, height of 2.35m and a length of 13.4m.

There will be 5 windows serving 3 bedrooms and 2 bathrooms. Due to the siting, views are unlikely to be achievable towards No.57, located directly to the west, however there will likely be views over the gardens of 55 and 53. The views are not considered significant as a result of the siting of the dormer and neighbouring dwellings which are unlikely to result in views directly into windows. Secondly the garden has a depth of which provides sufficient separation. A similar dormer could be constructed under permitted development in the existing roof slope.

Due to the siting of the development, it is not considered to result in significant harm on amenity by way of overbearing, overshadowing or overlooking and accord with D DM1 and D DM4 (c) of the Arun Local Plan.

PARKING

The attached garage is to be converted to habitable accommodation. This will result in the loss of a parking space however a replacement garage is proposed to the extension to the eastern side and there is plentiful on street parking and the loss will not result in adverse impacts upon the highway.

SUMMARY

The proposed development is in conflict with the relevant development plan policies and as such is recommended for refusal for the following reasons:

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), 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

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 CIL Liable therefore developer contributions towards infrastructure will be required (dependant on any exemptions or relief that may apply)

RECOMMENDATION

REFUSE

- 1 The full height extension to the east elevation due to its size and location, results in development out of character with the wider area, resulting in a dwelling that appears in contrast to its surrounding properties, harmful to the appearance of the street scene in conflict with D DM1 (1), D DM4 (b) and (e) and Section M.01 of the Arun Design Guide.
- 2 INFORMATIVE: Statement pursuant to Article 35 of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure)(England) Order 2015. The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by identifying matters of concern with the proposal and determining the application within a timely manner, clearly setting out the reason(s) for refusal, allowing the Applicant the opportunity to consider the harm caused and whether or not it can be remedied by a revision to the proposal. The Local Planning Authority is willing to meet with the Applicant to discuss the best course of action and is also willing to provide pre-application advice in respect of any future application for a revised development.