

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

REF NO: LU/121/21/HH

LOCATION: 17 Peregrine Road
Littlehampton
BN17 6DT

PROPOSAL: Erection of a new garage.

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION This application seeks to construct a garage at the front of the property.

RELEVANT SITE HISTORY

LU/351/20/HH	Erection of a new garage	Refused 16-02-21
--------------	--------------------------	---------------------

REPRESENTATIONS

No objection from Town Council.

Six letters of representation from nearby occupiers stating:

- The proposal is not in-keeping with the area and street scene by disrupting the character of the area through the front gardens. It affects the amount of light coming into number 19.
- The proposal fails to meet the principles outlined in the local plan.
- The size and scale of the proposal is unneighbourly.
- Concerns of the use of the garage, if it is used for commercial use sound would become an issue.

CONSULTATION RESPONSES RECEIVED:

None.

POLICY CONTEXT

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

PLANNING POLICY GUIDANCE:

NPPDG	National Design Guide
NPPF	National Planning Policy Framework
NPPG	National Planning Practice Guidance

CONCLUSIONS**PRINCIPLE**

In this case, the key policy is D DM1 of the Arun Local 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.

There are no policies in the Littlehampton Neighbourhood Plan that are relevant to this application.

DESIGN AND VISUAL AMENITY

The siting of the garage at the front of the property results in there being views of the garage to the street scene and wider area. The proposal is in the front garden of the dwelling and measures 9.94m in length, with a maximum height of 3.99m at the side (west) elevation. As such, the garage has as similar footprint to that of the host dwelling, however located towards the front of the site.

The garage has a significant harmful impact upon the character of the locality through the construction of an overly large and intrusive garage to the front garden of the property which doesn't fit in with the character of the area. The boundary foliage will screen some view of the garage, however at the side east and west, the roof length of 9.94m will still cause significantly harmful impacts to the neighbours.

It is noted that there is screening bordering the site in the form of foliage, however it is considered to not respond to the significant scale of the proposal. The application conflicts with policy D DM1 of the Arun Local Plan, and J.01 of the Arun Design Guide which relates to the context of the area being taken into account to the design and identity of proposals.

NEIGHBOURING RESIDENTIAL AMENITY

The development is not considered to result in any significantly harmful overshadowing or overbearing impact upon neighbouring dwellings, although the loss of light to number 19 is significant. This is as a result of the siting of the development in the front garden of the dwelling. With regard to potential for loss of privacy to nearby occupiers, as a result of the single storey nature of the development, it is not considered to result in any views of which are not available from the site at present.

The proposed development is considered to be in accordance with D DM1(3) of the Arun Local Plan.

SUMMARY

The proposed development is considered to be in conflict with D DM1 of the Arun Local Plan, due its detrimental impact on the character of the area through the introduction of a garage completely at odds with its locality.

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

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 appearance of the building has a significantly harmful impact upon the character of the street scene, and the wider locality, due to its height, scale and siting. The proposal conflicts with Policy D DM1 of the Arun Local Plan and the Arun Design Guide.
- 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 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 meet with the Applicant to discuss the best course of action and is also willing to provide pre-application advice in respect of any future application for a revised development.