

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

REF NO: BR/198/18/HH

LOCATION: Milford Cottage
Market Street
Bognor Regis
PO21 1TD

PROPOSAL: Demolition of existing outbuilding & erection of two storey extension. This application affects the character & appearance of The Steyne, Bognor Conservation Area.

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION	For the demolition of existing rear structure comprising a garage door and pitched roof over. The erection of a two storey extension. The extension would be located abutting the side and east elevation of the existing cottage increasing the width of the property by 5.3m by a depth of 3.8m. its height would measure 6.5m. Overall the addition would be 500mm wider and 200mm taller than the existing cottage.
SITE AREA	N/A
RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT DENSITY	N/A
TOPOGRAPHY	Predominantly flat.
TREES	None of any significance affected by the proposed development.
BOUNDARY TREATMENT	The host dwelling is a rear cottage attached to no.10 the Steyne. A 2m high flint wall forms the northern boundary the rear (east) boundary is occupied by a garage door straight onto Market Street.
SITE CHARACTERISTICS	Milford Cottage is attached to the Grade II listed building, No.10 The Steyne, and therefore is itself a listed structure. Originally a single building with slate roof and rendered walls, the house in question is now in separate ownership, and forms a small house which is accessed from Market Street. The cottage is served by a front door facing north and a garden curtilage courtyard and single car parking space. An outbuilding structure comprising an up and over garage door finished with a tile pitch roof forms a formal entrance abutting market street.
CHARACTER OF LOCALITY	The Steyne Conservation Area. The attached premises (10 The Steyne) is Grade II listed.

RELEVANT SITE HISTORY

BR/216/18/L

Listed building consent for the demolition of existing outbuilding & erection of a two storey extension.

Noted.

REPRESENTATIONS

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED:

Bognor Regis Town Council

"no objection"

COMMENTS ON REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED:

N/A

CONSULTATIONS

Conservation Officer

CONSULTATION RESPONSES RECEIVED:

Councils Conservation & Listed Building Officer:

- What appears to be an outbuilding adapted to create a single parking space - the demolition of this structure appears not to be of any concern as it is not considered to significantly affect the character of the host listed building, or the local area
- The extension is considered to be substantial in nature and is wider than the host dwelling - cannot be considered to be subservient to the host dwelling
- Occupies a significant amount of curtilage with limited uses - a bedroom, shower room, and large hallway area
- There appears to be a loss of original/older sash windows from an elevation view - not supported
- Use of French doors complicates the elevation contrasting the simple nature of the building
- The east elevation contains a single door & small 1st floor window which does not make a positive impact on the street scene
- Questions the long term intended use of the extension once constructed.

Conservation Advisory Committee - raise no objection.

COMMENTS ON CONSULTATION RESPONSES:

Considered in the conclusions part of the assessment.

POLICY CONTEXT

Designations applicable to site:

Built up Area Boundary

Conservation Area

Grade II Listed Building.
Pagham Harbour Access Management Zone B.

DEVELOPMENT PLAN POLICES

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
HERSP1	HER SP1 The Historic Environment
HERDM1	HER DM1 Listed Buildings
HERDM3	HER DM3 Conservation Areas
SDSP2	SD SP2 Built-up Area Boundary

PLANNING POLICY GUIDANCE:

NPPF	National Planning Policy Framework
NPPG	National Planning Practice Guidance

SUPPLEMENTARY POLICY GUIDANCE:

SPD2	Conservation Areas
------	--------------------

POLICY COMMENTARY

The Development Plan consists of the Arun District Local Plan 2011 - 2031, West Sussex County Council's Waste and Minerals Plans and Made Neighbourhood Development Plans.

The Neighbourhood Development Plan

Where applicable, Neighbourhood Development Plan's (more commonly known as a neighbourhood plan or NDP), once made by Arun District Council, will form part of the statutory local development plan for the relevant designated neighbourhood area.

