

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

REF NO: EP/24/22/HH

LOCATION: 3 Normandy Drive
East Preston
BN16 1LT

PROPOSAL: Conversion of roof space to habitable use to include a side dormer.

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION	The application seeks to construct two hip to gable roof extensions, one to the north (front) and the other to the south (rear) and a side dormer extension running along the western plane of the roof.
----------------------------	--

RELEVANT SITE HISTORY

EP/137/17/HH	Demolition of rear conservatory & erection of single storey rear extension.	ApproveConditionally 05-12-17
--------------	---	----------------------------------

REPRESENTATIONS

East Preston Parish Council - Objection.

- Concerns raised about how rooflights may have a negative impact on privacy of neighbouring properties.
- The scale of the dormer may make the host property look unbalanced.
- Due to the location of neighbouring properties, the dormer will be far more visible from the street than the average side dormer.
- A hipped roof should only be changed to a gable end at the rear yet the proposal here is for a gable end at both ends of the property.
- The dormer will have an unacceptable negative impact upon the privacy of the occupants of three properties to the west of the property.
- The scale of the dormer and its proximity to the western boundary of the property will likely not be mitigated by the obscured glazing proposed for the dormer.
- The dormer will have an overbearing/unneighbourly feel and may be overdevelopment of the plot.
- Consideration should be given to the impact on privacy and amenities of the future occupants of all three properties but especially as two of the properties are currently unoccupied.

8 Letters of objection from neighbours.

- Once completed it will be a eyesore and not in keeping with the general area.
- Loss of privacy from overlooking windows.
- Modification to the existing roof line at the rear of No.3 has already had an impact on light into rear garden in the evenings and creates an overbearing presence.

- This is exactly the type and size of addition to a property that was decided to be too large, aesthetically inappropriate in this road.
- The shallow pitch of the roof and lack of headroom means the property does not easily lend itself to this type of extension. The proposed construction creates a development of a size which is both overbearing and totally out of keeping with its immediate environment.
- Overbearing exacerbated by the layout of the plots in this portion of Normandy Drive.
- Detract from the character of the surrounding area on the south side of Normandy Drive
- The light grey cladding would emphasize the obtrusive nature of these changes.
- Development already started.

Response from applicant (including photos)

- Rooflights will only let light in from above.
- Examples of other loft conversions evidence in keeping character of development.
- Current building work being undertaken using PDR.
- Obscure glazed windows will be utilised.
- Enable use of property for extended family due to extenuating circumstances created through economic climate.

CONSULTATION RESPONSES RECEIVED:

None.

POLICY CONTEXT

Designation applicable to site:

Within 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)

[East Preston Neighbourhood Plan 2014 Policy 1](#)

Housing - General Principles

East Preston Neighbourhood Plan 2014 Policy 3

Design in Character Area Two

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 site is in 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 and D DM4 of the Arun Local Plan. Additionally, Policy 3 of the East Preston Neighbourhood Development Plan.

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.

Policy 3 of the East Preston Neighbourhood Development Plan (Area 2) sets out criteria for the design of proposals within Character Area Two. These are to ensure that a consistent low building height is protected, with no more than 1.5 storeys. Additionally, it ensures that where new rooms are to be created in a roof space, the height, or basic form of the roof will not be altered.

Arun recently adopted a Design Guide which provides detailed guidance that will help raise design standards across the District. 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, roof extensions should not be visually intrusive or block light into surrounding properties and dormers should be positioned in discreet locations, on the rear of the property wherever possible. In general roof extensions should not detract from the character and appearance of the building and local area.

BACKGROUND

Works to the dormer have already started. It was identified that the works already partially complete were developed under Permitted Development Rights (PDR) as the original plan had been to undertake a PDR scheme. During the course of works, it was decided to attempt to obtain full planning for this larger scheme.

DESIGN AND VISUAL AMENITY

It is proposed to provide a loft conversion by means of two hipped to gable extensions with a box dormer to run the full length of the roof, positioned on the western roof plane. The roof will contain 4 casement windows to the western box dormer, 3 rooflights to the eastern roof plane and a casement either end on the north and south gable elevations.

The property is a detached bungalow to the southern side of Normandy Drive, given the road layout the properties to both the east and west (by reason that they are corner plots) are orientated at an approx. 45-degree angle to the site, which itself is orientated in a traditional rectangular plot to the road frontage.

