

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

REF NO: BR/14/22/HH

LOCATION: 25 Pevensey Road
Bognor Regis
PO21 5NS

PROPOSAL: First floor side extension, mansard roof extension with 2 x side dormers and installation of crossover.

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION The application seeks to construct a first floor side extension, mansard roof extensions and the addition of 2 side dormers and installation of a vehicular crossover.

RELEVANT SITE HISTORY

BR/229/21/HH	First floor side extension, mansard roof extension with 2 x side dormers and installation of crossover	Refused 08-12-21
BR/129/10/	Amended proposal to previously approved scheme references BR/314/08 and BR/130/08 to form loft conversion and dormer to provide 3 bedrooms and bathroom	ApproveConditionally 16-06-10

REPRESENTATIONS

Bognor Regis Town Council provided no objection.

1 letter of support received

- After viewing the plans, I have no objection. I do however believe it has lost its kerb appeal from the first application.

CONSULTATIONS**CONSULTATION RESPONSES RECEIVED:**

None.

POLICY CONTEXT

Built up area boundary.

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:

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 and the Arun Design Guide.

Bognor Regis has a made Neighbourhood Plan although none of the policies are relevant to this application.

BACKGROUND

An application for a similar proposal was refused in December 2021. The application seeks a similar design which has been slightly altered.

DESIGN AND VISUAL AMENITY

The dwelling is a detached chalet bungalow with a barn hip roof and an attached garage. The proposal is highly visible from the street scene.

The proposal seeks to construct a first floor extension. This previously encompassed the garage however this element has been removed. There will be dormer extensions and as a result of the design it will alter the property to appear as a two storey property.

Given the scale of the changes, the alterations are not considered to appear subservient to the host dwelling in conflict with D DM4 (b), although are well integrated. There will be dormers to the eastern elevation and one to the west although these features are common in the street scene.

The surrounding properties are similar in design consisting of detached bungalows with many featuring large side dormers and roofs with a gable end or a small barn hipped roof, with limited examples of two storey dwellings.

Whilst the proposal has been scaled back, it is considered that the appearance of the dwelling from the front elevation would result in a roof design that it not present in the vicinity which feature predominately gable roofs and therefore would result in the dwelling appearing out of character.

As a result of the changes to the host dwelling, the development due to its scale is considered to significantly alter the appearance of the dwelling in the street scene. Whilst the extension has been reduced the property would still have the form of a 2 storey property and appear out of keeping in relation

to the surrounding properties and locality.

The Arun Design guide states 'Extensions should respond to and complement the existing character and appearance of the building and wider townscape in terms of scale, massing, materials, openings and roof form. The proposal is not considered to comply with this as it does not respond to or complement the existing character, appearing out of keeping with the locality. 'The scale, massing and positioning of extensions should be visually subservient to the existing property'. Due to the scale of the changes the additions are not subservient.

Whilst some alterations to the previous refusal have been made, this is not considered to have overcome previous reasons for refusal.

Due to the design and scale of the development proposed and the resultant change in appearance to the host dwelling, it results in a harmful impact the appearance of the street scene and character of the area in conflict with D DM1(1) and D DM4 (a),(b) and (e) of the Arun Local Plan and Section M of the Design Guide.

RESIDENTIAL AMENITY

The neighbouring property at No. 27 has a dormer with 2 windows and the first floor dormer addition would extend partly in front of this with a depth of 4m. The first floor element is retained in the footprint of the dwelling and with around 3.8m to the boundary, it does not result in an adversely overbearing impact. There will be a window to this elevation which was not in the previous application. This may enable some views into the windows of the dormer however with separation retained, it is not considered views would be significant.

To the east side there will be two dormers constructed. These will have a hipped roof and as such integrates the main dwelling. These are similar in size and will have a length of 3.75-4m, a depth of 2.5m, a height of around 3m. With approximately 2.9m retained to the boundary at No.23 and with the neighbouring property a bungalow, the additions will not give rise to adverse overbearing or overshadowing impacts.

There will be two additional windows at first floor level to the east which will front No.23. The dormer located closest to the rear, due to its siting is likely to give rise to views over the rear of the neighbouring property which are not currently achievable, although does not provide views direct into windows. Due to the siting of the window, it is necessary to obscure glaze/fixed shut the window to ensure this can mitigate against adverse overlooking upon the garden of No.23. There are no additional first floor windows to the rear proposed.

Whilst the proposal adds bulk to the property, it is not considered to result in adverse overbearing, overshadowing or overlooking upon neighbouring amenity and accord with D DM1(3) and D DM4 (c) of the Arun Local Plan.

SUMMARY

The proposed development is deemed to be in conflict with relevant development plan policies and as such is recommended for refusal.

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.

RECOMMENDATION

REFUSE

- 1 The development, by virtue of its design and scale will have a significantly harmful impact on the host dwelling and character and appearance of the locality in conflict with policies D SP1, D DM1 (1), D DM4 (a), (b), & (e) of the Arun Local Plan and Section M of 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.