

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

REF NO: FP/48/12/

LOCATION: 39 Davenport Road
Felpham

PROPOSAL: Proposed new garage, shower and utility room

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION	The application seeks consent for a side extension to provide a garage, shower and utility room (4.7 x 5 x 11.6 metres).
SITE AREA	Approximately 462 sq metres
RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT DEN	N/A
TOPOGROPHHY	Predominantly flat
TREES	None of any significance affected by the proposed development.
BOUNDARY TREATMENT	None to front. Close boarded timber fencing to side and rear boundaries, approximately 1.8 metres high, supplemented by planting.
SITE CHARACTERISTICS	Detached, two storey modern dwelling with hipped, pitch roof, faced in white pebbledash. First floor balcony on front elevation. Hardstanding to front with parking for 2-3 cars. Existing side-lean to garage.
CHARACTER OF LOCALITY	Predominantly residential comprising a private residential road of detached two storey dwellings of various designs and styles.

RELEVANT SITE HISTORY

REPRESENTATIONS

Representations received:

No objection.

Comments on Representations received:

CONSULTATIONS

Consultations responses received:

Comments noted.

Comments on Consultation responses:

POLICY CONTEXT

Designation applicable to site:
Within built-up area boundary

DEVELOPMENT PLAN POLICIES

Arun District Local Plan:	DEV19	Extensions to existing residential buildings
	GEN2	Built-up Area Boundary
	GEN7	The Form of New Development

PLANNING POLICY GUIDANCE

NPPF	National Planning Policy Framework
------	------------------------------------

POLICY COMMENTARY

OTHER MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS

It is considered that there are no other material considerations to warrant a decision otherwise than in accordance with the Development Plan and/or legislative background.

CONCLUSIONS

The side extension will be under a mono pitch roof with an eaves height of 2.3 metres and a maximum overall height of 5 metres. The extension will span the depth of the property (11.6 metres) at a width of 4.7 metres.

The proposal will be faced in block and render with plain tiles to match the main dwelling. The proposal is considered to be a large extension that will project up to the side (west) boundary adjoining No. 37 Davenport Road, spanning the entire depth of the property. The ridge of the extension will project up to a first floor side facing window above eaves height. As a result, the side extension appears contrived and disproportionately large in relation to the host dwelling. The extension is considered to be an excessive width and the roofline is at a different pitch to the main dwelling. The proposal is therefore considered to be an unsympathetic design that fails to integrate visually with the main dwelling, contrary to policy DEV19 i) ii).

The surrounding streetscene is characterised by a variety of dwellings of different designs and styles. The side extension is considered to be a poor design that does not integrate well with the host dwelling. Further, the extension appears cramped as it is an excessive depth and width that will project up to the side (west) boundary, above the eaves height of the existing two storey dwelling. The proposal is therefore considered to have an adverse impact on the visual amenities of the surrounding streetscene, contrary to policy DEV19 v) and GEN7.

There are five side facing windows in the neighbouring property (No.37) and minimal screening between the two properties, other than fencing and trellis. Four rooflights are proposed in the west facing roofslope of the extension. The rooflights will serve a garage/utility room/bathroom. Given their position high in the roofslope, it is considered there will be no adverse overlooking or loss of privacy to the neighbouring property.

It is therefore recommended that planning permission is refused for the following reasons.

HUMAN RIGHTS ACT

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 for 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

Not applicable in this instance.

RECOMMENDATION

REFUSE

- 1 The proposed extension, by virtue of its scale and design, represents an unsympathetic form of development that fails to integrate visually with the host dwelling, appearing cramped and visually intrusive within the streetscene. It therefore conflicts with policies DEV19 i) ii) v) and GEN7 of the Arun District Local Plan.