

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

REF NO: FP/134/25/HH

LOCATION: Old Watch House
Old Coastguards
Felpham
PO22 7BJ

PROPOSAL: Demolition of the existing garage and replacement with new store and residential annex to the main house.

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION As above.

RELEVANT SITE HISTORY

FP/40/25/HH Demolition of the existing garage and replacement with new garage incorporating a residential annex to the main house. Refused 23-05-25

REPRESENTATIONS

Felpham Parish Council - Objection, on the basis of:

- Does not meet space standards.
- Lack of flood risk assessment.
- Does not comply with ADC parking standards.
- Overshadowing of neighbouring property, FPC have grave concerns of the potential impact on neighbours.
- 1 metre gap from boundary at first floor level not maintained.
- Overdevelopment of site.
- Proximity of property to neighbour likely to cause damage during construction.

7 No. letters of objection received on the basis of:

- Increased traffic to single lane access road.
- Risk of subsidence following digging of foundations for basement level.
- Reduction in green space.
- Eyesore.
- Annexe is not physically or functionally linked to the main house.
- Enclosure.
- Cladding out of keeping.
- Inappropriate scale.
- Overlooking.

- Doubts over long term use.
- Contradicts nationally described space standards.

1 No. letter of support received on the basis of:

- Positive use of ancillary accomodation.

CONSULTATIONS

CONSULTATION RESPONSES RECEIVED:

Coastal Engineers - No response received.

POLICY CONTEXT

Within an area with potentially high groundwater levels.

Lidsey Local Food Risk Zone.

DEVELOPMENT PLAN POLICIES

Arun Local Plan 2011 - 2031:

DDM1 D DM1 Aspects of form and design quality

Felpham Neighbourhood Plan 2019-31 Policy Quality of Design

ESD1

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 is a terraced house along Old Coastguards, the dwelling is a corner property with a single storey garage to the front of the site. The access road is narrow, and the existing single storey garage is visible from the street scene, although not prominent due to its height and simple design. This application seeks planning permission for an outbuilding to replace the existing garage. It would contain 3 habitable rooms, a canoe store, and a WC.

The proposed outbuilding would be constructed up to the eastern side boundary and would be set in 1m from the rear boundary to the north. The outbuilding would measure 5m in width, 9.5m in depth and would have an eaves height of 2.8m with a maximum height of 4.2m. The outbuilding would be constructed 1.2m below ground level, resulting in a 1.5 storey external appearance. The requirement for the building to be partly below ground is indicative of the cramped and contrived form of development proposed. Due to the height and scale of the building occupying most of the plot, its siting to the front of the main dwelling, and its overly domestic appearance in terms of the feature glazing proposed within the front elevation, the outbuilding would not appear visually subservient and would not have the appearance of an ancillary building. Furthermore, due to the siting of the outbuilding, orientated 90 degrees from the Old Watch House, and with a visible physical separation from the host dwelling, this further exacerbates the domestic nature of the building.

It is noted that this application is a revised proposal following the refusal of FP/40/25/HH. The previous application was refused on the basis of its siting, scale, height and design, appearing unduly prominent within the street scene of Old Coastguards causing harm to the visual amenity, as well as significant overbearing and overshadowing of neighbours. While the current application has sought to remove some elements of the proposal such as the balcony and stepped western elevation, the height remains contentious. Although the height has been reduced by 1.2m, to 4.2m from 5.5m, the proposed outbuilding would be sunken into the ground by 1.2m. As such, the height would be maintained, as would the bulk and large footprint, albeit sunken down. The northern flank elevation has increased in depth since the refused proposal by 0.7m, resulting in a further increase in bulk and failing to overcome the previous reasons for refusal.

The Arun Design Guide states that developments and extensions should respond to the distinctive characteristics of the building and surrounding area, by taking a simple and unobtrusive form which does not overpower the existing or neighbouring properties, while taking the opportunity to incorporate innovative design if appropriate and maintaining established building lines. The scale and design of the proposed outbuilding would be obtrusive in this location and would appear unduly prominent and incongruous within the street scene, extending forward from the established building line to the west. The siting, scale and design of the proposed development would not be sympathetic or sensitive to the nature of the site and would be harmful to the character of the host dwelling, street scene and wider area. The width of the outbuilding, filling the plot, would appear cramped, and the design with the sunken ground levels would appear contrived and out of character with the wider locality.

