DELEGATED APPLICATIONS

ASSESSMENT SHEET

APPLICATION NO./ ADDRESS: WB/11/0094/FULL 20 St Andrews Road Worthing

DATE OF SITE VISIT: 1 March 2011

NEIGHBOURS CHECKED: Y

ADDITIONAL NEIGHBOUR NOTIFICATIONS (LIST ADDRESSES): N

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS:

The application site comprises a detached two storey house with detached single garage to the rear. The site is located in a residential street, largely comprised of semi-detached and terraced houses albeit that the site and neighbouring number 18 to the south comprise detached dwellings.

PROPOSAL:

The application seeks full planning permission for the construction of a part two, part single storey rear extension. The submitted plans also indicate the erection of a replacement detached garage to the rear.

The extension would have dimensions of 5.2 metres in depth at single storey level, 2.8 metres in depth at first floor level and span the full rear of the house with a width of 6 metres. The single storey element tapers to a hipped roof with the first floor features a crown roof with a height of 5.7 metres.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY:

None relevant.

RELEVANT PLANNING POLICIES:

Saved Worthing Local Plan policies BE1, H16 and H18
Submission Core Strategy policy 16
PPS1: Delivering Sustainable Development

REPRESENTATIONS:

Two submissions were received in relation to Council's notification of the proposal which comment on the following matters:

- No details provided of the replacement garage and seek clarification that this would be similar to the existing garage,
- Concern regarding loss of trees, particularly a Rowan tree which is an important nesting site for birds.

RELEVANT CONSULTATION RESPONSES:

Council's Engineer comments that in the absence of any ground investigation and or drainage proposals, request that should approval be granted it be conditional such that no development commences until a scheme for the disposal of surface water has been approved.

PLANNING ASSESSMENT:

The application site is located within the built up area wherein there is no objection in principle to domestic extensions subject to them integrating satisfactorily with the existing building, not resulting in any detriment to neighbours amenity and achieving compliance with all other relevant policies.

In this instance the application proposes a substantial part two storey, part single storey rear extension projecting by approximately 5 metres to the rear of the existing house. The extension would span the full width of the house and features a crown roof over the first floor. The existing house comprises a simple and modestly proportioned building with the extension forming a substantial increase in terms of bulk and floor space.

Due to its size in relation to the existing house, including a lack of subordinacy and the use of a crown roof over the first floor, the extension is not considered to integrate satisfactorily with the existing building and would appear as a large and bulky addition. Although the extension would not be readily visible in the general streetscape, its greater depth would be apparent between neighbouring buildings and the crown roof apparent from neighbouring properties.

The extension is not considered to relate satisfactorily with the existing building in terms of its form and general level of integration and is recommended for refusal on this ground.

The site does feature a number of trees and the site is extensively overgrown. The loss of some of this vegetation is considered to be inevitable and indeed required as part of good management of the property. However, there are no mature specimens of note within the vicinity of the extension and no objections are raised to any tree loss.

The extension has a substantial depth and would present additional bulk to both neighbouring properties. To the north, number 22 St Andrews Road would view approximately 3 metres of walling for two storey height measured from the back wall of this neighbour. However the extension is set away from this neighbouring house by around 3 metres and this is considered to allow a sufficient gap such that the extension would not appear intrusive or overbearing.

Number 18 to the south comprises a much altered and extended dormer bungalow with a principal vantage towards the south and west. Although there is one bedroom window at ground floor level facing north at number 18, this at present only has aspect over the side facing wall of the existing house and the detached garage on the boundary. Given this existing situation and that the window faces north it is not considered that the extension would result in a loss of outlook. Indeed the

repositioning of the detached garage may result in an improvement due to its very close proximity on the boundary line.

The extension features no side facing windows above ground floor level which could allow any material increase in overlooking. A side facing ground floor window to the dining room would only have aspect towards established boundary fencing and landscaping and would not allow any greater overlooking towards neighbours.

Approximately three (3) parking spaces are available on the site in addition to the detached garage which may not be of sufficient size to accommodate a modern vehicle. In any case the garage is shown to be relocated to the rear of the house. Permission has not been sought for this element of the proposal, and indeed, subject to height control, permission may not be required by virtue of the General Permitted Development Order (as amended).

In other regards the development is not considered to warrant objection and is recommended for approval.

HUMAN RIGHTS:

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. It is accepted that the proposal, if approved, would have some impact on the neighbouring properties. However, it is considered that the level of development proposed would not cause undue harm in terms of additional noise, disturbance and loss of privacy and that, on balance, existing residential quality of life would not be adversely affected as a result of the proposal. Accordingly it is considered that it is acceptable with regard to Article 8 and Article 1.

RECOMMENDATION:

Refuse planning permission for the following reason:

The proposed development comprises a large, and bulky addition to the existing house which by reason of its depth, lack of subordinacy to the existing house and design featuring flat crown roof, ~~the extension~~ fails to integrate satisfactorily with the existing building. As a result the extension would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the existing building and the surrounding area. The proposal therefore fails to comply with the provisions of Saved Policies BE1 and H16 of the Worthing Local Plan, South East Plan Policy BE1 and Submission Core Strategy Policy 16.

REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION:

The proposal fails to accord with the relevant policies of the Development Plan.

Saved Worthing Local Plan Polices

BE1, H16 and H18

Submission Core Strategy

Policy 16

IS RECOMMENDATION CONTRARY TO LETTER(S) OF REPRESENTATION? N

DELEGATED

Case Officer sign .....Date 21/3/11

Authorising Officer sign .....Date 22/3/11