

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

REF NO: R/91/25/HH

LOCATION: 19 Chaucer Avenue  
Rustington  
BN16 2PQ

PROPOSAL: Single-storey rear extension to replace existing extension, a single-storey side extension to create a new porch, and hip-to-gable conversion with a new rear dormer. New roof lights and roof lanterns. Pitch roof extended to front elevation.

<b>SITE AND SURROUNDINGS</b>
------------------------------

DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION	As above.
----------------------------	-----------

<b>RELEVANT SITE HISTORY</b>
------------------------------

R/116/20/CLP	Lawful development certificate for the re-siting and extension of existing garage	PP Not Required 04-09-20
--------------	---	-----------------------------

<b>REPRESENTATIONS</b>
------------------------

Rustington Parish Council - No objection.

No representations from nearby occupiers.

**CONSULTATION RESPONSES RECEIVED:**

None.

<b>POLICY CONTEXT</b>
-----------------------

Within an area with potentially high groundwater levels.

**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)

[Rustington Neighbourhood Plan 2014 Policy 2](#) Housing Design

**PLANNING POLICY GUIDANCE:**

NPPF	National Planning Policy Framework
------	------------------------------------

**SUPPLEMENTARY POLICY GUIDANCE:****CONCLUSIONS****DESIGN AND VISUAL AMENITY**

The site a semi-detached dwelling located along Chaucer Avenue. The proposed single storey side porch and the alterations to the front elevation would be visible from the street scene, however the rear extension would be obscured from the street scene by the existing built form.

The single storey side porch is proposed to the western flank of the host dwelling and is set back from the front elevation by 3.9m. The side extension would adjoin the rear extension. The extension would have a width of 1.1m and a depth of 3.7m, set in a minimum of 1.3m from the western side boundary. The extension would have a pitched roof form with a maximum height of 4.6m and an eaves height of 2.7m. Fenestration is proposed within the front and western flank elevations of the extension. By virtue of the size and siting of the proposal, the extension is minor in scale and would result in a visually subservient and integrated design. The extension can be seen from the wider street scene, but given its limited scale, the porch would not appear prominent, nor result in harm to the character or appearance of the host dwelling or street scene

According to the Arun Design Guide (ADG), side extensions should respond to building design in terms of roof pitch and use complementary and integrated materials and elevational design. The proposed extension would integrate well with the existing dwelling, with a pitched roof form reflecting the existing character of the host dwelling. Moreover, the extension would retain the character of the property by featuring similar materials to the existing roof of the dwelling and it would not appear out of place within its context. The extension would be set back from the front elevation of the host dwelling by 3.9m and would not appear unduly prominent within the street scene of Chaucer Avenue.

Following the demolition of the existing sun room and rear extension, a single storey rear extension is proposed. The extension would have a depth of 6m, extending from the main rear elevation of the host dwelling. The extension would have a width of approx. 6.5m. The extension would be large in terms of its size and scale however, given that the proposed rear extension would replace the existing sunroom and rear extension, and it would not be significantly deeper than the existing built form, it would not adversely affect the scale and massing of the building. The extension would have a flat roof with a height of 3.2m. The walls of the extension would feature grey render, the materials would not match the existing dwelling however, given that the works are not visible from the street scene, they are acceptable. Whilst not a subservient addition to the host dwelling, given the siting and limited visibility of the proposed extension, the extension would not result in harm to the character or appearance of the host dwelling, street scene or wider area.

The hip to gable roof extension is acceptable, and a similar extension could be achieved under permitted development. In any case, the extension respects the original roof ridge height and does not reduce the separation distance between the host dwelling and the neighbour to the west, the extension is therefore acceptable.

The proposed rear dormer would measure approx. 3.6m in depth, 6.9m in width and 2.7m in height. Two sets of windows are proposed within the rear elevation of the dormer. The walls of the dormer would feature tile hanging and a GRP flat roof. The windows are to be of uPVC. The development would alter the original character of the property, however the main roof ridge height is retained, and the development would not project beyond the original footprint of the property which helps to minimise any

visual harm upon the locality, which complies with the Arun Design Guide (ADG). Furthermore, a dormer of a similar size and scale could be constructed under permitted development made from materials to match the host dwelling. Overall, the proposed works would alter the character of the property, however it is noted that the area features dwellings with a variety of dormers such that the proposed works would not appear out of character within the street scene. 3 No. rooflights are proposed to the front roof slope of the dwelling. The rooflights would be proportionate in scale and number, and would not result in any harm in this regard.

