

Horsham PLANNING COMMITTEE Council REPORT

TO: Planning Committee South

BY: Development Manager

DATE: 20 June 2017

DEVELOPMENT: Erection of a single storey side extension and detached garage.

SITE: 8 Chestnut Way Henfield West Sussex BN5 9PA

WARD: Henfield

APPLICATION: DC/17/0665

APPLICANT: Mr Alan Murphy

REASON FOR INCLUSION ON THE AGENDA: More than 8 letters of representation have

been received contrary to the Officer's

recommendation.

RECOMMENDATION: To grant planning permission.

1. THE PURPOSE OF THIS REPORT

To consider the planning application.

DESCRIPTION OF THE APPLICATION

1.1 Planning permission is sought for the erection of a single-storey side extension which would project approximately 7.35m from the northern side elevation of the dwelling, spanning 9.5m in width, comprising pitched roof with an eaves height of 2.6m and a ridge height of 4.6m, set 0.5m below the main roof of the dwelling. The application also includes the erection of a replacement detached single garage sited 2.6m from the side elevation of the extension, spanning 3.6m in width, 6.4m in depth, and would include a pitched roof with an eaves height of 2.6m and a ridge height of 4.4m.

DESCRIPTION OF THE SITE

1.2 The application relates to a detached bungalow sited on the eastern side of Chestnut Way, Henfield. The dwelling is composed of a dark stock brick facing to all elevations, with a painted rendered northern and western elevation, including a front and rear facing projection with a gable end. The site also hosts an existing detached felt roofed single garage, and an existing rear conservatory. The surrounding area is suburban in character, located behind the main high street, made up of detached bungalows of a similar character and description, with some variation to the north and south of the street. The site is located wholly within the Henfield Conservation Area.

Contact Officer: Robert Hermitage Tel: 01403 215382

2. INTRODUCTION

STATUTORY BACKGROUND

2.1 The Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

RELEVANT PLANNING POLICIES

The following Policies are considered to be relevant to the assessment of this application:

2.2 National Planning Policy Framework:

NPPF7 - Requiring good design

NPPF12 - Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

2.3 Horsham District Planning Framework (HDPF 2015)

HDPF1 - Strategic Policy: Sustainable Development

HDPF33 - Development Principles

HDPF34 - Cultural and Heritage Assets

RELEVANT NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

2.2 Henfield Parish Neighbourhood Development Plan – Designated (Regulation 5 and 6)

PLANNING HISTORY AND RELEVANT APPLICATIONS

HF/17/63 Detached bungalow.

Comment: And b. regs. (From old Planning History) Application Permitted on 03.04.1963

3. OUTCOME OF CONSULTATIONS

3.1 Where consultation responses have been summarised, it should be noted that Officers have had consideration of the full comments received, which are available to view on the public file at www.horsham.gov.uk.

INTERNAL CONSULTATIONS

3.2 <u>Arboricultural Officer</u>: No objection, given the presence of existing built form and hardstanding on the site, the proposed development would not likely result in any additional harm to the trees over and above the existing arrangement.

OUTSIDE CONSULTATIONS

3.3 <u>West Sussex County Council – Highways</u>: No objection. While the layout of the garage and access could be improved the proposal would not be detrimental to highway safety or capacity.

PUBLIC CONSULTATIONS

- 3.4 <u>Henfield Parish Council</u>: Object, consider the proposal contrary to Policies 33 and 34 of the HDPF (2015).
- 3.5 Fourteen letters of representation have been received objecting to the proposal and subsequent revisions on the following grounds:
 - Inappropriate in scale for the size of plot
 - Unsympathetic design
 - Negative impact on streetscene

- Overdevelopment on site
- Will result in increased on street parking
- Loss of light to neighbouring window
- Danger to highway safety
- Insensitive design for Conservation Area
- Impact on trees

4. HOW THE PROPOSED COURSE OF ACTION WILL PROMOTE HUMAN RIGHTS

4.1 Article 8 (Right to respect of a Private and Family Life) and Article 1 of the First Protocol (Protection of Property) of the Human Rights Act 1998 are relevant to this application, Consideration of Human rights forms part of the planning assessment below.

5. HOW THE PROPOSAL WILL HELP TO REDUCE CRIME AND DISORDER

5.1 It is not considered that the development would be likely to have any significant impact on crime and disorder.

6. PLANNING ASSESSMENTS

- 6.1 It is considered that the principle issues in the determination of the application are:
 - a) Design and Appearance;
 - b) Impact on Conservation Area;
 - c) Impact on Neighbouring Amenity;
 - d) Highways, and:
 - e) Impact on Trees

