

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

REF NO: R/31/22/HH

LOCATION: 15 Broadmark Way
Rustington
BN16 2EY

PROPOSAL: Single storey side/rear extension. Replacement roof with rooms in new roof space, 3 x front dormers and 1 x rear dormer. Demolition of existing front porch and rear conservatories.

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION	The application seeks to replace the existing hipped roof with a new dual pitched roof, incorporating the existing property and attached garage under the one structure. The new roof is to have three small pitched roof dormers to the front (north) elevation and one larger dormer to the rear elevation to create new first floor accommodation. It is also proposed to rebuild the existing garage and provide a new larger full width rear round floor extension in lieu of an existing sun room.
-----------------------------------	--

REPRESENTATIONS

Parish Council - No objection.

1 letter from neighbouring resident - Objection.

To develop the neighbouring bungalow into a massive 5 bedroom chalet could intrude into the air space and privacy if the roof was reconstructed to a height higher than currently exists. number 11 Broadmark Way has now been redeveloped into a house from a bungalow. Effectively the neighbour will now be surrounded on all four sides by a chalet bungalow and houses, whereas previously bungalows existed only either side.

In principle, do not object to an extension next door provided this does not in any way exceed the current bungalow height.

CONSULTATION RESPONSES RECEIVED:

None.

POLICY CONTEXT

Designation applicable to site:

Within built up area boundary

DEVELOPMENT PLAN POLICIES

[Arun Local Plan 2011 - 2031:](#)

DDM1	D DM1 Aspects of form and design quality
DSP1	D SP1 Design

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**

In this case, the key policies are deemed to be D DM1 and D DM4 of the Arun Local Plan. Additionally, Policy 2 of the Rustington Neighbourhood Development 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.

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.

Policy 2 of the Rustington Neighbourhood Development Plan states that development proposals will be supported providing that their scale, density, massing, height, landscape design, layout and materials reflect and enhance the established character of the area.

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, the front extensions should not disrupt building lines, maintain and enhance frontages, be subservient to the host dwelling and respect the space between buildings.

DESIGN AND VISUAL AMENITY

The dwelling is a detached chalet bungalow with a hip roof with smaller gable protrusions with an attached garage. The proposal is highly visible from the street scene.

The proposal seeks to reconstruct the roof with a first-floor extension above the dwelling to incorporate the space over the garage with a new dual pitched gabled ended roof. The proposed roof will be approx. 1.2m higher than the existing ridge line. It is also proposed to add 3 pitched roof dormers to the front of the property (each 2m wide) and a single larger dormer to the rear of the property (4.4m wide). The attached garage to the side will be rebuilt to the same width to the side of the property and to the rear, further to the removal of the sunroom a single storey rear extension will be built. The rear extension will feature 2 small gable ends facing the rear garden, which will include large amounts of glazing across the rear of the property including within the gable-ends themselves.

The existing bungalow does not feature a first floor and it is noted that to the southern side of Broadmark Way the properties are all bungalows or converted chalet bungalows. There are two prominent styles of

bungalow to this immediate location in Broadmark Way, all have similar ridge heights and/or massing on site and feature details such as subservient single storey front gable protrusions and front roof planes sloping backwards in the site. This affords the street a distinct character and appearance. Front dormers are found mainly to the eastern end of the street, however towards the western end due to the scale and design of the bungalows front pitched roof dormers are not evident. By reason that they are a subservient form of development, the front dormers inclusion within this proposal will not cause harm, so this on its own is not a reason to refuse the application. However, given the overall scale of the changes to the bulk of the roof, the alterations are not considered to appear subservient to the host dwelling in conflict with D DM4 (b), although are well integrated.

No. 11 Broadmark Way has developed their roof in a similar way however they have included only one small dormer to the front and have retained the essence of two hipped subservient extensions. As such the alterations to No 15's roof would result in a roof design that is not present in the vicinity and therefore would result in the dwelling appearing as an alien feature. As a result of the changes the development due to its scale and loss of key design features, will significantly alter the appearance of the dwelling in the street scene. The dwelling when viewed from the front would have the form of a much larger property than the two dwellings either side of it, appearing overly dominant and out of keeping in relation to the surrounding properties and locality.

The Arun Design guide states 'Extensions should respond to and complement the existing character and appearance of the building and wider townscape in terms of scale, massing, materials, openings and roof form. The proposal is not considered to comply with this as it does not respond to or complement the existing character, appearing out of keeping with the locality. 'The scale, massing and positioning of extensions should be visually subservient to the existing property'. Due to the scale of the changes proposed, the additions are not subservient.

The rear extension has a maximum depth of 3m and will run full width across the rear of the property. Given the single storey nature of the proposal, the replication of design features in the gables and its good visual integration the rear extension is subservient to the host dwelling.

The proposed roof changes will have a significant harmful impact to the appearance of the street scene and character of the area and result in a development which would not be subservient to the host dwelling in conflict with policies D DM1(1) and D DM4 (a),(b) and (e) of the Arun Local Plan and Section M of the Design Guide.

NEIGHBOURING RESIDENTIAL AMENITY

In terms of the rear extension, it will project backwards from the rear of the property but not increase the width of the property to either side retaining a minimum of 790mm and 1.75m to the side boundaries. A rear garden length equal to design guidance recommended levels will be retained. Immediately to the west the garage of No 17's sits abutting the shared boundary, the rear elevation and the habitable space of No 17 sits much further back into its plot as such the proposed development accords with the 60-degree rule for rear extensions, as it also does with No 13. Although it is proposed to increase the height of the bungalow this is not seen to give rise to negative impact from overbearing or overshadowing as the bulk of the additional height is not located near to the amenity space of either neighbour and therefore not considered to result in any harmful overbearing or overshadowing impact upon the occupiers of nearby dwellings.

New fenestration is proposed to the first floor and therefore new viewing points will be created, the windows will face towards the road (north) and have views to the rear garden of the property (south). Given the urban nature of the site and by reason that other properties have loft conversions with rear facing windows, the views obtained over the rear of the property will not negatively impact either neighbour to the east or west.

The proposed development is considered to be in accordance with policies D DM1(3) and D DM4(c) of the Arun Local Plan.

SUMMARY

The proposed development is in conflict with relevant development plan policies and as such is recommended for refusal for the following reason.

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) and Article 1 of the First Protocol (protection of property). It is not considered that the recommendation for refusal of permission in this case interferes unreasonably with any local residents' right to respect for their private and family life and home, except insofar as it is necessary to protect the rights and freedoms of others (in this case, the rights of the applicant). 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

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 development, by reason of its design and scale will have a significantly harmful impact on the appearance of both the host dwelling and the immediate locality in conflict with policies D SP1, D DM1 (1), D DM4 (a), (b), & (e) of the Arun Local Plan and Section M of 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.