

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

REF NO: AW/31/21/HH

LOCATION: 3 Haydon Close
Aldwick
PO21 4LG

PROPOSAL: Single storey rear extension and front porch

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION	Construction of front porch extension measuring approximately 2m in width by 1.8m in depth and the construction of a rear flat roof extension measuring approximately 7.7m in width by 11mm in depth.
----------------------------	---

REPRESENTATIONS

Parish Council - No Objection

2 neighbouring representations objecting, having regard to ;

- Not in keeping with close
- Too large/high
- Overshadowing
- Overbearing chimney
- Loss of privacy
- Increased noise

CONSULTATIONS

CONSULTATION RESPONSES RECEIVED:

None

POLICY CONTEXT

Designation applicable to site:
2km buffer zones SSSI
Pagham Harbour Zone B

DEVELOPMENT PLAN POLICIES

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

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

PLANNING POLICY GUIDANCE:

NPPDG	National Design Guide
NPPF	National Planning Policy Framework
NPPG	National Planning Practice Guidance

SUPPLEMENTARY POLICY GUIDANCE:

SPD10	Aldwick Parish Design Statement
-------	---------------------------------

CONCLUSIONS**PRINCIPLE**

Policy D DM1 sets out 13 design aspects of which applications should be assessed against. These include: Character, Appearance, Impact, Innovation, Adaptability, Crime Prevention, Trees, Public realm, Layout, Public Art, Density and Scale.

Policy D DM4 sets out criteria for which applications relating to extensions and alterations of existing buildings must be assessed against. They generally seek to minimise the impact of the proposal on the character of the host dwelling, its neighbours and the locality.

Arun recently adopted a Design Guide which provides detailed guidance that will help raise design standards across the District, Part M relates to extensions. Developments should respond to the distinctiveness and characteristics of their surroundings in terms of scale massing and materials, protect the amenities of occupants and neighbours and seek to minimise energy consumption and improve environmental performance. In this instance, a rear extension should also not negatively impact adjoining properties in terms of privacy and overshadowing and preserve rear amenity space to at least 10.5m in depth.

Aldwick has an adopted Village Design Statement, the application site lies within Area 8.

Key areas of concern

- Design and Visual Amenity
- Overbearing, Overshadowing and Overlooking

DESIGN AND VISUAL AMENITY

It is proposed to construct a large flat roof extension to the rear of a 1960s styled bungalow, the extension is to consist of a new kitchen, guest bedroom and utility room, additionally to the front of the property a replacement porch is proposed.

The front porch appears to have been sympathetically designed to be constructed from materials which relate well to those currently in use on the dwelling, with an eaves height which matches the existing levels and therefore its scale and style is believed to be appropriate for its intended use.

It is proposed to build the rear extension running 1m away from the Northern and Eastern boundaries of the site and the proposal consists of a large footprint increase of over 100% of the dwelling. Current guidance with the Local Plan and Arun Design Guide states that extension over 50% increase of floor space will be considered disproportionate and are unlikely to be acceptable, although it is noted that this property has the benefit of a slightly larger rear/side garden when compared with its neighbours.

Given its disproportionate scale and lack of visual integration, it is considered the extension does not accord with D DM4 and the Arun Design Guide by means of its excessive footprint increase.

The extension's eaves line is to be slightly higher than the host dwelling; this minimal increase is deemed acceptable.

The design of the rear extension is to incorporate materials which are currently present on site. There are 2 expansive elevations to the North and East, without Interruptions these elevations are deemed unsympathetic and uncharacteristic and overly dominate on the host dwelling which is in conflict with policy D DM4 of the Arun Local Plan or Arun's Design Guide.

The rear extension is a visually unimaginative addition, which is overly dominate by means of scale, character and positioning on the host dwelling and neighbours; therefore having regard to the design and visual amenity, the proposal is not deemed to conflict with D DM1 and D DM4 of the Arun Local Plan and the Arun Design Guide.

OVERBEARING, OVERSHADOWING & OVERLOOKING

It is noted the extension will not be visible from the public realm and not impact the street scene in compliance with policies D DM1 (2) and D DM4 (e).

The proposed porch is not considered to be overbearing, overshadow or overlook any neighbouring properties due to its central positioning on site and appropriate scale.

As stated above, the extension runs 1m away from the Northern boundary and a portion of the Eastern boundary. The extension's overall height is approximately 3.2m, over 1m higher than the fence lines to the rear gardens.

The property to the East at No. 37 Pryors Lane has a relatively short rear garden at approximately 8m in depth. Given the additional height of the proposal, which runs in close proximity to the boundaries, and the short depth of the rear garden to No. 37 Pryors Lane it is considered that without interruption, this excessive bulk is overbearing on the neighbouring properties to the North and to a lesser extent the East. When considering the 45-degree rule, the proposed extension would extend past a point considered acceptable.

In terms of overshadowing, the length and positioning of the extension against the Northern boundary will create additional shading of the entire length of the rear garden of No. 4 Haydon Close. The effect of this along the length of the boundary is thought to be an unneighbourly form of development.

By virtue of being overbearing, overshadowing that the proposed extensions conflicts with policy D DM4 of the Arun Local Plan and the Arun Design Guide.

The proposed rear extension predominantly focuses new fenestration towards the South, overlooking the rear/side garden of the property, with suitable separation distance between it and the Southern neighbours. The new windows to the existing property will not serve habitable rooms and are also deemed acceptable. Therefore, no unwanted overlooking arises from the development.

It is therefore considered by virtue of overlooking that the proposed extension accords with policy D DM4 of the Arun Local Plan.

SUMMARY

The proposed development is deemed to accord with the relevant development 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), 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 Liabe therefore developer contributions towards infrastructure will be required (dependant on any exemptions or relief that may apply)

RECOMMENDATION

REFUSE

- 1 The extension by reason of its scale, design and positioning on site has a detrimentally harmful impact upon the established character of the host dwelling and the residential amenities of neighbouring residents in conflict with policies D DM1 and D DM4 of the Arun Local Plan and 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.