

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

REF NO: LU/166/21/HH

LOCATION: 3a Butts Mead
Littlehampton
BN17 6GP

PROPOSAL: Single storey rear extension & first floor extension over existing.

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION First floor extension above existing play room and utility area, with single storey extension measuring 3.1m in width by 1.7m in depth to the rear.

RELEVANT SITE HISTORY

LU/268/19/HH	Garage conversion to habitable area.	ApproveConditionally 18-10-19
LU/249/16/HH	White PVCu conservatory to rear	ApproveConditionally 04-10-16

REPRESENTATIONS

Littlehampton Town Council - No Objection
Network Rail - No Objection

CONSULTATIONS

CONSULTATION RESPONSES RECEIVED:

None

POLICY CONTEXT

Designation applicable to site:
BUAB
TPO

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)

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**

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.

Arun recently adopted a Design Guide which 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. In this instance, a side extension should also be subservient to the host dwelling and respect the space between buildings.

Littlehampton has a made neighbourhood plan however none of the policies are of relevance to this application.

DESIGN AND VISUAL AMENTIY

The proposal seeks to extended at first floor level above an existing single storey pitched roof protrusion and extend at ground floor level to the rear of this. The size of the extension is appropriate for its intended use and a suitable scale when compared with the host dwelling.

The extension will have the effect of closing the gap at first floor level between dwellings which will negatively impact the established special characteristics of the street. Arun Design Guidance states that to be acceptable first floor extension should be set back from the front of the dwelling by a minimum of 2m, be set back from the boundary by 1m and be 2m from neighbouring properties to ensure that a terracing effect is not produced. The extension will be set on the boundary and be less than 2 m away from the neighbouring property, it is set back from the host dwellings frontage however only by half of the recommend distance. This is repeated by D DM4 (d) of the Arun Local Plan which states extensions to first floors should be a minimum of 1m away from the boundary. It is therefore considered to conflict with design guidance and policy D DM4 as it is expected to produce the effect of terracing the buildings.

The eaves and ridge height of the extension considerably lower than those of the two-storey dwelling. The pitch matches that of the existing dwelling.

It is proposed that the extension be built from material which are not currently found on site, it is felt that

the choice of Pvc cladding does not sympathetically relate well to the host dwelling being traditionally built from brick.

The extension will be visible from the roadside as it is to be located directly above the previously converted garage. The street scene consists of uniformly design properties and through the choice of materials it is considered to be visually dominate on the host dwelling andnot sympathetically relate well to its surroundings.

Having regard to the design and visual amenity, the proposal is deemed to adversely impact the existing house in accordance with DDM1 and DDM4 (a) (d) of the Arun Local Plan and the Part M Arun Design Guide.

RESIDENTIAL AMENITY

In terms of the extension, it is not thought that this will be overbearing or overshadow the neighbours to the east. Although directly to the boundary there is an access path situated between the dwellings.

The bulk of the extension is adjacent to the neighbouring properties flank wall and therefore this will not impact views out of neighbouring properties or overshadow private amenity space. The rear extension is single storey only and be built with a flat roof to minimise any negative impacts on the neighbours.

Being a side extension the 45-degree rule is not applicable in this instance.

In terms of overlooking, all proposed fenestration will either face towards the front of rear gardens as per existing fenestration therefore no new view will be achievable which do not already exist.

It is therefore considered by virtue of being overbearing, overshadowing and overlooking that the proposed extensions accords with policy D DM4 of the Arun Local Plan and Part M of the Arun Design Guide.

SUMMARY

The proposed development is deemed to conflict with the relevant development policies and as such is recommended for refusal 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), 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.

CIL DETAILS

This application is CIL Liable therefore developer contributions towards infrastructure will be required (dependant on any exemptions or relief that may apply)

RECOMMENDATION

REFUSE

- 1 By reason of unacceptable levels of encroachment at first floor level relative to the spatial pattern of development in the area, the proposals will compromise the establish character of the area contrary to policy D DM4 (d)(e) of the Arun Local Plan and Part M of the Arun Design Guidance.
- 2 If you intend to submit an appeal that you would like examined by inquiry then you must notify the Local Planning Authority and Planning Inspectorate (inquiryappeals@planninginspectorate.gov.uk) at least 10 days before submitting the appeal. Further details are on GOV.UK.