

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

REF NO: EP/44/18/HH

LOCATION: 2 Hillview Crescent
East Preston
BN16 1RD

PROPOSAL: Hip to gable loft conversion

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION	It is proposed to create a first floor to the property by constructing a bonnet hipped roof with a window in the new gable end below the bonnet hip illuminating the internal accommodation. This would extend a fully hipped roof. The ridge and eaves of the roof would remain at the same height.
SITE AREA	0.05 hectares
TOPOGRAPHY	Predominantly flat
TREES	None affected by the proposed development.
BOUNDARY TREATMENT	The front and side boundary has a low brick wall approximately 0.5m high with hedge, trees and shrubs to supplement the boundary. To the rear garden there is a timber fence and trellis approximately 1.8m high.
SITE CHARACTERISTICS	The application property comprises a semi detached bungalow with a hipped tiled roof and red facing bricks beneath. The property has a conservatory and a single garage to the rear. The property is situated on a corner plot at the junction of Hillview Crescent and Orchard Road.
CHARACTER OF LOCALITY	The character of the locality is predominantly residential and consists predominantly of semi detached bungalows. Two identical properties to the applicant's property to the rear of the application site including 4 Chiltern Close neighbouring the application site immediately to the north, have bonnet hipped roofs which incorporate a first floor to the property.

RELEVANT SITE HISTORY

EP/41/18/PDH	Notification under extended permitted development rights	Prior Approv not req for a single storey rear extension measuring 5m from the rear wall of the original dwelling with a maximum height of 3.16m & an eaves height of 2.85m.	25-04-18
--------------	--	--	----------

EP/150/17/HH	Loft Conversion & rear extension - Resubmission of	Refused
--------------	--	---------

EP/113/17/HH Loft conversion & rear extension

Refused
06-10-17

The previous application EP/150/17/HH included a rear dormer, now omitted from the scheme as well as the hip to bonnet hip gable roof conversion which is as previously submitted in the current application. In addition EP/150/17/HH included a ground floor rear extension which has now been permitted under EP/41/18/PDH and is not included in this application.

EP/150/17/HH was refused for the following reasons;

REFUSE

1 The proposed development, comprising the roof extensions and single storey rear extension, by virtue of their unsympathetic design, significant size and prominent location are considered to have an unacceptable discordant and incongruous impact upon the character and appearance of the host dwelling as well as that of the immediate locality contrary to policies GEN7 and DEV19 of the Arun District Local Plan; Policies 1 and 3 of the East Preston Neighbourhood Plan; and the National Planning Policy Framework.

2 The proposed development due to the size and position of the single storey rear extension is considered to give rise to an unacceptable dominant effect, leading to an unacceptable sense of enclosure and loss of outlook to the occupiers of No.28 Orchard Road in conflict with policies GEN7(iv) and DEV19(iii) of the Arun District Local Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework.

REPRESENTATIONS

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED:

East Preston Parish Council

Objection.

We appreciate the single storey rear extension has been covered by EP/41/18/PDH although my council had concerns the proposed height of the extension was higher than the original building and therefore contrary to Permitted Development rules.

This council believes the latest iteration of roof design does not address the comments made in the Planning Officer's report for Application EP/150/17, i.e. "The hip to bonnet hip alteration will see the profile of the roof moved closer to Hillview Crescent and conflict with Policy 3(ii) of the East Preston Neighbourhood Plan due to the alteration of the basic form of the roof. The detrimental impact of the proposed development upon the host dwelling is increased by virtue of the property being semi-detached with the neighbouring property retaining the hipped design and the application property only retaining a small hip but with a more prominent gable end. It is noted that the applicant has attempted to address the previous reason of refusal but the minor change to propose a small bonnet hip is not considered sufficient to overcome the previous concern and refusal. The proposal will unbalance the property and have an unacceptable adverse impact on the established character and appearance of the host dwelling and the wider area, which primarily retains the symmetry of the roofs on the semi detached properties and is contrary to policy GEN7(ii) and DEV19(v) of the Arun District Local Plan."

Therefore, this council asks Arun District Council to continue to refuse Planning Permission for this proposal.

