DELEGATED APPLICATIONS

ASSESSMENT SHEET

APPLICATION NO./ ADDRESS: WB/09/0097/FULL 31 Mayfield Close

DATE OF SITE VISIT: 3 July 2009

NEIGHBOURS CHECKED : Y

ADDITIONAL NEIGHBOUR NOTIFICATIONS (LIST ADDRESSES): N

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS:

The site comprises a two-storey detached house located on the east side of Mayfield Close, north of Hurston Close. This is a residential area, comprising of a mix of dwelling types. The neighbouring properties to the north are of identical design and present and even rhythm to the street frontage. To the south, the site is bounded by the extensive gardens associated with 'Highdown' which is located to the east.

The site is on a steep slope from the east sloping down to the street frontage.

There is a large Norway Maple in the front garden of the site which is protected by a Tree Preservation Order.

PROPOSAL:

The proposal is for the construction of a single storey side extension to the south elevation. Alterations are proposed to the garage to convert into living accommodation. No conditions were placed on the original planning permission (WB/1002/82) that would prevent the proposals from being carried out as permitted development and so these works are not included in the current application.

The side extension would measure approximately 3.8 metres in width from the side wall of the house and would start to wrap around the rear corner of the house, measuring 4.8 metres in width at the rear. The extension would be approximately 6 metres in length, set towards the rear of the side elevation and extending 3 metres beyond the existing rear wall. The extension would be positioned 600mm from the boundary to the south (enabled by the cutting back of the existing hedge). A hipped roof is proposed which would be set below the eaves level of the main roof.

Matching brickwork and tiles are proposed with timber weatherboarding to the upper sections.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY:

Planning permission was refused for a single storey side extension and single storey front extension earlier this year (WB/09/0097/FULL) for the following reasons:

Having regard to the regular form, rhythm and building line of the existing street scene, and the relative openness and prominent positioning of the site, the proposed extensions would, by virtue of their scale, height, design and unsympathetic siting in relation to the existing building represent an overbearing and incongruous form of development, detrimental to the recipient building and the street scene and would be harmful to neighbour amenities, notably in terms of the overbearing impact to the occupiers of No. 29 to the north. As such the proposal is contrary to Saved Policies BE1, H16, and H18 of the Worthing Local Plan 2003 and Saved Policies CH1 and DEV1 of the West Sussex Structure Plan 2001-2016.

RELEVANT PLANNING POLICIES:

Saved Worthing Local Plan policy BE1, H16 and H18
South East Plan 2009 policy CC6 and BE1

REPRESENTATIONS:

One letter of representation has been received raising concerns over the proximity of the extension to the boundary, the damage it may cause to the hedge and loss of property value.

RELEVANT CONSULTATION RESPONSES:

The **Assistant Director of Health and Housing** raises no objection subject to the following condition:

If during development, any visible contaminated or odorous material, (for example asbestos containing material, stained soil, petrol/diesel/solvent odour, underground tanks or associated pipework) not previously identified, is found to be present at the site, then no further development (unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority) shall be carried out until it has been investigated by the developer. The Local Planning Authority must be informed immediately of the nature and degree of the contamination present and a method statement detailing how the unsuspected contamination shall be dealt with must be prepared and submitted to the Local Planning Authority for approval in writing before being implemented.

PLANNING ASSESSMENT:

Any relevant issues raised in the representations have been taken into consideration throughout this assessment.

Due to its positioning on the building and the relationship with the neighbouring site to the south there would be no significant impact on the amenities of neighbouring occupiers in terms of loss of light, outlook or privacy.

Since the previous refusal, the scale of the extension has been reduced by reducing the bulk of the roof. With the ridge level set below the existing eaves, the design of the extension better relates to the scale of the recipient building, blending well with its design with the use of matching brickwork and roof tiles. Although the pruning of the hedge may make the extension more visible on the boundary, the extension would be sufficiently spaced from the boundary and at a scale that is considered appropriate.

The hipped roof form reflects the design of the front section of the main roof of the house and that of the garage.

As such the proposal is considered acceptable in design terms and would not be harmful to the visual amenities of the site or area in general.

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:

Grant permission subject to the following conditions:

- Standard time limit.
- Contamination precaution.
- Matching materials

REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION:

The proposal accords with the relevant policies of the Development Plan.

Saved Worthing Local Plan Polices

Policies BE1, H16 and H18

The South East Plan 2009

CC6 and BE1

National Policy

PPS1

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

DELEGATED

Case Officer sign [redacted] Date 15.7.09

Authorising Officer sign [redacted] Date 20.7.09