

PLANNING APPLICATION REPORT

REF NO: P/47/11/

LOCATION: 52 East Front Road
Pagham

PROPOSAL: Single storey extensions

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION	Extension and alterations to the existing dwelling to include a single storey addition to the east and north of the existing building, together with a single storey extension to the south and timber decking and access steps. The front and side extensions would measure (at maximum) approximately; 4.2m in height, 12.7m in length, and 5.2m in width which includes boat and bicycle storage below in the form of a basement. The extension to the south would measure approximately 2.2m in depth x 4.7m in width x 3.2m in height.
SITE AREA	Approximately 452 square metres
RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT DEN	N/A
TOPOGRAPHY	Raised foreshore, stepped downwards to rear garden so majority of site below sea level
TREES	None of any significance affected by the proposed development.
BOUNDARY TREATMENT	Picket fence and hedging to front boundary. Walls of outbuildings form part of side boundaries but largely undefined. Retaining wall to southern boundary.
SITE CHARACTERISTICS	Detached property with white walls and felt tiled roof. White plastic windows, UPVC. Timber and UPVC doors. Various single storey outbuildings in garden, which are built up to side boundary.
CHARACTER OF LOCALITY	Residential seaside estate. Properties set in linear fashion to road frontage. Foreshore to the south of the site and scrub land to north.

RELEVANT SITE HISTORY

P/62/96	Ground floor extension at rear	Approve Cond 01-11-1996
---------	--------------------------------	----------------------------

P/99/08/

Alteration and extension to single storey
residential property incorporating existing
railway carriages

Approve Cond

17-09-2008

REPRESENTATIONS

Representations received:

Pagham Parish Council

Pagham Parish Council:

Members felt this proposal warranted particular scrutiny as it purported to set a precedent for two storey development in respect of which there has been consistent adopted policy constraint since 1975.

Representations from the public have also highlighted the out of character, intrusive and prejudicial nature of recent applications such as this which seek to establish maximum footprint and bulk with little regard to EA recommendations for drainage in a 3a flood zone. Members agreed with these representations that this proposal was dominant and overbearing to adjacent dwellings.

The prospect of engineering a very large excavation in order to accommodate a proposed underground room was viewed as particularly contentious from the point of potential extreme prejudice to dwellings adjacent where existing foundations systems would be put at risk of shingle subsidence and consequential collapse.

Members felt that the following policy needed to be considered:

Local Plan Policy Gen 7 iv)adverse impact upon adjoining occupiers.

2 letters of objection:

- To close to the 100% timber railway carriage building of No.54 East Front Road.
- Loss of sunshine to west side of No.54 and increase fire risk.
- Reduction to distance between 52 and 54 to 1600mm will to close for privacy and comfort.
- Concerns with regards to subsidence from excavation and damage to neighbouring path with the removal of the boundary wall.
- No other properties have boat stores, believe the reason for the room is for overflow habitable accommodation.
- Extension makes a 2 storey extension, unacceptable in the local area plan and considerable bulky.
- Loss of view from 54 to the west.
- Overall footprint would exceed the 40% allowance of coverage set out within guidelines.
- Boiler emissions will be discharged close to neighbouring windows.
- No approach in terms of Party Wall legal matter.
- Application disregards policies GEN7 and AREA1 of the ADLP.
- Design and Access Statement inaccurate and the site does adjoin The Dell.
- Development should have regard to the SSSI.
- Simplistic and uninteresting building without architectural merit.
- Extension shows a substantial and overbearing bulk within the street scene and should be reduced in scale, otherwise forming an unwanted precedent.
- Officer requested to considered previous decision of P/111/05.
- Roof lights would create an unwanted precedent and also contrary to LP policies.
- Floor level of the basement significantly lower, verging on dangerous.
- Drop down windows directly onto the foreshore would also seem to be impractical in such an

exposed location.

-Disabled access is inadequate.

-If approved, informative should be attached restricting any storage of building materials within the SSS1's.

Comments on Representations received:

Comments on Parish Council Response:

The comments raised by the Parish Council are noted.

Comments on Letters of Objection:

Comments are noted.

The issue raised with regards to the Party Wall Act is a private issue between the relevant parties.

CONSULTATIONS

Engineers (Coastal Protection)

Environment Agency

Consultations responses received:

None

Comments on Consultation responses:

None

POLICY CONTEXT

Designation applicable to site:

Within built up area boundary

Within an Area of Special Character

Private Street

DEVELOPMENT PLAN POLICIES

Arun District Local Plan:

[GEN2](#)

[GEN7](#)

[DEV19](#)

[AREA1](#)

Built-up Area Boundary

The Form of New Development

Extensions to existing residential buildings

Areas of Special Character

PLANNING POLICY GUIDANCE

PPS1

PPS25

Delivering Sustainable Development

Development and Flood Risk

SUPPLEMENTARY POLICY GUIDANCE

PDS

Pagham Parish Council's Village Design Statement by PaghamPC

POLICY COMMENTARY

The above policies combine to describe the criteria against which the application will be assessed particularly with regard to visual and residential amenity, within the Area of Special Character, or flood risk.

