

From: Nicola and Stephen Harlow, 25 Upper Drive, East Preston

Planning Application EP/7/21/HH

Objection and comments relating to proposed front extension to provide additional garaging

EP/7/21/HH is the third application submitted for a single storey front extension to provide additional garaging at 23 Upper Drive, East Preston. The previous two applications (EP/96/20/HH and EP/124/20/HH) were withdrawn by the applicant. It is good to see that the new application is more considerate to the immediate neighbours and neighbourhood generally.

I would like to raise the following regarding the application:

- aspects of the application which contravene both the Arun Local Plan and Section M.01 (Household Extensions) of the Arun Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document, adopted on 25 January 2021
- issues which need clarification
- a policy compliant solution

1. Aspects of the application which contravene the Arun Local Plan and the Arun Design Guide

a. Depth of proposed garage

The Design Guide Section M.01 refers to front extensions, porches and canopies and on page 116 it states that:

Front extensions should generally be no deeper than 1.5 metres

The proposed garage is 3.5 metres deep.

Antonyms for 'generally' are rarely, seldomly, infrequently or exceptionally. What 'exceptional' circumstance could ever be envisaged for a garage?

As garage space for two cars is desired by the applicant, a policy compliant solution is outlined in point 3 below.

b. Natural light to 23 Upper Drive

- i) The Design Guide page 115 sets out issues that need to be considered when building an extension and states that a scheme should:

Protect the amenity of occupants by ensuring appropriate lighting levels.

- ii) The Arun Local Plan paragraph 13.4.3 states:

Extensions and alterations to existing buildings should be designed to ensure adequate natural light within the building, garden and amenity space.

The proposed garage will take away natural light to the reception room on the north side of 23 Upper Drive. This will affect both current occupants and future occupants.

2. Issues relating to the application which need clarification

- a. Page 118 of the Design Guide refers to protecting neighbouring amenity.

Loss of amenity can relate to light, outlook and privacy.

In the case of detached properties the Design Guide states that the impact of loss of amenity can be avoided through:

keeping both single- and two-storey extensions within a 45-degree line taken from the edge of the nearest ground and first floor windows of habitable rooms in the neighbouring property

Whilst this part of the Guide refers to rear extensions I understand that this rule is in general use and is not restricted to rear extensions.

The drawings show that the proposed garage meets the 45 degree rule in relation to the ground floor room at 25 Upper Drive but do not show the affect on the outlook from the first floor room (bedroom). The first floor is set back by 1.5 metres from the ground floor. It is not possible to tell from the drawings whether the 45 degree rule to protect the outlook from the first floor bedroom on the south east side of 25 Upper Drive is met.

- b. Page 119 of the Design Guide refers to roofs of extensions and states:

The roofs of extensions must preserve neighbouring amenity by avoiding designs which result in excessive visual intrusion

The first floor bedroom on the south east corner of 25 Upper Drive will overlook the proposed garage. The plans do not show the design or material to be used for the flat roof of the proposed garage.

In order to ensure compliance with the Design Guide details of the materials to be used for the flat roof should be submitted.

3. Policy compliant solution

The following proposal would provide the applicant with two garages and would not have a negative impact on the reception room on the north side of 23 Upper Drive:

- An extension of up to 1.5 metres from the existing integral garage to house one car; this could be fully compliant and of sufficient size to house the longest of road cars.
- An additional garage on the south east corner of the property for a second car (the plans show there is sufficient space for this). Providing the garage is a reasonable size and height it would probably be compliant with planning policy.

As there is a compliant solution available, there is no reason to grant planning permission for this (non-compliant) scheme.