

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

REF NO: EP/53/22/HH

LOCATION: 38 Hillview Crescent
East Preston
BN16 1RQ

PROPOSAL: Hip to gable loft conversion with rear dormer.

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION The application seeks to create a second floor to the existing dwelling by way of a hip to gable and a rear dormer and a first-floor extension above an existing ground floor extension.

RELEVANT SITE HISTORY

EP/36/22/CLP	Lawful development certificate for a proposed loft conversion hip to gable with rear dormer.	PP Required 13-05-22
--------------	--	-------------------------

REPRESENTATIONS

East Preston Parish Council: Objection.

- The proposal will unbalance the pair of semi's.
- The proposal will be out of keeping with the street scene.
- Rear dormer overly long and out of keeping with host dwelling.

East Preston Preservation Society: Objection.

- The proposal will unbalance the pair of semi's.
- The proposal will be out of keeping with the street scene.
- Two storey dormer will be overbearing on neighbours.

2 letters of objection:

- The size and prominence of the dormer will have a harmful impact upon neighbouring properties.
- Large expanse of brick/cladding effecting outlook.
- Basic shape of the roof altered against policy.

OFFICERS COMMENTS ON REPRESENTATIONS:

The comments are noted and will be addressed in the conclusion section.

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)
DSP1	D SP1 Design

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 key policies are deemed to be D DM1 and D DM4 of the Arun Local Plan (ALP). Additionally, Policies 1 & 3 of the East Preston Neighbourhood 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 1 of the East Preston Neighbourhood Development Plan (EPNP) sets out general principles for development within the Parish. Part (i) relates to the scale, density, massing, height, landscape design, layout and materials of development proposals, and how proposals must reflect and enhance the established character of the area.

Policy 3 of the East Preston Neighbourhood Development Plan 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.

DESIGN AND VISUAL AMENITY

The application site is located to the west side of Hillview Crescent, the last house before a sharp bend in the road. The properties directly to north are sited at a 45-degree angle to the application sites meaning their rear boundary forms the side boundary of the application site. To the north of the host dwelling is the properties driveway and adjacent neighbours flat roof garage. It is proposed to construct a hip to gable extension, rear dormer and first floor extension above an existing flat roof ground floor extension. In essence these extensions form a long rear dormer which will be constructed using materials already found on site.

The alteration of the roof from hip to gable and the proposed dormer window will add bulk and mass to the roof of the dwelling. This will have a significant impact upon the appearance of the host dwelling within the street scene. The 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 unbalancing the set of semi-detached dwellings.

The dormer would also be visible from the street as the front of the site and the rear of the neighbouring property have an open nature. The Arun Design Guide requires roof extensions to be in discreet positions. This additional extension would appear incongruent within the street scene and give a solid two-storey bulk running a significant proportion of the host dwelling's length, where there currently exists a roof sloping into the centre of the site. The proposed dormer, resultant of its significant scale, is not considered to be a sympathetic or subservient addition to the host dwelling. The dormer extension will have a significant length running over 9m out from the ridge and have a flat roof, creating a box like second storey to the bungalow and have the effect of creating a full two-storey high, flush elevation, in conflict with policies D DM4 of the ALP and policy 3(ii) of the EPNP .

NEIGHBOURING RESIDENTIAL AMENITY

Objections have been received relating to the loss of privacy. Windows to the proposed roof extension will face over the public realm or over the private rear amenity space of the host dwelling and are not of concern. Windows are present to the side (north) facing elevation, although these are currently to non-habitable rooms, to protect the future occupiers of the properties to the north a condition to provide non-opening obscure glazed windows would make these acceptable in terms of protection of privacy of the neighbours to the north.

The proposed development is not thought to be overbearing or overshadowing to the neighbours to the north. The proposed development would be contained within the existing footprint of the dwelling and retain an approx. 3.2m gap between the proposed extension and the shared boundary to the north. A separation gap of 23m is retained to the rear boundary of the host dwelling. By reason of these separation distances and due to the existing garage of the host dwelling also being a feature to the rear boundary of No.34 Hillview, no negative impact is foreseen.

Therefore, the proposed development will accord with D DM1 and D DM4 of the Arun Local Plan and Part M of the Arun Design Guide.

SUMMARY

The proposed development conflicts with relevant Development Plan Policy and as such is recommended for refusal for the reasons identified below.

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

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 unsympathetic design, significant size and prominent location will 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 D DM1 and D DM4 of the Arun Local Plan and Policies 1 and 3 of the East Preston Neighbourhood Plan.
- 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 discussing those with the Applicant. However, the issues are so fundamental to the proposal that it has not been possible to negotiate a satisfactory way forward and due to the harm which has been clearly identified within the reason(s) for the refusal, approval has not been possible.