

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

REF NO: FG/17/22/HH

LOCATION: 44A Ocean Drive
Ferring
BN12 5QP

PROPOSAL: Erection of single storey rear/side extension following the demolition of existing conservatory.

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION

The application seeks to erect a single storey rear extension that extends 6.1m off of and 7.3m across the rear elevation. The proposal features a flat roof design with eaves at 2.9m and a rooflight reaching up to 3.25m. There is also an installation of 1 No. rear door to the existing garage. These works are to be conducted following the demolition of the existing conservatory.

REPRESENTATIONS

Ferring Parish Council - No response.

2 No. representations from nearby occupiers - Object:

- Site plan does not accurately show the properties curtilage.
- Loss of privacy and noise increase.
- Disruption during construction due to shared driveway.

OFFICERS COMMENTS

The site and block plans have been amended to show the correct curtilage.

Impacts of amenity are considered within this report.

Disruption of the shared driveway during building works is not a planning concern and is not grounds for refusal.

CONSULTATION RESPONSES RECEIVED:

None.

POLICY CONTEXT

Designation applicable to site:

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)

Ferring Neighbourhood Plan 2014 Policy 1A

A Spatial Plan for the Parish

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 considered in this application are Policy D DM1 & D DM4 of the Arun Local Plan and Policy 1A of the Ferring Neighbourhood Development Plan. Additionally section M of the Arun Design Guide which relates to extensions is of relevance.

Ferring has a made Neighbourhood Development Plan with Policy 1A being of relevance which states that proposals within the Built Up Area Boundary will be supported, subject to accordance with other relevant development plan policies. This proposal is compliant by virtue of being sited within the Built-Up Area Boundary.

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.

The Arun Design Guide 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.

DESIGN AND VISUAL AMENITY

The host dwelling is a single storey semi-detached dwelling that is connected to its attached neighbour by a garage to the northern site boundary. The proposal is for a single storey rear extension that extends 6.1m off of and 7.3m across the rear elevation. The proposal features a flat roof design with eaves at 2.9m and a rooflight reaching up to 3.25m. The scale of the proposal is considered large relative to the host dwelling and is not considered subservient however, it is similar in scale to other rear extensions found at other properties within the locality such as No. 38 Ocean Drive. Additionally, the proposal retains a significant rear amenity space depth of 14.6m which is more than that which is set out by Section H of the Arun Design Guide at 10.5m. The scale is considered acceptable.

The proposal is to sit between the rear elevation of the property and the existing rear garage, covering

the existing conservatory footprint and some of the rear garden. This proposal acts as somewhat of an infill extension. The siting of the proposal is appropriate as it features matching design to the host dwelling with rendered walls and brick trimming to the corners. The siting and design are appropriate.

The proposal features matching external wall materials to those found on the existing dwelling and a fibreglass flat roof, both of which are considered appropriate by virtue of matching the existing or being an acceptable alternative. The proposed materials for windows and doors are to be uPVC as opposed to Timber to match the existing, these materials are considered acceptable despite not matching those found on dwelling.

This is a single storey rear extension and will have no views from the front of the property and as such, no visual impact on the street scene.

The installation of 1 No. rear door to the existing garage is acceptable given its to consist of appropriate materials and considered permitted development.

The proposal is compliant with relevant development plan policies D DM1 & D DM4 of Arun Local Plan.

NEIGHBOURING RESIDENTIAL AMENITY

The single storey rear extension is to extend 2.5m beyond the garage to the northern elevation. This 2.5m projection is separated from the northern site boundary by approx. 1m. Section G and M of the Arun Design Guide sets out the 45 and 60 degree rules to help gauge and reduce impacts on neighbouring amenity. The height and depth of the proposal is such that it does not obstruct 45 or 60 degree sightlines from the rear of No. 44 Ocean Drive. As such, it has no unacceptable adverse impacts by way of overshadowing or overbearing on No. 44 Ocean Drive.

The proposal is separated from the southern site boundary by 4.6m and is set back from the rear of the neighbouring property No. 50 Ocean Drive by approx. 16m. The proposal does intersect 60 degree sightlines from the rear of No. 50 Ocean Drive. However, the rear viewpoints from No. 50 Ocean Drive are obstructed by an existing outbuilding at its northern site boundary and are separated by a significant distance between the rear of No. 50 Ocean Drive and the proposal at 16m. The proposal is not considered to have any adverse impacts on No. 50 Ocean Drive by way of overbearing or overshadowing.

There is to be a set of 5 No. rear glass doors and 2 No. windows to the southern elevation of the proposal. The rear glass doors look out to the rear garden and provide no adverse viewpoints into neighbouring properties. As such, these do not give rise to any adverse impacts by way of overlooking.

The 2 No. new windows to the southern elevation are at ground floor, are separated from the southern elevation by 4.6m and met by a fence at the boundary. These do not give rise to any adverse impacts by way of overlooking.

The rear door to the garage is at ground floor and close to the northern site boundary, separated by approx. 0.5m. The northern site boundary is treated by a boundary fence at approx. 1.7m in height. This component is considered permitted development and does not give rise to significantly adverse impacts by way of noise production or overlooking.

By virtue of not being overbearing, overshadowing or overlooking onto neighbouring properties, the proposal is in compliance with relevant development plan policies D DM1 & D DM4 of the Arun Local Plan.

CONCLUSION

The proposal is compliant with relevant development plan policies and as such, is recommended for approval subject to the following conditions and informatives.

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

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:

- Elevations, Floor Plans, Site Plan & Location Plan 148/01 Rev A

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

- 3 **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 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 National Planning Policy Framework.