DELEGATED APPLICATIONS ASSESSMENT SHEET

APPLICATION NO./ADDRESS: WB/11/0073/FULL – 18 Sea Lane

DATE OF SITE VISIT: 09/03/11

NEIGHBOURS CHECKED: Y

ADDITIONAL NEIGHBOUR NOTIFICATIONS (LIST ADDRESSES): N

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS:

The site is on a tree lined residential dual carriageway near to the sea. It is characterised by detached two-storey domestic properties, some built in a Modernist style with green tiled roofs.

The application property is a modern two-storey property, built in the mid-1960s. It has a brown tiled roof and brown brick walls. The building has been extended at the back, via a single storey timber framed rear conservatory. This straddles the width of the building.

PROPOSAL:

The development sought for has been advertised as part two storey and part single storey rear extension

The proposal consists of:

- A gabled rear two-storey extension dropping to a flat roof single storey section to measure in its entirety (at max) approx; 7.5 metres in height, 10.3 metres in length, and 6.3 metres in depth

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY:

None

RELEVANT PLANNING POLICIES:

South East Plan
CC1, CC6, BE1

Worthing Core Strategy
16

Worthing Local Plan 2003
BE1, H16, H18

Government Advice
PPS1

REPRESENTATIONS AND RELEVANT CONSULTATION RESPONSES:

None

PLANNING ASSESSMENT:

Introduction

The principle planning concerns with this development is its impact visually and upon neighbours.

Visual

The new extension will replace an existing timber framed conservatory, which is of no intrinsic visual or design merit. The gabled form of the new extension does not relate particularly well to the pitch roof of host building but its scale is, at least, proportionally correct. Further the apex of the gable does not exceed the height of the existing pitched roof. Finally, the entire extension is hardly visible from public vantage point so the prevailing character and appearance of the street remains unaffected.

For these reasons, the justification to refuse permission on the basis of design alone cannot be substantiated.

Neighbors

The neighbours principally impacted upon are the ones adjoining the application property and those to the immediate other side (the extension is remote to the remainder).

Neighbour to south (No. 16)

This neighbour has several habitable room windows facing the application site, close to where the proposed extension would be built. A degree of impact upon the rooms these windows serve is inevitable.

Nonetheless, the rear extension drops to single storey with a flat roof toward the shared boundary with this neighbour. There is also some distance retained between its flank and the shared boundary. On this basis any resultant overbearing and overshadowing effect would not be of an unacceptable nature. The same argument applies to the neighbour's somewhat curtailed outlook.

The absence of windows/openings at first floor and above in the extension's flank negates the potential for direct loss of privacy. Views from the first floor windows in the rear face of the extension onto the neighbour would be oblique, and not be of an invasive nature.

A restriction on the use of the flat roof for recreational amenity purposes to avoid potentially unacceptable loss of privacy can be secured by condition.

Neighbour to north (No. 20)

The extension is two-storey in its height toward the shared boundary with this neighbour. But there is substantial distance between its flank and the neighbouring building (more than 3 metres). Such a distance is sufficient to avoid unduly adverse overbearing and overshadowing effect, with a good

extent outlook for the neighbour remaining unaffected. Further a garage building of considerable length exists along the shared boundary, so light and outlook to the ground floor windows of the building next door is already restricted.

The absence of windows/openings in the extension flank facing the neighbour ensures unacceptable overlooking is avoided. Any loss of privacy arising from the oblique views obtained from the first floor windows would not be invasive.

Conclusion

For the above reasons there is no unacceptable impact upon identified amenities.

RECOMMENDATION:

Approve subject to:

1. Standard time limit
2. Plans as approved
3. Materials and finishes to match existing
4. Notwithstanding "pd" windows/openings in flanks
5. Notwithstanding "pd" flat roof not used for amenity purposes

REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION:

The proposal complies with relevant Development Plan policies.

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 on balance, existing residential quality of life would not be significantly adversely affected as a result of the proposal. Accordingly it is considered that it is acceptable with regard to Article 8 and Article 1.

IS RECOMMENDATION CONTRARY TO LETTER (S) OF REPRESENTATION?

N/A

DELEGATED

Case Officer
Sign.....Date.....22/3/11.....

Authorising Officer
Sign.....Date.....22.3.11.....