

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

REF NO: BE/172/21/HH

LOCATION: 266 Chichester Road
North Bersted
PO21 5AX

PROPOSAL: Retrospective application for single storey front and rear extension and detached garage.

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION A retrospective application for a single storey front and rear extension and detached garage.

RELEVANT SITE HISTORY

BE/42/21/HH	Single storey rear extension with rear/side dormer, erection of detached garage & erection of front porch.	ApproveConditionally 28-06-21
-------------	--	----------------------------------

BE/25/17/HH	Single storey rear extension with rear/side dormer, erection of detached garage & erection of front porch.	ApproveConditionally 11-05-17
-------------	--	----------------------------------

REPRESENTATIONS

Bersted Parish Council - No Objection

No representation received from nearby occupiers.

CONSULTATION RESPONSES RECEIVED:

None

POLICY CONTEXTBuilt Up Area Boundary
Pagham Harbour Zone B
CIL Charging Zone 4**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)

PLANNING POLICY GUIDANCE:

NPPF	National Planning Policy Framework
NPPG	National Planning Practice Guidance

SUPPLEMENTARY POLICY GUIDANCE:

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

CONCLUSIONS**PRINCIPLE**

The key policies considered are D DM1 and D DM4 of the Arun Local Plan. Part M and general criteria set out in the Arun Design Guide is also considered.

Bersted Parish Council have a 'made' Neighbourhood Development Plan with Policy ES1 being relevant to this application. This policy states that new development which would have an effect on the appearance or character of the surrounding area, should be of a high quality design and should contribute to local character by creating a sense of place appropriate to it's location.

PLANNING HISTORY

Proposed works for a single storey rear extension with a rear/side dormer, erection of detached garage and front porch were previously approved in 2017, and again in 2021 (BE/25/17/HH and BE/42/21/HH). These proposals differ to the works that have been constructed and are outlined in this retrospective application.

DESIGN AND VISUAL AMENITY

The works are located to the front and rear of the dwelling, and include two single storey extensions and erection of a detached garage. The property has limited visibility from the public realm and street scene, as it is situated off the main road and behind neighbouring properties.

The rear extension has a width of 8.6m and depth 5.5m. The front has a width of 7.15m and depth of 4.6m. Both extensions have low slope flat roofs and differ significantly in design to the existing pitched hip roof of the host dwelling. The extensions are not considered to be unacceptably intrusive visually, but do not match that of the original. In comparison to the works originally proposed, the extension is smaller in scale and less obtrusive in the context of the surrounding area. Chichester Road has a mixed and varied style composition, but is made up of mainly two storey, semi-detached or terraced properties. The host dwelling adds to this variation, being a single storey bungalow. Being off the main road and of limited visibility, the visual appearance of the property has little impact upon the composition and rhythm of the street. Therefore, although not in keeping with the general character of its surroundings, the extensions can be considered acceptable in their context.

The development is not considered to be subservient to the design of the original building. The materials do not match that of the existing, which disrupts any potential integration. The host dwelling has a cream colour render, with a tiled roof. The extensions are clad in grey fibre cement weather boarding, with a one ply membrane roof and white UPVC fascia and soffit. This impacts the visual amenity of the building and causes slight intrusion upon its appearance. The design of the extension is not considered to be fully compliant with policy ES1 but does not cause detrimental harm upon the visual appearance of the area.

The garage has a width of 11.5m and depth of 5.85m. It is divided into two spaces; a garage and store. The roof above the garage is a pitched gable, the store to the side has a flat roof. The design differs considerably to the approved proposal, the built garage now having smaller footings. This has less visual intrusion upon the surrounding area than that originally proposed. The materials used differ to the existing property, but do not have a detrimental impact upon visual amenity or appearance.

As stated in Part M of the Arun Design Guide, front extensions should take care not to disrupt the existing composition of the street in terms of rhythm or building line, ensure continuation of existing building design in terms of details and materials, maintain and enhance front garden spaces and avoid large, flat-topped porches; incorporating pitched roofs in most cases. For rear extensions, the scheme should exploit opportunities for innovative and contemporary design where appropriate. The development is not considered to fully comply with Part M, but does not have detrimental impact upon visual or design amenity and is acceptable due to the distance of the dwelling from the road.

Although not subservient to the design of the existing, the development is not unduly harmful or intrusive to visual amenity and has limited impact upon the character of the area. It cannot be easily viewed from the public realm and causes minimal disruption the composition of the street. It is therefore considered to be in accord with D DM1 and D DM4 of the Arun Local Plan.

RESIDENTIAL AMENITY

The extensions are located to the front and rear of the property. Both are single storey and have low slope roofs, with a height of 2.9m at the top and around 2.8m at the eaves. The building is on a plot of land to the rear of properties along Chichester Road, Van Dyck Place and to the side of Rembrandt Close. The development retains a considerable distance from these neighbouring properties, with the distance from boundaries being a minimum of 4.86m to the north east (Van Dyck Place), 17m to the south east, 18m to the south west (Chichester Road) and 1.48m to the north west (Rembrandt Close). Properties in Rembrandt Close are most at risk of any potential overbearing or overshadowing from the extensions, but given they are single storey and there is a relatively high fence between the properties restricting visibility, the impact upon these neighbouring properties is minimal and acceptable. The distance retained, along with the minimal risk of overshadowing or overbearing, is in accord with D DM4 of the Local Plan and Part M of the Design Guide.

The front extension exhibits a window to the south west, patio doors to the north west and another window to the south east. The rear extension features two windows to the north west, a window to the north east and a set of doors and window to the south east. The features to the north east, south east and south west elevations give rise to little overlooking and have minimal impact on residential amenity. The door and windows located on the north west elevation overlook properties in Rembrandt Close but are not intrusive. The visibility from these features is highly restricted by the fence between the properties, and so are not considered to be unduly harmful to neighbouring amenity. Therefore the features exhibited by both extensions do not result in any adverse overlooking, overshadowing or overbearing.

The garage is to the south west of the main dwelling, and is to the rear of the properties along Chichester Road. It has a pitched roof measuring 4m high at the top, and 2.5m at the eaves; and a low slope flat roof at a height of 2.7m. Although potentially overbearing considering its height, the built garage is lower than the garage originally approved, which had a mansard roof 4.75m high. Being smaller, it is considered less intrusive to neighbouring amenity than originally approved. The built garage retains a minimum distance of 1.738m from the south western boundary, and 0.904m from the south east. Although close to the rear boundaries of the properties along Chichester Road, these dwellings exhibit long gardens of around 20-25m, which reduces any impact of overbearing or overshadowing imposed by the garage. The development is in accord with D DM4 and does not have an unduly harmful impact upon residential amenity.

The garage features three sets of doors, none of which overlook neighbouring properties on Chichester Road. These doors are not considered harmful to residential amenity and do not pose adverse risk of overbearing, overlooking or overshadowing.

Part M of the Arun Design Guide states that extensions should not negatively impact, and instead 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 proposal is respectful to the privacy of the neighbouring properties, and is not adversely intrusive. The proposal is considered to be in accord with Part M.

The proposal is in accordance with D DM1 and D DM4 of the Arun Local Plan and does not result in unacceptable harm upon neighbouring amenity. It also complies with Part M of the Arun Design Guide.

SUMMARY

The proposed development is deemed to accord with relevant development plan policies and as such is recommended for approval.

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

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

- 1 **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 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 National Planning Policy Framework.