The proposed outbuilding be timber clad. The doors would be aluminium and the windows would be timber. The outbuilding would have a pitched roof with slate style tiles, similar in appearance to the existing tiles. Whilst the materials proposed for the garage would not result in harm, the siting, scale, and design of the garage would not be in keeping with the character of the host dwelling, street scene or wider area.

Overall, the proposed outbuilding would appear unduly prominent within the street scene by reason of its scale and siting. The proposed development would be a visually obtrusive and incongruous form of development and would result in demonstrable harm to the character of the locality and visual amenity of the street scene and wider area. The proposed development is therefore contrary to policies D DM1 and D DM4 of the Arun Local Plan, the Arun Design Guide, and policy ESD1 of the Felpham Neighbourhood Development Plan.

NEIGHBOURING RESIDENTIAL AMENITY

The host dwelling is an end of terrace property within a row of seven. The dwelling currently features a single storey rear garage which is modest in scale and does not result in any significant overbearing impact to neighbouring dwellings.

The proposed outbuilding at 1.5 storeys would be set directly behind the rear garden of Nos. 1 and 2 Coastguard Cottages resulting in overbearing impacts as the flank-to-flank distance is only 7m, while the ADG states back to side separation distances should be a minimum of 14m. The sense of enclosure remains despite the reduction in height of the proposal above ground. The neighbour to the north east, Eaves, has a flank-to-flank separation distance of less than 2m. Due to the siting, height and scale of the outbuilding, it would result in overbearing and overshadowing of Nos. 1 and 2 Coastguard Cottages and Eaves.

Fenestration is proposed within the front (south) elevation which would provide outlook to the rear gardens along Havelock Close and would not result in harmful overlooking impacts. There is a low-level window proposed within the rear (north) elevation which would be screened from any harmful

overlooking impacts by the 1.8m boundary fence.

Overall, the proposed outbuilding would result in harmful impacts by way of overbearing and overshadowing of neighbouring dwellings 1 and 2 Old Coastguards and Eaves. The proposal is contrary to policies D DM1 and D DM4 of the ALP.

PARKING

The loss of an internal parking space within the garage is acceptable. The site is located within Parking Zone 2, as per the Arun Parking Standards SPD the dwelling is required to provide 2 No. parking spaces. The SPD outlines that garages should measure 3m x 6m to accommodate a vehicle while the existing garage measures approx. 5.1m in depth and 2.6m in width and therefore is not of a sufficient depth to accommodate a vehicle. The proposed garage measures 2.5m in width and 5m in depth and is also not of a sufficient depth to accommodate a vehicle.

While the existing garage is not a sufficient depth to provide internal parking under the SPD guidance (3m x 6m), the existing driveway provides more than 2 parking spaces and is therefore acceptable under the Arun Parking Standards SPD. Therefore, the loss of a garage space is acceptable in this instance as it would not result in an overall loss of parking provision within the site.

SUMMARY

The proposed outbuilding would appear unduly prominent within the street scene by reason of its scale and siting. The proposed development would be a visually obtrusive and incongruous form of development and would result in demonstrable harm to the character of the locality and visual amenity of the street scene and wider area. The proposed development is therefore contrary to policies D DM1 and D DM4 of the Arun Local Plan, the Arun Design Guide, and policy ESD1 of the Felpham Neighbourhood Development Plan.

The proposed outbuilding would result in harmful overbearing and overshadowing impacts of neighbouring dwellings. Therefore, the proposal is contrary to policies D DM1 and D DM4 of the ALP.

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.

CIL DETAILS

This application is not CIL liable.

RECOMMENDATION**REFUSE**

- 1 The proposed outbuilding, by reason of its siting and scale would appear unduly prominent within the street scene of Old Coastguards. The proposed development would be an incongruous form of development and would result in demonstrable harm to the character of the locality and visual amenity of the street scene and wider area. The proposed development is therefore contrary to Arun Local Plan policies D DM1 and D DM4, the Arun Design Guide and policy ESD1 of the Felpham Neighbourhood Development Plan.
- 2 The proposed outbuilding would result in adverse impacts by way of overbearing and overshadowing of neighbouring properties at numbers 1 and 2 Old Coastguards and Eaves, contrary to Arun Local Plan policies D DM1 and D DM4.
- 3 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 identifying matters of concern with the proposal and determining the application within a timely manner, clearly setting out the reason(s) for refusal, allowing the Applicant the opportunity to consider the harm caused and whether or not it can be remedied by a revision to the proposal. The Local Planning Authority is willing to provide pre-application advice in respect of any future application for a revised development.