

Recommendation Report for Planning Permission

REF NO: BE/34/12/

LOCATION: 53 Sunningdale Gardens
Bognor Regis

PROPOSAL: Single storey pitch roof extension

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION	The application seeks consent for a single storey front extension to provide an enlarged kitchen and dining room (6.4 x 2.5 x 3.5 metres).
SITE AREA	Approximately 355 sq metres
RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT DEN	N/A
TOPOGRAPHY	Predominantly flat.
TREES	None of any significance affected by the proposed development.
BOUNDARY TREATMENT	None to front.
SITE CHARACTERISTICS	Detached two storey modern dwelling constructed from brown facing brickwork with a pitch, tiled roof and uPVC glazing. Gravel area to front and driveway to side.
CHARACTER OF LOCALITY	Residential cul-de-sac. Modern, open plan residential estate comprising two storey detached / semi-detached dwellings and bungalows of identical character and design. No formal front boundary treatments.

RELEVANT SITE HISTORY

REPRESENTATIONS

Representations received:

Comments awaited.

1 letter of Objection:-

Not in character with other properties in the estate - all porch based extensions extend to a maximum of 4-5 feet and do not extend along the length of property. Application does not follow same principles. Covers entire width of property far beyond the present frontages to any other property on the estate. Roof not in character - pyramid style, whereas other have sloping roofs. Even stand alone garages have 'A' frame roofs.

Comments on Representations received:

Comments noted. Impact on the streetscene and character of the area is assessed below.

CONSULTATIONS

Consultations responses received:

None

Comments on Consultation responses:

None

POLICY CONTEXT

Designation applicable to site:

Tree Preservation Order

PD restriction

Open plan condition

Class C Road

DEVELOPMENT PLAN POLICIES

Arun District Local Plan:

DEV19

GEN2

GEN7

Extensions to existing residential buildings

Built-up Area Boundary

The Form of New Development

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 front extension will be under a shallow, hip roof with an eaves height of 2.3 metres and a maximum overall height of 3.5 metres. The extension will span the front elevation of the property at a depth of 2.5 metres.

The extension will be constructed in facing brickwork with matching interlocking roof tiles. The ridge of the extension will be positioned approximately 150mm below eil height of first floor windows. The hip roofline contrasts with the pitch roofline of the host dwelling. It is considered that

the proposal is visually subservient to the dwelling, being single storey.

The side boundary to No. 51 is boundary fencing, 1.8 metres high and vegetation. The proposed siting of the extension will not create any loss of amenity to this property through overlooking/loss of privacy and there will be no adverse impact on the amenities of No. 55.

The surrounding area is an open plan modern residential estate. Dwellings have a distinct, modern character and design with pitch rooflines and mono pitch single storey porches. There are no formal boundary treatments at the front of properties. As a result, the area is distinctly open in character. The proposed front extension will therefore be visible within the streetscene.

The hip roofline of the extension is in contract to the smaller, mono pitch roof single storey front porch extensions, which characterises properties within the surrounding streetscene. Further, the extension is a greater depth and height. It will therefore be out of keeping with the distinct pattern and character of properties within the streetscene. Although the plot is positioned at the end of a residential cul-de-sac, situated behind a fenceline, it is considered that the design of the extension, notably the hipped roofline, does not reflect the distinct pattern and spatial character of the surrounding estate and is therefore visually incongruous, contrary to policy DEV19 v).

It is therefore recommended that planning permission is refused for the following reasons.

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

Duty under the Equalities Act 2010

In assessing this proposal the following impacts (Neutral) 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).

RECOMMENDATION

REFUSE

- 1 The proposed extension, by virtue of its design and hipped roofline, represents a visually intrusive form of development, out of character with the prevailing spatial character and pattern of surrounding development. The development is thereby contrary to policies DEV19 v) and GEN7 of the Arun District Local Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework.