

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

REF NO: P/100/19/HH

LOCATION: 9 Kings Drive
Pagham
PO21 4PY

PROPOSAL: Rear extension and conversion of roofspace to habitable use to include a side dormer and conversion of roof from hip to gable end, and alterations to front bay windows.

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION The application seeks to construct a rear extension, conversion of roofspace to habitable accommodation with the addition of a dormer and a hip to gable addition. The ridge height will also slightly increase.

REPRESENTATIONS

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED:

Pagham Parish Council
Pagham Parish Council
No objection

5 objections from 4 nearby neighbours.

- The extension will mean an a 6m increase, gable extension and higher roof line will dominate the sky line.
- Large and overbearing compared to other properties.
- Floor to ceiling window will allow direct overlooking, removing all privacy.
- Predominately detached bungalows, the proposal would result in a two story house.
- Not in keeping with the buildings in the street.
- The large dormer will overlook our residence and is overbearing.

CONSULTATION RESPONSES RECEIVED:

None

POLICY CONTEXT

Designation applicable to site:
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
SDSP2	SD SP2 Built-up Area Boundary

PLANNING POLICY GUIDANCE:

NPPF	National Planning Policy Framework
NPPG	National Planning Practice Guidance

CONCLUSIONS

PRINCIPLE

The key policies considered are D DM1 and D DM4 of the Arun Local Plan. Pagham does not have a Neighbourhood Plan.

DESIGN AND VISUAL AMENITY

The development seeks various alterations to the property which will largely alter the appearance of the dwelling and will be highly visible from street scene and wider area.

The existing dwelling is a bungalow with a hipped roof. This is similar to that of the surrounding area which consists of properties largely comparable in design and size.

The proposal seeks to create a hip to gable roof to the front elevation. A first floor is also proposed which would result in an increase to the ridge height of the dwelling by approximately 0.5m. A large window is to be installed to the front resulting in the appearance of a two storey dwelling. There is however a similar example at No.26 which consist of a first floor window, giving a similar design appearance as proposed.

Due to the scale of the changes which would largely alter the appearance of the dwelling and increase the ridge height, the development is not considered subservient to the host dwelling and is in conflict with DDM4 (b) of the Arun Local Plan.

A dormer is also proposed to the southern elevation. This is large in size and with no similar examples within the vicinity, appears as an unduly dominant feature on the roof slope. The proposed dormer resultant of its scale, will add significant bulk, to the roof of the dwelling and as a result of the largely uniform character, the addition is considered to appear as an alien feature within the street scene. The dormer is considered to have a significant impact upon the appearance of the host dwelling within the street scene, resulting in a property out of keeping with the remainder of the street which are largely uniform in design and size.

A rear extension is also proposed with a depth of 6m. This appears well integrated and due to its siting at the rear, with no viewpoints from the street scene is considered acceptable.

The proposed development specifically the proposed dormer is considered to have a detrimentally harmful impact upon the character of the locality and the spatial pattern of the area, with no similar examples and a predominately uniform character, in conflict with D DM1(1) and D DM4(a) and (e) of the Arun Local Plan.

RESIDENTIAL AMENITY

There is a conservatory to the rear and this will be removed to allow for an extension. This will have a depth of 6m. The ridge of the roof will be extended and therefore will have a height of 6.15m and eaves to 2.75m. This adds bulk to the rear of the dwelling. However, both neighbouring properties extend

further west than the host dwelling and as a result the extension meets in line with the rear of both neighbouring properties. As a result, it is not considered to appear adversely overbearing or overshadowing upon neighbouring amenity.

The dormer will be situated to the southern elevation and will run along the side elevation with a width of 8.55m, height of 2.45m and a depth of 3.5m. With separation small at 1.15m it may give rise to slight overbearing upon the neighbouring occupier at No.7 however this is not considered significant.

There will a number of windows to the dormer serving bathrooms and a bedroom. However due to the No.7 being single storey, it is not considered these would give rise to adverse overlooking.

A rear window to the gable end at first floor level will be installed. Whilst this would introduce additional overlooking, however due to its siting which is set in line with the rear of neighbouring properties, it is not deemed to give rise to adverse overlooking with views over gardens but none into direct neighbouring windows. The large glazed window to the front elevation will have views over the street scene.

Due to the siting and design of the proposal, it is not considered to result in harm upon neighbouring amenity by way of overbearing, overshadowing or overlooking and accord with D DM1 and D DM4 (c) of the Arun Local Plan.

SUMMARY

The proposed development is deemed to be in conflict with relevant development plan policies and as such is recommended for refusal.

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 inclusion of the large dormer results in a form of development, by virtue of its size and siting which will be unduly dominant and an incongruous feature, out of keeping with the street scene and as such would have an unacceptable impact on the established character and appearance of the locality, in conflict with policies D DM1 and D DM4 of the Arun Local Plan.
- 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 discussing those with the Applicant. However, the issues are so fundamental to the proposal that it has not been possible to negotiate a satisfactory way forward and due to the harm which has been clearly identified within the reason(s) for the refusal, approval has not been possible.