Design and Appearance

- 6.2 Policy 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework states that developments should be required to ensure that the scale, massing and appearance of the development is of a high standard of design and layout and where relevant relates sympathetically with the built surroundings.
- 6.3 The proposed side extension would project 7.35m from the northern side elevation of the dwelling, spanning a similar width to the widest parts of the original part of the dwelling, incorporating gable ended projections to the front and rear to match the existing. The roof of the extension would match the appearance of the main roof of the dwelling, which would be set some 0.5m lower than the existing ridge. The extension would facilitate an additional bedroom with en-suite, a relocated kitchen area, and a utility room.
- The site benefits from a generous corner plot location, which extends to the north, adjoining the junction to Church Street. While the proposed extension is large it is considered that the size of the plot, and the siting and orientation of the dwelling within the plot, could accommodate an extension of this size. The roof of the extension would be set below the ridge of the main dwelling and this allows the addition to both reflect changing ground levels and read as a smaller element in relation to the main dwelling. This approach would reduce the impact of the additional width on the resulting building, which would not appear unsightly or overdeveloped.
- 6.5 The application also proposes to demolish the existing detached flat roofed garage to the north of the dwelling, and erect a replacement pitched roof detached garage in its place.

The proposed replacement garage would comprise a similar footprint to the existing, albeit slightly wider, and would utilise a roof form to closely match to the roof of the main dwelling. Detached flat roofed garages are a common feature on the street, and as such resisting the principle of the replacement garage would be difficult to justify. Considering the size of the site's plot, the cumulative visual impact of both the extension and the replacement garage would be appropriately accommodated, and sympathetically designed.

Overall, the proposed extension and replacement garage would be sympathetic to the design and appearance of the main dwelling and the prevailing character of the street. Whilst the extension is large, the size of the plot would adequately accommodate an extension of this proportion. As such, the proposed extension and replacement garage is therefore considered in accordance with Policy 33 of the HDPF.

Impact on Conservation Area

- 6.7 Policy 34 of the Horsham District Planning Framework states that the Council will sustain and enhance its historic environment through positive management of development affecting heritage assets, stating that development within a Conservation Area will only be permitted if the proposal would preserve or enhance the Conservation Area.
- The site is located wholly within the Henfield Conservation Area. Chestnut is a street composed of detached bungalows, with detached two-storey dwellings sited to the south on Chestnut End, with more traditional dwellings to the north on Church Street. The street comprises a relatively modern vernacular, in which the modest dwellings do little to harm the character of the Conservation Area, and neighbours a more traditional form of development to the north.
- 6.9 Whilst the proposed extension is large, the development would neither dominate the appearance of the dwelling, appear unduly prominent on the street, nor comprise an appearance out of context with the prevailing character of the area. It is considered that the development would have a neutral impact on the setting and character of the Conservation Area, as the design and size of the proposal would not adversely impact on the appearance of the surrounding character. As such, the proposal is considered to accord with Policy 34 of the HDPF.

Impact on Neighbouring Amenity

- 6.10 Policy 33 continues to state that permission will be refused where a development may negatively impact on neighbouring amenity.
- 6.11 The proposed side extension would project from the northern elevation of the dwelling, which would be sited some 10.2m from 6 Croft Villas to the east, and 21.1m from No. 2 Chestnut Way to the west. The site is bound by a 1.8m fence and 2m high hedge to the eastern boundary to Craggits Lane, which separates the site from Croft Villas.
- 6.12 Considering the single-storey nature of the development, coupled with the separation distances from neighbouring dwellings, retention of boundary screening to the rear-east of the site, the proposed side extension and replacement garage would not result in any adverse impact to the neighbours by way of loss of light or outlook. The proposal would not introduce any potential for overlooking of adjoining properties, with the resulting relationship comparable to that which already exists in this location. The proposed development is considered to accord with Policy 33 of the HDPF.

Highways

6.13 It is noted that neighbouring representations have been received raising concerns regarding the parking on and off the site, and access to the site from the street. The

existing drive would be extended approximately 2m to accommodate an additional parking space and the resulting arrangement is considered acceptable in principle. A condition is recommended to require further details in respect of tactile paving to either side of the access and for a minor revision to improve the southern side of the access. This approach would ensure the proposal is acceptable in highway safety terms, and accords with policy 40 of the HDPF.

Impact on Trees

6.14 Neighbouring and local concern has also been raised with regards to the impact on the trees to the rear of the site, which back on to Craggits Lane. Given the presence of existing built form and hardstanding on the site, the proposed development would not likely result in any additional harm to the trees over and above the existing arrangement.

7. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 7.1 That the application be approved, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1 Approved Plans
 - 2 **Standard Time Condition**: The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

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

3 **Regulatory Condition**: The materials and finishes of all new external walls, windows and roofs of the development hereby permitted shall match in type, colour and texture those of the existing building.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity and in accordance with Policy 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

4 Pre-Commencement Condition: Notwithstanding the submitted drawings, prior to the commencement of the development plans and details pertaining to the hereby approved access shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The details shall make provision for tactile paving at either side of the access, and, revisions to the southern side of the access to provide adequate access to the garage. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the agreed details.

Reason: In the interest of road safety, and in accordance with Policy 40 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

Background Papers: DC/17/0665