East Preston and Kingston Preservation Society

The proposed alterations to this house closely resemble those applied for under EP/150/17, for which permission was recently refused. The large increase in the mass of the roof created by the alteration from hip to bonnet gable is retained from EP/150/17. This feature was the prime reason for the rejection of that application, because the enlarged roof would dominate the existing building and conflict with the existing character of that building and of the wider neighbourhood.

The Officer's Report said that "The proposal will unbalance the property and have an unacceptable adverse impact on the established character and appearance of the host dwelling and the wider area, which primarily retains the symmetry of the roofs of the semidetached properties". This is indeed an area in which the original appearance of the bungalows has been preserved and ought to be protected. 2 Hillview Crescent, being a corner property, is one in which the proposed changes would be especially conspicuous and therefore especially damaging to the character of the area.

The proposal is contrary to Policies GEN7 and DEV19 of the Arun Local Plan and to Policies 1 and 3 of the East Preston Neighbourhood Plan. We therefore trust that this application will be refused.

COMMENTS ON REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED:

Noted and addressed in the Conclusion section of the report below.

CONSULTATIONS

CONSULTATION RESPONSES RECEIVED:

None

COMMENTS ON CONSULTATION RESPONSES:

Comments noted

POLICY CONTEXT

Designation applicable to site:

ADOPTED LOC PLN

NO PUBLIC SEWER

DEVELOPMENT PLAN POLICES

[Arun District Local Plan \(2003\):](#)

GEN2	Built-up Area Boundary
GEN7	The Form of New Development
DEV19	Extensions to existing residential buildings

[Publication Version of the Local Plan \(October 2014\):](#)

SD SP2	Built -Up Area Boundary
D DM1	Aspects of Form and Design Quality
D DM4	Extensions & Alterations to Existing Buildings

PLANNING POLICY GUIDANCE:

NPPG National Planning Practice Guidance

NPPF National Planning Policy Framework

POLICY COMMENTARY

The Development Plan consists of the Arun District Local Plan 2003, West Sussex County Council's Waste and Minerals Plans and Made Neighbourhood Development Plans.

The Arun District Local Plan 2011-2031 (Publication Version) October 2014 and supporting documents were submitted for independent examination on 30 January 2015. A number of Main Modifications to the Arun District Local Plan 2011-2031 (Publication Version) October 2014 were approved by the Council on 22nd March 2017. Consultation and a further examination in public has taken place. The examination was completed in September 2017. The Main Modifications have been amalgamated with the Arun District Local Plan 2011-2031 (Publication Version) October 2014 to form the 'Modified - Arun Local Plan (2011-2031) - January 2018 Consultation Version' which was out for public consultation over a six week period starting on Friday 12 January 2018 until 5pm on Friday 23 February 2018.

In conclusion the emerging Local Plan, the 'Modified Arun Local Plan - January 2018 - Consultation Version', is at a very advanced stage and carries significant weight.

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. Whilst an NDP is under preparation it will afford little weight in the determination of planning applications. Its status will however gain more weight as a material consideration the closer it is towards it being made. Arun District Council will make reference to an NDP when it has, by the close of planning application consultation, been publicised for pre-submission consultation (Reg.14).

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.

Policy 1, Housing in the East Preston Neighbourhood Plan applies to this proposal and includes criteria i. which states proposals will be supported, provided:

i. the scale, density, massing, height, landscape design, layout and materials of all development proposals, including alterations to existing buildings, reflect and enhance the architectural and historic character and scale of the surrounding buildings;

The site is within Design Character Area 2 in the East Preston Neighbourhood Plan where Policy 3 relates. This policy states:

Policy 3: Design in Character Area Two

Development proposals in Character Area Two as shown on the Proposals Map (roads outlined in red) will be supported provided their scale, density, massing, height, landscape design, layout and materials of, including alterations to existing buildings, will:

- i. maintain a consistent low building height, with no development proposal of more than 1.5 storeys ; and
- ii. 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.

The proposal is not considered to be in accord with Policies 1 and 3 since it does not reflect and enhance the architectural character and scale of surrounding buildings and furthermore, it is does not maintain the basic form of the roof.

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

PLANNING

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 host dwelling locality and would it have a significant adverse impact upon 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 application site falls within the built area boundary where the principle of development is acceptable subject to accordance with relevant development plan policies. The key policy considerations in the determination of this application are deemed to be GEN7 and DEV19 of the Arun District Local Plan; Policies 1 and 3 of the East Preston Neighbourhood Plan, and guidance within the National Planning Policy Framework.

