



**TO:** Planning Committee South

**BY:** Head of Development

**DATE:** 16<sup>th</sup> July 2019

**DEVELOPMENT:** Retrospective application for the erection of a two storey side extension and hip to gable roof extensions. Installation of two front pitched roof dormer windows, 1x front rooflight and 5x rear rooflights.

**SITE:** Little Stoke Sandgate Lane Storrington Pulborough West Sussex RH20 3HJ

**WARD:** Chantry (Historic Ward)

**APPLICATION:** DC/19/0417

**APPLICANT:** **Name:** Mr and Mrs Powell **Address:** Little Stoke, Sandgate Lane Storrington RH20 3HJ

**REASON FOR INCLUSION ON THE AGENDA:** At the discretion of the Head of Development

**RECOMMENDATION:** To approve planning permission subject to appropriate conditions

## 1. THE PURPOSE OF THIS REPORT

To consider the planning application.

### DESCRIPTION OF THE APPLICATION

- 1.1 Retrospective planning permission is sought for extensions that have been carried out at Little Stoke, a detached bungalow on Sandgate Lane in Storrington. Planning permission has previously been granted under application DC/18/0152 for an infill side extension, gable roof extensions, two front dormer windows and two front rooflights, and 4 rear rooflights.
- 1.2 The extensions as built largely follow this planning permission but differ from the approved plans in the following respects:
- The front dormer windows have a taller ridge line now level with the ridge to the main roof
  - The two front rooflights have been reduced to a single rooflight.
  - The four rear rooflights (conditioned to be obscure glazed and fixed shut) have been replaced with 5 clear glazed and openable rooflights set higher in the rear roof plane
  - Various alterations to original fenestrations have been undertaken throughout the ground floor to the property, including an additional north-west facing door and window at ground floor level within the infill extension.

### DESCRIPTION OF THE SITE

- 1.3 The application property is a detached single storey dwelling of mid-20<sup>th</sup> century design and construction. The property primarily comprises of white painted facing brickwork, plain

clay roof tiling in addition to dark uPVC windows/doors and retains some green painted crittall windows. The property has recently been extended/altered (as described above), and vertical tile hanging introduced to gable ends and vertical faces of dormer windows.

- 1.4 The application site is situated within the defined-built up area of Storrington, which passes near the application site to the south. Sandgate Lane benefits from a prevailing semi-suburban character as principally derived from the quantum of built development in combination with the extent of woodland and generously proportioned garden areas. In the immediate surrounds of Little Stoke uninterrupted Long views towards the north scarp of the South Downs ensure a more rural feel than would typically be expected of a cul-de-sac development such as this.
- 1.5 There is a notable gradient in the vicinity of Little Stoke, with land raising towards the north and east. As a consequence, adjacent dwellings to the north and north east are situated above the application site. The site is unaffected by any statutory landscape, environmental or heritage designation.

## **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:

#### **National Planning Policy Framework**

#### **Horsham District Planning Framework (HDPF 2015)**

Policy 25- Strategic Policy: The Natural Environment and Landscape Character

Policy 32- Strategic Policy: The Quality of New Development

Policy 33- Development Principles

#### **Storrington, Sullington & Washington Neighbourhood Plan 2018-2031**

- 2.2 The Storrington, Sullington & Washington Neighbourhood Plan (SSWNP) 2018-2031 was submitted for examination on 12.02.2018. In response to formal recommendations made by the examiner under Regulation 16 on 22.11.2018, alternative modifications were resolved to be undertaken on 06.02.2019 with a further period of consultation undertaken. In response to the modifications and consultations the Local Planning Authority has considered that the SSWNP satisfies basic conditions in accordance with regulations 17A and 18; therefore should proceed to referendum in due course.
- 2.3 Paragraph 216 of the NPPF (2018) confirms that an emerging plan can be assigned material weight following publication, subject to the stage of preparation and extent of unresolved objections against individual policies. Given the relative maturity of the SSWNP the relevant policies of the neighbourhood plan can be assigned significant weight in the determination of this application. The relevant policies of the Submission SSWNP are listed below:

Policy 14 – Design

### PLANNING HISTORY AND RELEVANT APPLICATIONS

DC/18/0152	Erection of a single storey side extension, two new gable roof ends and two front dormer windows to facilitate roof conversion. Erection of a new car port.	Application Permitted on 21.03.2018
SG/15/58	Bungalow and garage (From old Planning History)	Application Permitted on 03.09.1958

### **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](http://www.horsham.gov.uk)

Consultations:  
None

Parish Comments: Objection

3.2 The application is contrary to permissions previously granted under application DC/18/0152 constituting a clear breach of the conditions imposed.

Public Representations:

3.3 7 letters of objection were received in response to the proposal. The main material grounds for objection can be summarised as follows:-

- Loss of privacy arising from north-west facing rooflights
- Obscure glazing and non-opening conditions as required by condition 3 under DC/18/0152 considered necessary to ameliorate loss of privacy arising from north-west facing rooflights
- Inconsistent arrangement of fenestrations

### **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**

Main issues:

The main considerations material to this application relate to:

- The impact of the extensions and alterations on the character and appearance of the building and area
- The impact of the extensions and alterations on the privacy of neighbouring occupiers

Principle of Development

6.1 The application currently before the Council follows a previously permitted application (DC/18/0152) for additions of a similar nature, bulk, scale and design. Within this context it is considered that there has been no material change in circumstance and or policy that would warrant a reconsideration of the principle of development previously established, subject to all other material considerations.

