

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

REF NO: EP/74/19/HH

LOCATION: 2 Hillview Crescent
East Preston
BN16 1RD

PROPOSAL: Hip to barn hip extension & single storey rear extension.

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION	The application is for a hip to barn hip extension, and a single storey extension, which replaces an existing conservatory and measures 5m deep X 7m wide X 3.5m high. The extension is to the northern side of the dwelling. Two velux windows are also proposed on the southern elevation.
----------------------------	--

RELEVANT SITE HISTORY

EP/16/19/HH	Single storey rear extension with an addition of a second floor including a rear dormer and gable end window	Refused 11-04-19
EP/44/18/HH	Hip to gable loft conversion	Refused 10-05-18
EP/150/17/HH	Loft Conversion & rear extension - Resubmission of EP/113/17/HH	Refused 12-01-18
EP/113/17/HH	Loft conversion & rear extension	Refused 06-10-17

REPRESENTATIONS

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED:

East Preston Parish Council

East Preston Parish Council

Objection:

- The proposal has an unsympathetic design and a significant size in a prominent location.
- The proposal has an unacceptable discordant and incongruous impact upon the character and appearance of the area.
- The proposed dormer will overlook the three adjacent gardens.

East Preston & Kingston Preservation Society - Objection:

- The proposal only differs from the previous application by having a slightly smaller rear dormer which does not reduce the impact it has upon the host dwelling, the locality, or the amenity of nearby occupiers.

3 letters of objection:

- The rear dormer will overlook neighbouring dwellings.
- The proposal is 'overdevelopment' and is out of character with the locality.
- There is very little difference to this submission from the previous one that was rejected.
- The issues that effect the properties to the North still have not been addressed at all.
- Why has the impact on the street scene from this proposal been ignored?

Following substitute plans an additional representation has been received.

Parish Council - Objection:

- Appreciate the efforts to address objections previously raised.
- Committee continues to feel strongly that the proposed changes are not suitable for such as prominent corner site and result in changing street scene.

OFFICERS COMMENTS ON REPRESENTATIONS:

Comments noted and where material planning considerations are made they 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

CONCLUSIONS

PRINCIPLE

The key policies are deemed to be D DM1 and D DM4 of the Arun Local Plan. 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 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.

PLANNING HISTORY

This application represents the fifth planning application relating to the site that involves a single storey extension and changes to the roof space to allow for additional accommodation.

A similarly designed roof alteration was refused under EP/44/18/HH.

DESIGN AND 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 area, and particularly Orchard Road, has a very uniform character of semi-detached single storey properties with hipped roofs. On Orchard Road, there are no immediate examples of different roof forms and this is a notable factor/character to this street.

Hillview Crescent and Chiltern Close do have a small number of dwellings with roof alterations. These are found directly adjacent to the site to the North, and to the North-East. Number 4 Hillview Crescent features a barn-hipped side dormer, facing the street scene, which continues the ridge height of the host building to the East. A similar addition is also found at Number 4 Chiltern Close. Approximately 80m to the North, Number 15 Hillview Crescent has performed a hip to gable roof extension, with a rear dormer. These examples however do not form part of the immediate locality which informs the character and appearance upon which this proposal will be assessed against.

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 gable (with hip bonnet) and the proposed dormer window will add significant bulk and mass to the roof of the dwelling. 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 being gabled. This hip to gable 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 extension will unbalance the property (as a semi-detached building) and

have an unacceptable adverse impact on the established character and appearance of the host dwelling, and Orchard Lane, which primarily retains the symmetry of the roofs on the semi-detached properties. 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 reasons. Additionally, due to the proposal compromising this established spatial pattern, it is considered to conflict with D DM4(e) of the Arun Local Plan.

The ground floor extension replaces the existing Northern projection and conservatory. The extension is lower than said projection by 0.8m and runs along the Northern elevation of the host dwelling. When viewed from Hillview Crescent the single storey rear extension is not considered to appear as a dominant structure on the house. Whilst it is noted that the proposed extension projects further from said elevational wall than existing, it has a lower ridge height, which is considered to allow the proposal to appear sympathetic to the host dwelling. Therefore, the proposed single storey extension is considered to appear subservient and well integrated with the host dwelling, and as such is considered to be in accordance with policy D DM4 (a) and (b) of the Arun Local Plan and Policy 1(i) of the East Preston Neighbourhood Plan.

NEIGHBOURING RESIDENTIAL AMENITY

The proposed single storey extension, by virtue of its design and location is not considered to give rise to any unacceptably adverse overlooking impacts on neighbouring properties, as the windows are at ground level and it is limited to single storey.

The two proposed rooflights on the Northern roof slope, potentially provide for unacceptable overlooking of neighbouring dwellings that is 28 Orchard Road, 2 Chiltern Close and 4 Hillview Crescent. However, a condition to require that any opening is above 1.7m from ground floor would prevent adverse overlooking and so should not form a reason for refusal.

The proposed rear extension does not significantly impact upon the occupiers of number 28 as the roof of the proposed extension slopes down to a height of 2.5 m only 0.7m above the intervening boundary fencing.

Therefore, the proposed development is not considered to be in conflict with D DM1(3) and D DM4(c) of the Arun Local Plan.

SUMMARY

For the above reasons the proposal, as amended, will result in an unacceptable impact to the character and appearance of the immediate locality in conflict with the relevant policies in the Arun Local Plan, and the East Preston Neighbourhood Development Plan, and as such, it is recommended for refusal for the following reason.

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 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 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.