VISUAL AMENITY

The application site is located in a prominent corner position where the front, side and rear elevations are clearly visible from the street. The proposed alterations to the roof will have a significant impact upon the appearance of the host dwelling within the street scene. The alteration of the roof from hip to a smaller bonnet hip style will add significant bulk and mass to the roof of the dwelling.

It is considered that this gives an awkward relationship that would draw the eye and exacerbate the dominance of the proposed roof when viewed from the street on Hillview Crescent and Orchard Way. The proposed roof alterations would have a significant presence within the street scene by virtue of the design of the proposed development. The hip to bonnet hip alteration will see the profile of the roof

moved closer to Hillview Crescent and conflict with Policy 3(ii) of the East Preston Neighbourhood Plan due to the alteration of the basic form of the roof.

The proposed development is primarily viewed upon Orchard Way where there are no examples of a gable to bonnet gable roof conversion and the semi detached bungalow properties have uniform fully hipped roofs. When viewed along this road the proposed bonnet hipped roof would be noticeably out of character particularly given that there are long range views toward 2 Hillview Crescent as it is a corner property which has a southern border on Orchard Way.

There are two properties to the rear of the applicant's property at 4 Hillview Crescent and 4 Chiltern Close which are similar semi detached bungalow properties which did have hipped roof to bonnet hipped roof extension granted in 2001 (EP/151/01 - 4 Hillview Crescent) and 2002 (EP/10/02 - 4 Chiltern Close) however these are the only bungalows in the local area which have had the same roof extension as proposed in this application. This occurred prior to the adoption of the East Preston Neighbourhood Plan and in particular policy 3(ii) and paragraph 4.28 which are specifically written to prevent unsympathetic alterations to the form of the roof, such as is proposed in this application. This has been further reinforced by paragraphs 56-58 of the National Planning Policy Framework which came into force in 2012. In addition the two properties which have had their roof extended are in less prominent locations in the wider street scene being located on shorter lengths of suburban roadway.

The detrimental impact of the proposed development upon the host dwelling is increased by virtue of the property being semi-detached with the neighbouring property retaining the hipped design and the application property only retaining a small hip but with a more prominent gable end. It is noted that the applicant has attempted to address the previous reason of refusal but the change to the proposal removing the rear dormer is not considered sufficient to overcome the previous concern and refusal.

The proposal would unbalance the property and have an unacceptable adverse impact on the established character and appearance of the host dwelling and the wider area, which primarily retains the symmetry of the roofs on the semi detached properties and is contrary to policy GEN7(ii) and DEV19(v) of the Arun District Local Plan. No objection is raised to the principle of the roof lights on the front or rear roof slope.

Therefore, the proposal is not considered to appear subservient or well integrated with the host dwelling and will appear as an unduly dominant addition when viewed from the street and as such is in conflict with policy DEV19(i) and (ii) of the Arun District Local Plan and Policy 1(i) of the East Preston Neighbourhood Plan and design guidance within the NPPF.

RESIDENTIAL AMENITY

The proposed roof alterations by virtue of their design and location are not considered to give rise to any unacceptably adverse overshadowing or overbearing impacts on neighbouring properties. The proposed roof lights at first floor level, which could be constructed under permitted development rights, would give rise to some additional overlooking of property garden to the east at no. 28 Orchard Road.

The proposal as submitted is considered to comply with policy GEN 7 and DEV 19 in that it in itself would not cause a significant harm to the residential amenities of neighbouring properties.

CONCLUSION

The proposed development is considered to conflict with relevant Development Plan Policy and the East Preston Neighbourhood Plan and as such is recommended for refusal for the reasons identified below. This is notwithstanding other development in the area similar to that proposed which was considered under a different Development Plan regime.

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 proposed development, comprising of a roof extension, by virtue of its unsympathetic design, significant size and prominent location is considered to have an unacceptable discordant and incongruous impact upon the character and appearance of the host dwelling as well as that of the immediate locality contrary to policies GEN7 and DEV19 of the Arun District Local Plan, Policies 1 and 3 of the East Preston Neighbourhood Plan, and guidance in the National Planning Policy Framework.
- 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.