### Character, Design and Appearance:

- 6.2 Policies 32 and 33 of the HDPF require development to be of a high standard of design and layout. Development proposals must be locally distinctive in character and respect the character of their respective surroundings. Where relevant, the scale, massing and appearance of development will be required to relate sympathetically with its built-surroundings, landscape, open spaces and to consider any impact on the skyline and important views.
- 6.3 Policy 14 of the Submission SSWNP provides that the scale, density, massing, height, landscape design, layout and materials of all development, including alterations to existing buildings, will be required to reflect the architectural and historic characteristics of surroundings buildings and landscapes.
- 6.4 The extensions and alterations to the application property are of a directly comparable nature to those previous considered acceptable under application DC/18/0152. The additional height to the front dormer windows and revised window and rooflight arrangement as constructed do not materially harm the appearance of the building or its wider setting, and consequently are considered to accord with the relevant design criteria of policies 32 and 33 of the HDPF and policy 14 of the Submission SSWNP.

### Amenity:

- 6.9 Policy 33 of the HDPF provides that development will be required to ensure a design that avoids unacceptable harm to the occupiers/users of nearby property and land with sufficient regard to the sensitivity of surrounding development.
- 6.10 The Council's House Extensions Design Guidance (Advice Leaflet No.1)(2008) advises that a minimum distance of 21m should be maintained between facing first floor rear windows of habitable rooms. Whilst it is acknowledged that this cannot be applied prescriptively, and any assessment must account for the specific characteristics of an application site, this represents an acceptable standard of mutual impact for the purposes of HDPF policy 33.
- 6.11 The impact of the extensions to the properties to the front/south at Tumby Woodside and to the side at Taqaph House remain as considered under the previous application, and no harm is identified.
- 6.12 The principal consideration is whether the five rear rooflights would have a harmful impact on the privacy of the adjacent properties to the rear/north, Little Downs, Springwood and Pine Rise, all of which sit on high ground level. In this respect it is noted that the previous planning permission required the four rear rooflights to be fixed shut and obscure glazed to reduce the perception of overlooking.
- 6.13 The application site, Little Stoke, is situated within a generously proportioned plot with notable separation maintained to neighbouring dwellings. Approximately 26m separates Little Stoke from Pine Rise, 66m to Little Downs, and 30m to Springwood. These separations far exceed the standard of separation advised by the Council's Design Guidance. Both Pine Rise and Little Downs also sit beyond the access road that serves them. A distance of approximately 6m separates Little Stoke from the closest common boundary with Springwood to the north east. These distances are sufficient to prevent the extensions resulting in any harmful overbearing impression or degree of overshadowing to neighbouring occupiers.
- 6.14 In respect of Little Downs it is considered that the intervening distance of 66m in combination with existing vegetation is sufficient to prevent any material loss of privacy

from the development. No vantage towards Pine Rise or its respective garden spaces to the north west could be identified from the rooflights due to the change in land levels and presence of intervening vegetation.

- 6.15 The greatest potential impact is on the privacy of Springwood, which is offset to the north east. The rooflights to the previous scheme were to serve a landing, stairwell and ensuite bathroom and set 1.05m above floor level. This would have resulted in direct eye line views towards Springwood, albeit at an angle. This impact necessitated the imposition of a condition requiring these rooflights to be obscure glazed and fixed shut.
- 6.16 The base of the north facing rooflights now installed is approximately 1.55m above floor level, with the rooflights now incorporating clear glazing and opening mechanisms. These rooflights now serve two bedrooms and two bathrooms. As was observed in person by the case officer, an outlook towards Springwood can be achieved if deliberately attempted, however this is not readily possible given the height of the rooflights above floor level and the angle of view towards Springwood. The view provided by these rooflights does not allow for a clear appreciation of neighbouring habitable rooms within Springwood, and only affords only a limited outlook over neighbouring garden spaces including that at Pine Rise. It was further noted that this was not a natural outlook given the height of the rooflights from floor level, the oblique relationship, and intervening distance. Consequently any direct overlooking must be deliberately attempted in a contrived manner to be achieved, and even then would not result in clear intrusive and harmful views into the neighbouring private property. This represents a clear difference and improvement in impact to the rooflight arrangement previously approved.
- 6.17 Whilst it is accepted that the very presence of rooflights is capable of creating a perception of overlooking, in this case the height of the rooflights in the roof slope and angle of the property from Springwood is such that this perception is not significant or sufficiently harmful to warrant the need to either refuse planning permission or condition the rooflights to be obscure glazed and fixed shut as before.
- 6.18 In this respect the comments of neighbouring occupiers requesting the incorporation of an appropriately worded condition requiring the use of obscure glazing and/or non-opening windows as before have been fully considered. Paragraph 55 of the NPPF *inter alia* provides that planning conditions must only be imposed where necessary and reasonable in all other respects. Given that no unacceptable harm is considered to arise from the rooflights, a condition restricting the composition of north facing rooflights is no longer deemed necessary in this instance.
- 6.19 On this basis the application is considered to accord with Policies 25, 32 and 33 of the HDPF and policy 14 of the Submission SSWNP, and is recommended for approval accordingly, subject to the conditions below.

## **7. RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 7.1 That planning permission be approved subject to the following condition.

### Conditions:

#### **1 Approved Plans List**

Background Papers: DC/18/0152  
DC/19/0417