



**Horsham
District
Council**

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT REPORT

TO: Development Management Committee (South)

BY: Development Manager

DATE: 20 September 2016

DEVELOPMENT: Revised proposal for creation of disabled facilities including a 1.5 storey rear extension, single storey side extension and roof alterations to existing dormers following refusal of application DC/16/1171

SITE: Little Paddocks Crays Lane Thakeham Pulborough

WARD: Chanctonbury

APPLICATION: DC/16/1702

APPLICANT: Mr David Perry

REASON FOR INCLUSION ON THE AGENDA: More than 5 letters of representations have been received contrary to the Officer's recommendation.

RECOMMENDATION: To refuse 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 one and a half storey rear extension, which would project approximately 10.2m towards the rear boundary of the site, spanning 11.5m in width, comprising a half hipped roof with an eaves height of 5.2m and maximum ridge height of 7.3m, set some 1.2m below the ridge of the main roof of the dwelling. The rear addition would include a ground floor single-storey element, spanning the length of the proposed addition, a side hipped roof dormer, rear facing open hipped gable with floor to ceiling glazing, a large side facing open gable projection, and side dormer which would connect to the existing rear facing box dormer. The application also includes a hipped roof to the existing rear facing dormer window.

DESCRIPTION OF THE SITE

- 1.2 The application relates to a detached one and a half storey dwelling sited on the north-western side of Crays Lane, Thakeham. The dwelling is composed of a stone facing to the ground floor on all elevations and comprises a 8.6m high steep pitched roof with open side gables, with front and rear facing tile hung dormers, including a sun room to the north western elevation with balcony overhead, and a single storey rear utility and boot room addition. The site is raised above street level, behind heavy screening, and the land steeps sharply to the north-east beyond the rear garden curtilage of the site. The site is located

ITEM A10 - 2

outside of the built up area, and therefore within the countryside. The surrounding area is characterised by sporadic development, comprising detached dwellings of varying styles and ages.

2. INTRODUCTION

STATUTORY BACKGROUND

- 2.1 The Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

RELEVANT GOVERNMENT POLICY

- 2.2 National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012) Section 7
2.3 National Planning Policy Guidance (March 2014)

RELEVANT COUNCIL POLICY

- 2.4 The relevant policies of the Horsham District Planning Framework are considered to be policy 1, 2, 26, 28, and 33

RELEVANT NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

- 2.5 Thakeham Parish Neighbourhood Planning Document – Designated (Regulation 5 and 6)

PLANNING HISTORY

T/1/70	Residential bungalow Comment: Outline (From old Planning History)	PER
T/11/71	Erection of single detached dwellinghouse (use of existing bungalow (rowan cottage) to be discontinued) (From old Planning History)	PER
T/21/88	Removal of condition 3 on t/1/70 (requiring demolition of building) (see 1256/t/87 for history) (From old Planning History)	PER
T/29/68	New 14ft. vehicular access with sight lines and splays to serve land (use agricultural) (From old Planning History)	PER
T/44/70	Dwelling (use of existing bungalow (rowan cottage) to be discontinued) (From old Planning History)	PER
DC/12/0282	Retrospective permission for a field shelter	PER
DC/16/1171	Creation of disabled facilities including a 1.5 storey rear extension, single storey side extension and roof alterations to existing dormers	REF

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.

PUBLIC CONSULTATIONS

- 3.2 **Thakeham Parish Council** have expressed no objection to the proposal, and note that their position remains unchanged from the previous application, DC/16/1171, which acknowledged the size of the addition and was warranted by the disability of the needs that the proposal sought to address.
- 3.3 Six letters of representation (including one letter of support from the Applicant's Doctor) have been received supporting the application on the following grounds:
- Development would improve facilities available to allow comfort and care for the applicant
 - The development has no adverse affect on neighbouring or adjacent properties, or surrounding areas
 - The extent of the proposed development is in line with neighbouring development
 - The proposed addition is sympathetic and reasonable in scale

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 & appearance, and;
 - b) Impact on neighbouring amenity
- 6.2 In regards to design and appearance, 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. The policy continues to state that permission will be refused where a development may negatively impact on neighbouring amenity.
- 6.3 In regards to development within the countryside, Policy 28 of the Horsham District Planning Framework states that household extensions will be supported if the development can be appropriately accommodated within the curtilage of the existing dwelling, and should be in-keeping with the scale and character of the existing dwelling.

