DELEGATED APPLICATIONS ASSESSMENT SHEET

APPLICATION NO./ADDRESS:

WB/09/1070/FULL –

10 Latimer Road, Worthing

DATE OF SITE VISIT: 10.2..2009

NEIGHBOURS CHECKED: Y

ADDITIONAL NEIGHBOUR NOTIFICATIONS: N

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS:

The application property in is set in a post war residential suburb near the seafront in Goring. It comprises a detached chalet 1950s bungalow occupying a wide plot on the north side of Latimer Road opposite the junction with Anscombe Road which leads to the sea front. The property has a vehicular access on the western side of the frontage which leads to a detached pitched roof garage that is separated from the house by a distance of around 5 metres. The property features a plain tiled hipped roof with projecting front bay and hipped roof above and a small flat roofed front dormer . It also has a front porch and is faced in brick. The rear garden is shallow, if wide and bounded at the rear by a substantial wall

The surrounding properties are quite different in design and style but contain some strong common themes and generally cohere. The property fronting Latimer Road to the west is a detached two-storey house and to the east is a detached bungalow and beyond that a 3 storey block of flats. Both the immediate neighbours' facing flanks are blank. The bungalow contains rear facing rooflights serving a loft conversion and the adjacent house has rear facing first floor windows. The two corner properties opposite the application site are detached two-storey houses and to the rear of the application site there is a mix of bungalows (some with roof extensions) and two storey houses.

PROPOSAL:

Single storey rear extension and conversion of existing bungalow to a two storey house by way of first floor extensions, new roof, elevational alterations and balcony to first floor front elevation.

The application follows refusal (WB/09/0488/FULL refers) of an earlier proposal, similar in nature but refused on design grounds on 30.7.09 and subsequent pre-application negotiations.

The single storey extension is identical in scale, siting, and function. It is positioned towards the eastern end of the rear elevation and will provide a utility room and store/workshop. It will project 5 metres from the rear wall of the house and will have a width of 5.3 metres. A side space of 1.3 metres will be retained to the east side boundary and 1.9 metres to the rear boundary. The one difference is that it would have a false hipped roof with a large flat area in the centre, as opposed to the wholly hipped style in the previous application. The height of 2.75 metres to its eaves and 3.85 metres to its ridge remains the same. Two doors are proposed in the west elevation, one window in the east elevation, and no openings in the rear elevation.

The first floor extension will likewise create 2 additional bedrooms, a study, two bathrooms, and a landing area and will be achieved by building up vertically from the eaves. However, the roof form is distinctly different. The ridge has now been raised to 8.5 metres and a part gable part hipped projection introduced above the western front bay. The roof is splayed in period style with sprocketed rafters and oversails the eaves. A chimney has also been introduced on the eastern flank. The resulting dwelling would be two-storeys high, with an eaves height of 5.1 metres. The pitched roof above the front bay will be removed similar to the previous scheme and it is proposed to replace it with an 8.1 metre long balcony platform that will extend across and above the front porch and the front bay. The balcony will project 1.5 metres from the two-storey wall of the house and the balustrades will be stainless steel with clear glass infill panels. Access will be from French doors serving a first floor lounge. The flank elevations are blank, at first floor level, save the chimney and the brick and rendered bands and decorative diamond brick inset panel at first floor level. The porch would be reconfigured in period style and the rear first floor windows would serve principally bathrooms/WC , save one window out looking north from a bedroom.

It is proposed to finish the new and existing walls with a smooth white render and brick work with to use 'Decra' Lightweight roof tiles in a 'Mocha' colour (coated, zinc aluminium steel tile panels).and concrete plain tile hanging in the gable.

PLANNING HISTORY

The property was built in 1952-1953. There is no relevant planning history, apart from the refusal detailed above. .

RELEVANT PLANNING POLICIES:

The South East Plan 2009
CC6, BE1

Worthing Local Plan 2003
BE1, H16, H18

Government Guidance
PPS1, PPS3

REPRESENTATIONS AND RELEVANT CONSULTATION RESPONSES:

The Environmental Health Officer's comments are awaited but previously recommended that standard pre-cautionary condition on contamination.

Two local objections have been received from the occupiers of Nos 5 and . 9 Aglaia Road (to the rear) summarised in the following points:

- At least 3 of the proposed first floor windows will overlook their gardens and property as well as neighbours at No. 7. They are currently secluded and not overlooked.
- Also concerned about noise and disturbance as a result of building works.
- Loss of sea view.
- If the applicants wanted a house then they should have bought one , not a bungalow

PLANNING ASSESSMENT:

The relevant considerations are the design and appearance of the extensions in relation to the existing dwelling and the streetscene generally, and the effects on the residential amenities of the occupiers of neighbouring properties.

Impact on the amenity of occupiers of neighbouring residential properties

The increased height, length and 'bulk' of the extensions will have *some* additional impact on the outlook from the side and rear windows of No. 8 Latimer Road, located to the east of the application property. However, there is a good separation in excess of 3 metres between the two properties, and bearing in mind the orientation of the properties, the extension is not considered to have a significant impact on the light reaching No. 8, nor will it be unacceptably overbearing. The additional windows in the ground floor of the east elevation can be screened by boundary fencing or planting and are not considered to give rise to unacceptable levels of overlooking of No. 8 Latimer Road. As such it is considered that the extension will not have an unacceptable impact on the amenities of No. 8 Latimer Road.