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

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 and residential amenities of the locality within the Area of Special Character, or its character.

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

PRINCIPLE

The site is located within the built-up area of Pagham Beach Estate which is an area of Special Character, noted for the distinctive scale and height of the residential buildings, the layout of the estate and the form and spacing of the buildings. The estate displays a mixed quality of design standard between the newer, permanent residential properties and the original holiday chalets and railway carriages, the latter being considered in this case.

Planning permission has been granted for the alteration and extension of this dwelling under P/99/08/ for a similar footprint, so the principle of development of an extension of this footprint has been accepted.

RESIDENTIAL AMENITY

With regard to residential amenity, it is recognised the side extension would abut a site boundary, and that, because of the provision of a basement store below the extension will be of a greater height than it would be otherwise. This creates a potential for a greater degree of overshadowing onto the neighbouring property to the east.

Although the side extension does remain single storey in height and appearance, with the roof angled away from the north boundary, the proposed additions would be significantly greater in height to existing building as well as the approved scheme (P/99/08). The addition would have an overall height of 4.3m which extends along the eastern boundary for some 12.7m. The overall depth of the addition coupled with its height, projecting some 1.6-1.8m above the outbuildings within the front garden area of 54 East Front Road is considered to have a detrimental affect upon the neighbouring property by way of an overbearing affect and loss of light. In terms of residential amenity the proposed addition is therefore considered to be unacceptable.

VISUAL AMENITY

With regard to visual amenity, the proposal is also considered to be unacceptable. The previous planning approval with the increase in height of the host dwelling, meant that the extension appeared visually subservient with the ridge height set well below that of the host dwelling. The proposed addition is considered to conflict with this. Its height, scale and depth is considered to compete with that of the host dwelling with only a height of 200mm the difference between ridge height of the host dwelling and that of the extension. As such it is not considered to appear visually subservient or integrated with the host dwelling and therefore conflicts with the requirements of policy DEV19 of the Local Plan.

The application also proposes 6No. roof lights with the eastern roof slope of the extension. The site is located within the Pagham Area of Special Character in which development within roof slopes is not encouraged. The amount of roof lights proposed mean that they would appear as prominent feature when approaching the site from the east. These would appear out of character and in conflict with the objectives of the designated Area of Special Character. It is also considered that the introduction of roof lights across the width of the eastern roof slope would set an unwanted precedent for unsympathetic roof lights within the street scene and emphasise the unacceptable scale of the extension. Furthermore it is considered contrary to the character and development criteria set out in the Pagham Village Design Statement in relation to preserving the character of the area.

FLOOD RISK

The side and rear extensions that are proposed, will be raised to ensure finished floor levels are such to assist in reducing the future risk of the property being undulated in a flood event. The proposal therefore accords with PPS25 by avoiding the exacerbation of flood risk.

SUMMARY

The proposed height, scale and appearance of the proposed extension fails to integrate and appear subservient to the host dwelling detrimental to both the character and appearance of the host dwelling and locality. The height and depth of the extension would also have a detrimental impact upon the residential amenity currently enjoyed by at the neighbouring site, 54 East Front Road as the addition would be significantly higher than neighbouring outbuildings.

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

RECOMMENDATION

REFUSE

- 1 The extension by reason of its height and depth competes with the scale of the host dwelling, therefore failing the requirements of Local Plan for extensions to appear visually integrated and subservient to the host dwelling. The addition is therefore detrimental to the appearance of the host dwelling as well as the visual amenities of the area which is defined as an Area of Special Character. The development would therefore be contrary to policies GEN7 DEV19 and AREA1 of the Arun District Local Plan.
- 2 The Arun Local Plan identifies the application site as being within the Pagham Beach Estate Area of Special Character. Proposed developments in such an area should respect the special characteristics of the area and those characteristics are outlined in the Areas of Special Character Supplementary Planning Document. The proposal fails to respect these special characteristics with the introduction of 6No. roof lights within the eastern roof slope of the front extension which has an extensive footprint dominating the front part of the site. The proposals are therefore contrary to policies AREA1 DEV19 and GEN7 of the Arun Local Plan.
- 3 The extension, by reason of height and length, would be detrimental to the residential amenities of occupiers of 54 East Front Road because of the loss of light and overbearing effect. The development would be contrary to policies GEN7 and DEV19 of the Arun District Local Plan.