Design and Appearance

- 6.4 The proposed addition would comprise an overall maximum height of approximately 7.3m, which would be set some 1.2m below the ridge of the main roof of the dwelling. The proposed addition would consume an overall ground floor area of approximately 112m², compared to the dwelling's existing 151m² foot print (including the side sunroom and rear utility additions), resulting in a footprint increase of approximately 74%. Due to the increase

ITEM A10 - 4

in footprint, and dominating scale and bulk, the addition is not considered to display any level of subservience to the main dwelling. Ultimately, the addition is not considered to be viewed as a small element in relation to the main dwelling, and would appear unduly prominent in relation to the main dwelling, thus contrary Policy 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework.

- 6.5 It is acknowledged that the rear elevation of the dwelling is well screened from neighbouring and public view. However, this does not stand as sufficient justification to contradict the Council's policy on development principles. With this and the above in mind, the proposed addition is considered contrary to Policy 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework.
- 6.6 The proposed extension would provide wheelchair accessible living space at ground floor level, including a kitchen, therapy room, and WC, and an open plan bedroom area with lift access at first floor level. Policy 28 specifically states that extensions should not be disproportionate to the size of the existing dwelling, and should also in addition, be in keeping with the scale and character of the existing dwelling. Due to the dominating size and appearance of the proposed addition, the application is considered contrary to Policy 28.
- 6.7 The policy continues to state that extensions should be in keeping with the scale and character of the existing dwelling. Whilst the site does include a generous curtilage, given the size of the dwelling, the overall size of the addition is not considered in keeping with the scale and size of the existing dwelling. Further to this, the rear elevation of the addition would be built close to the rear boundary of the curtilage of the site, and is therefore not considered appropriately accommodated within the curtilage of the site.
- 6.8 Some level of subservience has been attempted, in that the ridge of the addition would be set 1.2m below that of the main roof. However, this attempt to display subservience is negated by the dominating size of the addition and the further variation of the roof form and pitches, especially to the north-western elevation. Further to this, the proposed appearance of the extension, mainly relating to the proposed dormers on the north western elevation, is not considered of an appropriate design to the site, given the existing variations in roof forms. Paragraph 60 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states policy should not impose architectural styles through unsubstantiated requirements to conform to certain development forms or styles. However, the NPPF states that it is proper to seek to promote or reinforce local distinctiveness. The resulting appearance is not considered to promote or reinforce the character of the dwelling, and would appear incongruous in relation to the main part of the dwelling and the wider surrounding area, and is thus considered contrary to the NPPF.

Impact on Amenity

- 6.9 Due to the sites location outside of the built area, to which the proposed addition would be sited facing away from any directly neighbouring dwellings, no impact by way over overlooking, overshadowing, or overbearing is foreseen.

Other Considerations

- 6.10 The Local Planning Authority has every sympathy with the applicant regarding the justification for the size of the addition. This includes incorporating wider hallways, larger separating room apertures, and a wheel chair lift, as the current living situation is not currently suitable for wheelchair access. Whilst the requirement for this level of accommodation is appreciated in order to enable this, the applicant's personal circumstance is not considered to overcome material planning considerations, or override the conflict identified within local planning policy. It should be noted that the Local Planning Authority does not object to the principle of a large rear extension, as the site could

ITEM A10 - 5

accommodate such an extension. However, an addition of this size is not considered an acceptable scale or design, to which the benefits to the personal circumstance would not outweigh the identified harm which would arise if planning permission were granted.

Conclusion

- 6.11 There is no objection in principle to an extension to the property, however, the proposed rear extension is considered a dominant and inappropriately scaled addition to the dwelling. Whilst the Local Planning Authority sympathises with the applicant with regards to the requirements for this level of accommodation, the applicant's personal circumstance is not considered to overcome material planning considerations, or override the conflict identified within local planning policy. The proposal is therefore considered contrary to policies 28 and 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework, and Paragraph 60 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

7. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 7.1 That the application is refused for the following reason:

The proposed rear extension, by virtue of its scale, massing, and design, would represent a dominant, and inappropriately scaled addition to the site, which would have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the dwelling within the wider surrounding area, and is therefore considered inappropriately designed and unsympathetic in character, contrary to Policies 28 and 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework, and Paragraph 60 of the National Planning Policy Framework

Background Papers: DC/16/1171