Overall, the proposed development would result in an increase to the footprint of the host dwelling. The alterations to the roof of the dwelling would alter the character of the dwelling in terms of its scale and massing, however the proposed roof extensions would extend over the existing built form and given the varied character of the street scene, the proposed development is acceptable. The proposal is therefore in accordance with policies D DM1 and D DM4 of the Arun Local Plan (ALP).

### RESIDENTIAL AMENITY

Part M of the ADG states householder extensions should protect neighbouring amenity in terms of privacy and overshadowing, considering the positioning of neighbouring buildings and respond to existing elevations through the size and positioning of doors and windows.

The proposed side porch would be small in scale, and it would be set in a minimum of 1.3m from the western side boundary. Given the size and scale of the porch, the porch would not result in overbearing or overshadowing impacts to neighbouring properties. The fenestration proposed along the front and side (west) elevations of the dwelling will have be at ground floor level with an outlook of the front/side garden amenity of the property and will not result in any overlooking impact.

The proposed hip to gable roof extension would increase the bulk and massing of the dwelling. Notwithstanding this, it is noted that the host dwelling is set in 1.36m from the western side boundary, and as such, given the spacing retained between the roof extension and the neighbour dwellings, the proposed roof extension would not result in overbearing or overshadowing impacts to the neighbour to the west.

The proposed rear dormer would be contained within the existing rear roof slope of the host dwelling, and would not result in overshadowing or overbearing impacts to neighbouring properties. Two windows are proposed at first floor level within the rear elevation of the dormer. The windows would have an outlook of the rear garden amenity and whilst some views of neighbouring gardens would be available from the windows within the dormer, these views would not be significantly different to those available from a dormer constructed under permitted development and are acceptable. The three rooflights proposed within the front roof slope are high level and would not lead to any overlooking impact.

Due to the scale and siting of the rear extension, there would be an intersection of neighbouring 60-degree sightlines and 45-degree light accessibility lines when taken from the neighbour to the east and west. Given the presence of the existing boundary fence, the proposed height of the rear extension and the spacing maintained between the extension and the eastern side boundary, the proposed rear extension would not result in demonstrable harm to the neighbour to the east by way of overbearing or overshadowing impacts. The proposed extension would be located 16m away from the rear boundary, and set in 2.1m from the eastern side boundary. The extension would be located 1.3m away from western side boundary. Given the spacing retained between the rear extension and the neighbour to the west, the extension would not result in overbearing or overshadowing impacts to the neighbour to the west.

The rear extension would feature fenestration along the rear, eastern and western flank elevations. The proposed fenestration would be located at ground floor level and would not result in any overlooking,

given the existing boundary treatment and spacing retained between the extension and neighbouring properties.

The proposal is in accordance with policies D DM1 and D DM4 of the Arun Local Plan in that it does not result in unduly harmful adverse overshadowing, overlooking or overbearing effects on neighbouring properties.

#### SUMMARY

The proposal is in accordance with relevant Development Plan policies and as such, is recommended for approval 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) and Article 1 of the First Protocol (protection of property). It is not considered that the recommendation for approval of the grant 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 approval 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 not CIL liable.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

#### APPROVE CONDITIONALLY

- 1 The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of 3 years from the date of this permission.

Reason: To comply with Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).

- 2 The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved drawings:

Existing Location & Site Plan 01.  
Proposed Site & Roof Plan 02.  
Existing and Proposed Ground Floor Plans 03.  
Existing and Proposed First Floor Plans 04.  
Proposed Elevations 06.  
Existing and Proposed Roof Plans 07.  
Proposed Block Plan 08.  
Biodiversity Enhancement Statement (received - 23-05-25).

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of amenity and the environment in accordance with Arun Local Plan policies D DM1 and D DM4.

- 3 Based on the information available, this permission is exempt from the requirement to provide a biodiversity gain plan under Paragraph 13 of Schedule 7A to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. The following exemption applies:

This planning permission is for development which is a householder application within the meaning of article 2(1) of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015.

Reason: In accordance with Schedule 7A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).

- 4 INFORMATIVE: Statement pursuant to Article 35 of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015 (as amended). The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by assessing the proposal against all material considerations, including planning policies and any representations that may have been received and subsequently determining to grant planning permission in accordance with the presumption in favour of sustainable development, as set out within the National Planning Policy Framework.