The rear boundary of the site is well screened with a high concrete wall and there is a separation of around 25-30 metres that will help to alleviate any problems of overlooking of the bungalows in Aglaia Road that may be caused by the new first floor windows in the rear of the application property. It should also be borne in mind that the area exhibits a mix of bungalow and houses and flats where intervisibility at first floor into the rear gardens of nearby properties is a feature of the area and the rear gardens and rear windows of the bungalow in Aglaia Road are already visible for the first floor rear windows

of the house at no 12, the rear rooflights of No 8 and the upper floors of the flats at Walberton Court.

The proposed extensions will be sufficiently removed from No. 12 Latimer Road, and as such, it is considered that it will not create unacceptable levels of overlooking or overshadowing, nor will it be unacceptably overbearing.

The articulation the flanks as proposed with light render at first floor level and decorative features will avoid an oppressive outlook for neighbours.

Design and Impact on visual amenities of site and surroundings

The properties in the immediate surrounding area are a diverse though complimentary and generally coherent mix of flat blocks, two storey houses, and bungalows. In principle, it is considered that the conversion of this property from a bungalow to a two-storey dwelling would not be out of character with the surrounding area.

The previous proposal was, however, of a disappointing quality, showing a poor composition, appearing bulky and incongruous and failing to respond to positive aspects of local distinctiveness and also failing to take reasonable opportunities to improve the quality of the townscape. The features of particular concern were:

- the removal of the front bay and the hipped roof projection above the bay which currently helps balance the overall pleasing composition, adding variety to the wide front elevation.
- The loss of the bay roof at the front was considered to be a misconceived attempt to achieve symmetry and a suitable grandeur for this large double fronted home, but only served to highlight the imbalance in the building by drawing attention to the off-centre front entrance. The result was a bland and unresolved composition and boxy front elevation with an uninteresting first floor that was somewhat divorced from the ground floor due to its flatness and lack of detailing.
- The removal of the ground floor bay window on the west elevation of the house further disrupted its character and results in a large, austere and blank elevation with a box-like character that is highly visible in views along Latimer Road from the west.
- The shallow pitch of the proposed roof was considered to be out of scale with the building and out of character with the predominant style of roof in this area, most of which are steeply pitched with plain roof tiles. The shallow roof would have essentially acted as a small lid on a large rectangular building and would further accentuate its boxy appearance.
- The existing bungalow is of a different design to No. 8 Latimer Road, but nevertheless the two properties form a closely related pair of bungalows amongst two storey houses and they are both noticeably visible in the street scene and from vistas northwards from the sea front along Anscombe Road. Both these properties and the majority of surrounding properties have a traditional brick finish with plain roof tiles. The proposal involved smooth white rendering of the new and

existing walls of the building and a new shallow pitched roof with the alien non-traditional 'Decra' Lightweight metal roof sheets which appear to have been proposed because of the very shallow roof pitch. Whilst there is a lot of variety in the street scene, it was considered that the use of this unusual palette of materials and finishes in this form would be jarring and harmful to the local distinctiveness of the area and would be at odds with the traditional materials and mix predominantly utilised on this building and its immediate neighbours and would create a particularly disharmonious relationship with the remaining bungalow at No. 8.

Against this background the core of the current scheme has been negotiated. The raised roof lends the building more traditional and pleasing proportions whilst the hipped front projecting helps modulate the form and retains a traditional and balanced composition. The reconfigured porch fits in to the period design nearby and the balcony integrates well and is a feature of such sea view houses. The roof design with sprocketed rafters and oversailing eaves complete the pried sea font vernacular and the mix of render and brick work well in this context.

The minor areas of concern are, firstly, the form of the rear ground floor extension which is incongruous and unsympathetic and should revert to its previous hipped form and, secondly, the continued use of the incongruous, non traditional /non- vernacular Decra' Lightweight metal roof sheets. Plain tiles are more appropriate. These elements plus control over the architectural details of the roof, hips, eaves and soffits, balcony and openings and chimney may be secured by condition, as well as facing materials generally.

As such the application addresses the reason for the previous refusal and subject to the conditions set out below is acceptable..

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:

Granit planning permission subject to the following conditions:

1. 5 years time
2. No windows in first floor on west or east flanks or roof or ground floor extension on east elevation
3. The development shall not commence unless and until architectural details including roof, hips, eaves and soffits, balcony and openings

and chimney have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and the development shall not be built other than in full accordance with any such approval and shall be retained thereafter, notwithstanding the General Permitted Development Order 1995 as Amended Town and Country Planning Act 190 As Amended.

Reason: To ensure a good standard of appearance in accordance with Saved Worthing Local Plan BE1 and Planning Policy Statement:1 Delivering Sustainable Development.

4. Notwithstanding the submitted drawings the roof form of the ground floor rear extension and the use of Decra' Lightweight metal roof sheets on nay part of any roof or ground floor extension is not permitted. The development shall not commence unless and until details of an alternative roof form and roof material/design ~~have~~ and chimney have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and the development shall not be built other than in full accordance with any such approval and shall be retained thereafter.

Reason: To ensure a good standard of appearance in accordance with Saved Worthing Local Plan BE1 and Planning Policy Statement:1 Delivering Sustainable Development.

5. Approve samples of facing materials

REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION:

The proposed development would, by reason of its design, massing, scale, form and materials, achieves a good quality design which harmonises well with the character of the area and the would not unacceptably harm the amenities for neighbouring occupiers. As such, the proposal complies with Saved Worthing Local Plan Policies BE1 and H16, The South East Plan Policies CC6 and BE1, and National Policy PPS1.

IS RECOMMENDATION CONTRARY TO LETTER (S) OF REPRESENTATION?

Yes
DELEGATED

Case Officer
Sign.....Date.....

Authorising Officer
Sign.....Date 12.2.10