

PLANNING APPLICATION REPORT**REF NO:** LU/397/10/**LOCATION:** 26A Eagles Chase
Littlehampton**PROPOSAL:** Proposed 2 storey side extension (resubmission of LU/347/10/)**SITE AND SURROUNDINGS**

DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION	The extension would measure approximately 3.1m in width x 4.1m in depth x 6.9m in height.
SITE AREA	Approximately 100 square metres.
RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT DEN	N/A
TOPOGRAPHY	Predominantly flat
TREES	None of any significance affected by the proposed development.
BOUNDARY TREATMENT	Open to front of the site. Hedging some 3-4m in height to southern boundary, rear enclosed by timber fencing approximately 1.8m in height.
SITE CHARACTERISTICS	End of terrace 2 storey dwelling. Red brick elevations, gable pantiled roof. Porch to south side elevation. Small amenity area to side and rear of dwelling. Dwelling was formed as an extension to the previously constructed terrace.
CHARACTER OF LOCALITY	Sited within a cul-de-sac, characterised by semi detached and terraced 2 storey residential dwellings. Private driveway to southern boundary leading to private parking area to rear of site. Railway track to north of terrace.

RELEVANT SITE HISTORY

LU/126/89	Conversion of existing garage into living room with new bedroom & en-suite shower room above	Approve Cond 08-05-1989
LU/473/89	Conversion of existing garage and previously approved first floor extension into one single bedroom starter unit with on-site parking.	Approve Cond 20-12-1989
LU/347/10/	Proposed two storey extension	Refused 20-12-2010

REPRESENTATIONS

Representations received:

Littlehampton Town Council

Objection;

- Overdevelopment and insufficient garden or amenity land remaining.
- Conflict with pattern of development
- Excessive bulk and scale
- Prejudices highway safety with children's play area nearby, extension would restrict drivers views emerging from parking area.

Comments on Representations received:

Comments on Town Council Response:

Comments are noted. The proposal is set back from the highway and therefore not considered to impact upon highway safety. Further the boundary adjoining this access road is formed by mature hedging some 3-4m in height which at present restricts the views of cars emerging from this area.

CONSULTATIONS

Consultations responses received:

None

Comments on Consultation responses:

None

POLICY CONTEXT

Designation applicable to site:

Within the Built-up area boundary

Permitted Development Restriction: Extensions

DEVELOPMENT PLAN POLICIES

Arun District Local Plan:

[GEN2](#)
[GEN7](#)
[DEV19](#)

Built-up Area Boundary
The Form of New Development
Extensions to existing residential buildings

PLANNING POLICY GUIDANCE

PPS1

Delivering Sustainable Development

POLICY COMMENTARY

PLANNING

The above policies combine to describe the criteria against which the application will be assessed particularly with regard to visual and residential amenity.

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

PLANNING

Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 states:-

"If regard is to be had to the development plan for the purpose of any determination to be made under the planning Acts the determination must be made in accordance with the plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise."

The proposal is considered to conflict with relevant Development Plan policies in that it would have a materially adverse effect on the visual amenities of the locality as well as having an adverse impact upon the established character of the surrounding area.

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 proposed application seeks permission for a 2 storey side extension to the existing dwelling. The dwelling was formed as an addition to No.26 Eagles Chase to which LU/473/89 refers. The application is the resubmission of a previously refused application for a 2 storey side extension.

The proposed 2 storey extension has been reduced in depth and width to the application previously refused (LU/347/10/) therefore reducing the amenity area lost from the extension. Nevertheless, the proposal still extends close to the southern boundary of the site which forms the majority of the private amenity area to this 1 bedroom dwelling. Although there would be amenity area maintained to the front of the site, this is not considered to private amenity space and its use as a private amenity area would be totally out of keeping with the general layout and appearance of the street scene.

Further, given that the amenity area of the existing dwelling is significantly reduced to that of neighbouring properties within the locality as considered previously any further reduction would be out of character with others within the locality. Whilst the proposal does attempt to overcome the loss of private amenity space maintained, the area to the rear of the property is still considered to be inadequate for its intended purpose, detrimental to the private amenity of current or future occupants.

The current application reduces the scale of the side extension with a notable reduction to its depth. This attempts to overcome previous concerns with the extension not appearing visually subservient as well as appearing as a cramped addition out character with the street scene. However the scale of the extension is still comparable to the width of the existing dwelling which does not appear visually subservient to the host dwelling, therefore the further addition would continue to alter the appearance of the dwelling with an extension that is out character with the general layout and appearance of the street scene as well as not appearing visually subservient to the host dwelling.

It is therefore recommended that the application be refused for the following reasons.

RECOMMENDATION

REFUSE

- 1 The site by virtue of its size and shape is considered unsuitable to accommodate the proposed extension together with private amenity space satisfactorily without demonstrably impacting upon the private amenity of the occupant and the layout of the street scene. The proposal would therefore result in a form of development which would be detrimental to the current and future occupants of the dwelling together with the

character and amenities of the surrounding residential area, contrary to policies GEN7 and DEV19 of the Arun District Local Plan.

- 2 The proposed side extension by way of its overall width and depth would significantly alter the appearance of the property forming an unsympathetic addition to an existing terrace which results in an extension that would not appear visually integrated or subservient to the existing dwelling and thereby would be detrimental to the appearance of the dwelling and the street scene. The proposal would therefore conflict with policies GEN7 and DEV19 of the Arun District Local Plan.