Made Plans in Arun District Council's Local Planning Authority Area are: Aldingbourne; Angmering; Arundel; Barnham & Eastergate; Bersted; Bognor Regis; Clymping; East Preston; Felpham; Ferring; Kingston; Littlehampton; Rustington; Walberton; Yapton.

Bognor Regis Neighbourhood plan - no relevant policies apply.

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

PRINCIPLE

The application site is located within the built up area boundary, where the principle of development is acceptable subject to accordance with the relevant development plan policies, as stated in SD SP2 of the Arun Local Plan. In this case, the key policies are deemed to be D DM1, D SP1, D DM4, HER SP1, HER DM1 & HER DM3 of the Arun Local Plan. The NPPF is also relevant.

DESIGN & AMENITY

This proposal would allow for the erection of a two storey addition abutting the east and side elevation of the existing cottage increasing the width of the property by 5.3m by a depth of 3.8m. its height would measure 6.5m. Overall the addition would be 500mm wider and 200mm taller than the existing cottage.

Policy D DM4 of the Arun Local Plan lists a set of criteria in which extensions to dwellings should comply;

- a. the extension or alteration sympathetically relates to and is visually integrated with, the existing building in siting, massing, design, form, scale and materials;
- b. the extension or alteration is visually subservient to the main building and provide a high standard of amenity;
- c. the extension or alteration does not have an adverse overshadowing, overlooking or overbearing effect on neighbouring properties;
- d. in streets characterised by relatively small gaps at first floor level between buildings, any extension or alteration at first floor level does not come to within a minimum of one metre of the side boundary and;
- e. the extension or alteration does not compromise the established spatial character and pattern of the place but is instead a positive addition.

The proposed extension is noticeable larger in height and in width compared to the existing dwelling whilst its footprint would occupy the existing amenity space serving the existing cottage.

By virtue of its scale, mass and bulk the extension is considered to dominate the host dwelling providing an incongruous and unsympathetic design feature. By virtue of its location, the proposed development would be visible in the street scene and therefore would give rise to any unacceptable adverse impact on the character of the locality and Steyne Conservation Area to its detriment.

The scale of the proposal would significantly reduce the amenity space serving the current dwelling to its detriment by allowing for virtually no external amenity space therefore making for an inadequate living environment for future occupiers, contrary to Para 127 of the NPPF (f) which looks to encourage developments that promote a high standard of amenity for existing and future users.

By virtue of its design with a separate entrance door to the proposed east elevation and an internal layout to include a kitchen and toilet facility, Officers are mindful of an intention to subdivide the dwelling to a separate unit of accommodation. This is also suggested in the agents details where the statement includes 'it will have its own access from the street allowing visitors to come and go as they please without causing disturbance'.

The Councils Conservation Officer comments are noted. Although the proposal to demolish the outbuilding structure is supported the replacement structure is considered to allow for an incongruous and dominant design feature.

The proposal would therefore be contrary to policies D SP1, D DM1, D DM4, HER SP1, SPD2, HER DM1 & HER DM3 of the Arun Local Plan (2011-2031) and therefore shall be refused on its merits.

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

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 proposed development by virtue of its dominant and incongruous design would cause harm to the special character and setting of the Steyne Conservation Area. For these reasons the proposal is contrary to Policies HER SP1, HER DM3 & SP2 of the Arun Local Plan (2011-2031).
- 2 By virtue of its scale, mass and bulk, the extension is considered to dominate the host dwelling providing an incongruous and unsympathetic design feature to the detriment of the host dwelling. For these reasons the proposal is contrary to Policies D DM1 & D DM4 of the Arun Local Plan (2011-2031).
- 3 By virtue of its scale and siting, the extension is considered to consume the amenity space serving the current dwelling, therefore failing to provide for a high standard of amenity and making for an uncomfortable living environment for future occupiers. For these reasons the proposal is contrary to Policy D DM1 of the Arun Local Plan (2011-2031) and para 127 of the National Planning Policy Framework.