

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

REF NO: EP/47/26/HH

LOCATION: Crabapple Cottage
10 Tamarisk Way
East Preston
BN16 2TF

PROPOSAL: Demolition of sunroom and replacement with two storey front extension; two storey side extension; single storey rear extension and revised roof.

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION	As above.
----------------------------	-----------

REPRESENTATIONS

East Preston Parish Council - No objection.

1 No. letter of support received:

- The scale and design of the extension in keeping with the character of the property and the wider street scene.
- No loss of light, privacy, or amenity to my property.

2 No. letters of no objection received:

- Concerns regarding first floor fenestration potential for overlooking to the rear.

CONSULTATION RESPONSES RECEIVED:

None.

POLICY CONTEXT

Within Built-Up Area Boundary.

Within 200mm Mean High Water.

DEVELOPMENT PLAN POLICIES

[Arun Local Plan 2011 - 2031:](#)

DDM1	D DM1 Aspects of form and design quality
DDM4	D DM4 Extensions and alter to exist builds (res and non-res)

[East Preston Neighbourhood Plan 2014 Policy 1](#) Housing - General Principles

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**DESIGN AND VISUAL AMENITY**

The site comprises a detached two-storey dwelling on Tamarisk Way. This application seeks planning permission for the demolition of the existing sunroom, the construction of a two-storey front extension, a two-storey side extension, a single-storey rear extension, and revisions to the roof, including an increase in the ridge height. The majority of the works would be visible from the street scene.

Following demolition of the existing sunroom on the front/side elevation, a two-storey front infill extension is proposed, extending in line with the existing front and western flank elevations. This element would measure 1.7m wide and 3.4m deep. It would have an eaves height of 4.6m, matching the host dwelling, and a maximum height of 7.3m, matching the proposed increased ridge height. The extension would not extend beyond the principal elevation. The proposed extension would not disrupt the established building line and it would reflect the character and appearance of the host dwelling. As such, the two storey front extension would not result in harm to visual amenity.

The proposed two-storey side extension would adjoin the eastern flank elevation of the dwelling and would measure 6m in width and 8.2m in depth. It would have an eaves height of 4.6m, matching the existing eaves height of the host dwelling, and a maximum height of 7.3m, adjoining the proposed ridge height. Part M of the Arun Design Guide (ADG) specifies that side extensions should be set back from the front elevation and set down from the ridgeline by a minimum of 0.5m. The proposed extension would be equal to the ridge height of the existing dwelling and would be in line with the principal elevation; therefore, it would not accord with this section of the ADG. The ADG also states that side extensions should respond to the design of the host building in terms of roof pitch and should use complementary and integrated materials and elevational design. Although the proposed extension would not appear as a subservient addition to the host dwelling, it would integrate well with the existing property through the use of matching materials and a pitched roof form that reflects the existing dwelling. As such, the extension would not appear out of place within its context and would not result in harm to the character of the host dwelling or the street scene.

The proposed single-storey rear extension would measure 7.2m deep and 9.5m wide and would infill the existing rear projection. Across both the existing and proposed single-storey rear elements, a new false crown roof is proposed with one lantern-style rooflight. The rear element would have an eaves height of 2.2m and a maximum roof height of 3.1m. The proposed rear extension would exceed the guidance set out in Part M of the ADG, which states that, for detached houses, single-storey rear extensions should not extend more than 3.3m from the rear elevation of the original dwelling. However, given its limited visibility from the wider street scene, and as it would not extend further than the existing single-storey rear addition, the extension would not result in harm to the host dwelling, street scene or wider area.

The proposed roof revisions would increase the ridge height from 6.6m to 7.3m, an increase of 0.7m. The existing roof is lower than many of the surrounding dwellings, and there is no uniform ridge height within the Tamarisk Way street scene. Therefore, the increase in ridge height would not appear incongruous and would not harm the character of the area. Two gable-end features are proposed within the front roof slope above two of the first-floor windows. Similar designs and front dormers are present within the street scene; each dwelling along this part of Tamarisk Way is unique, and a variety of roof forms are visible from the road. The proposed pitched roof features would be small in scale, set substantially down and in, and would have pitched roofs, in accordance with the ADG.

Overall, the proposed development would alter the character of the dwelling through its non-subservient scale and massing. However, given the use of matching materials and the overall integration of the extensions with the existing dwelling, the proposed works would not result in harm to the character or appearance of the host dwelling. The proposal is therefore in accordance with Arun Local Plan (ALP) policies D DM1 and D DM4.

NEIGHBOURING RESIDENTIAL AMENITY

Part M of the ADG states that householder extensions should protect neighbouring amenity in terms of privacy and overshadowing, taking into account the position of neighbouring buildings. It also states that extensions should respond to existing elevations through the size and positioning of doors and windows.

The single-storey rear extension would not extend beyond the furthest rear wall of the host dwelling. It would have a maximum height of 3.1m and a separation distance of 1.6m to the western side boundary, while the distance to the eastern side boundary would remain unchanged. Given its siting, scale and relationship with neighbouring boundaries, the rear extension would not result in overbearing or overshadowing impacts. The fenestration associated with the rear extension would be located within the rear elevation at ground-floor level and would not result in overlooking.

The proposed first-floor additions and roof revisions would increase the height, bulk and massing of the host dwelling. The works would remain largely within the existing footprint, aside from the infill elements, and would not extend closer to the side boundaries than the existing built form. Given the separation retained between the roof extension and neighbouring properties, the development would not result in significant overbearing or overshadowing impacts to either neighbour. Windows within the rear elevation would provide views that would not be significantly different from those currently achieved. It is also noted that the neighbouring properties to the rear are separated by a distance of 26m to the boundary. As such, the proposal would not result in unacceptable overlooking.

The proposed development would not result in harm to the residential amenity of neighbouring properties in accordance with ALP policies D DM1 and D DM4.

SUMMARY

The proposed development is in accordance with the relevant development plan policies and is recommended for approval, subject to the following conditions and informatives. There are no neighbourhood plan policies relevant to this proposal.

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.

CIL DETAILS

This application is not CIL liable.

RECOMMENDATION**APPROVE CONDITIONALLY**

- 1 The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of 3 years from the date of this permission.

Reason: To comply with Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).

- 2 The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:

- Location Plan
- Block Plan 4049/01/07
- Ground Floor Plan 4049/01/05
- Ground Floor, First Floor and Roof Plans as Proposed 4049/01/03
- Elevations as Proposed 4049/01/04

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of amenity and the environment in accordance with Arun Local Plan policies D DM1 and D DM4.

- 3 Based on the information available, this permission is exempt from the requirement to provide a biodiversity gain plan under Paragraph 13 of Schedule 7A to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. The following exemption applies:

This planning permission is for development which is a householder application within the meaning of article 2(1) of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015.

Reason: In accordance with Schedule 7A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).

- 4 **INFORMATIVE:** Statement pursuant to Article 35 of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015 (as amended). The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by assessing the proposal against all material considerations, including planning policies and any representations that may have been received and subsequently determining to grant planning permission in accordance with the presumption in favour of sustainable development, as set out within the NPPF.