The road consists of various bungalow types, including hipped roofs, barn end design and fully gabled properties. There has been various extension to other properties in the area including various dormers. Of most significance are the views towards the property from the junctions with Sea Road and Normandy Lane, where barn-end and hipped roof properties are viewed, without dormers.

Comments have been received that the proposal will alter the bungalow into becoming a two-storey property, although it is not felt like this is the case, it is agreed that as the dormer runs the full length of the roof it will be highly visible from the street from multiple viewing points (more so than that of other examples in the area). It is agreed that no other dormers, especially to the extent of the proposed, can be seen to the immediate grouping of properties on the southern side of Normandy Drive. It will therefore conflict with Policy D DM1(1) by reason of its negative impact on the character of the area and with Policy D DM4(e) in that it will negatively and significantly compromise the spatial character of the immediate area. It has been stated that this proposal will be contrary to Policy 3 of the EPNP. This policy states development should 'maintain a consistent low building height, with no development proposal of more than 1.5 storeys; and where new rooms are to be created in a roof space, ensure the height of the

roof is not increased and the basic form of the roof is not altered.' No additional height is proposed, yet it is acknowledged and agreed that its basic form will be negatively and significantly altered. The proposal therefore also conflicts with EPNP Policy 3.

Design guidance states loft conversions are an effective use of previously developed land and should be acceptable if the form of a dormer is unobtrusive and is located, where possible on rear elevations. Given the design of the property it is not possible to locate the dormer to the rear elevation. The development is to be in the original footprint of the dwelling and achieves appropriate intensification of land use, however the dormer will be an alien feature within the immediate area.

The dormer, alongside the two hipped to gable extensions will alter the bulk of the dwelling above ground floor level. Given the extent of the dormer, the full width of the bungalow (located 500mm back from the front and rear elevations) the scheme is overly dominant to the dwelling. For the reasons given below it does not produce a high standard of design and therefore conflicts with Policy D DM4 (a) and (b).

The development is out of character with the area and an overly dominant on the dwelling, the proposed works conflict with policies D DM1, D DM4 of the Arun Local Plan and Policy 3 of the EPNP.

RESIDENTIAL AMENITY

The area is characterised by 1/1.5 storey dwellings on moderate sized plots. In some cases the properties have an awkward arrangement with one another, as is the case in this instance. The separation distance between the host dwelling's western elevation and its respective boundary is 4.5m, at its closest point. The western elevation is only 7.6m from the rear of the neighbouring property (No.5) from where it appears as a cramped form of development. The scale and close proximity of the dormer will give an overbearing appearance and oppressive outlook to the occupiers of number 5.

The forward part of the dormer does not have the same effect (northern portion), due to the positioning of the garages to each property and as such it has limited viewing points. The garages are either side of the boundary line, with only a pedestrian access way to the rear gardens separating them. The effect of the garage is that they are a more dominant form of development to users of the side access ways, however given the effect on the rear private amenity space of No 5, in terms of being overbearing, the proposed dormer conflicts with policies D DM1(3) and D DM4(c) of the Arun Local Plan.

The full extent of the properties PDR for roof alterations has not been demonstrated on plan and Certificate of Lawful Development has not been sought, so it has limited weight to this application.

It is noted that there are inconsistencies in the plans, 4 windows are shown to the elevations and only 3 on plan. Additionally, it is noted that windows are to be obscure glazed but it is expected that only the side facing windows would need to be obscured. In terms of overlooking, as mentioned above, the applicant has clarified that the windows would be obscure glazed and they could also be conditioned non-opening under 1.7m. Although a perceived sense of overlooking may occur to both the west from the casements and the eastern rooflights, which appear to have cills lower than 1.7m above finish floor level, no actual overlooking would occur given that a suitably worded condition could be imposed. This accords with Policy D DM4(c).

SUMMARY

The proposed development conflicts with the relevant development policies for the reasons given above and as such is recommended for refusal for the following reasons.

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 dormer by reason of its size, location and design results in an incongruous form of development which is out of character with the area in conflict with policies D DM1 (1) and D DM4 of the Arun Local Plan, Policy 3 of the East Preston Neighbourhood Plan and Section M of the Arun Design Guide.
- 2 The dormer by reason of its size and location, would be an overbearing form of development on No.5 Normandy Drive contrary to policies D DM1 (3) and D DM4 (c) of the Arun Local Plan.
- 3 **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.