DELEGATED APPLICATIONS ASSESSMENT SHEET

APPLICATION NO./ADDRESS: WB/10/0039/FULL – 87 Littlehampton Road

DATE OF SITE VISIT: 17/02/11

NEIGHBOURS CHECKED: Y

ADDITIONAL NEIGHBOUR NOTIFICATIONS (LIST ADDRESSES): N

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS:

The site is on a busy road carrying traffic west-to-east from the suburb of Durrington toward the Broadwater area of town.

The application property is a detached two-storey property with predominately cream rendered walls. It has been unsympathetically extended in the past via two prominent two-storey flat roof extensions off either side. The distinguishing character of the original building is the front gable and protruding bays.

PROPOSAL:

The development sought for has been advertised as single storey rear extension, two storey side extension and new pitched roof over existing extension

The proposal consists of:

- Single storey L-shaped (rear and side) false-pitched roof extension to measure (at max) approx; 3.3 metres in height, 10.6 metres in width, 6.1 metres in depth

- Two-storey side extension hipped roof with valley pitch behind, to measure (at max) approx; 6.5 metres in height, 3 metres in width, 3.4 metres in depth

- Parapet roof to existing flat roof extension to measure (at max) approx; 0.3 metres in height, 2.7 metres in width, 3.1 metres in length

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY:

None

RELEVANT PLANNING POLICIES:

South East Plan
CC1, CC6, BE1

Worthing Core Strategy
15, 16

Worthing Local Plan 2003

BE1, H16, H18

Government Advice
PPS1

REPRESENTATIONS AND RELEVANT CONSULTATION RESPONSES:

Borough Engineers comments in summary, that:-

Existing property falls just outside hatching on EA Areas Susceptible to Surface Water Flooding. Noted roof area is significantly increased and that application does not give any details of disposal of surface water, the garden both front and back is large and grassed and therefore can easily accommodate soakaways.

Request that should approval be granted it be conditional such that "no development approved by this permission shall commence until a scheme for the disposal of surface water in accordance with PPS25 has been approved by the Planning Authority. It would be necessary to undertake a soakage test in accordance with BRE 365

PLANNING ASSESSMENT:

Introduction

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

Visual

The new roof to the existing flat roof extension would improve upon the appearance of the existing property. Although this and the new two-storey extension would add considerable bulk and mass to the overall building, both elements would be successful in distinguishing the new extensions from the old so preserving the form of the original building.

The design of the single storey extension is sufficiently integrated to the main dwelling to avoid being of an offensive design. It is not visible to the public.

For these reasons, there is not sufficient justification to withhold permission on visual grounds alone.

Neighbours

The neighbour principally affected by the development is the neighbours to either side (the development is sufficiently removed from the remaining neighbours to avoid unacceptable impact arising onto them)

Neighbour to east

The proposal would bring built form closer to the shared boundary with this neighbour. This would inevitably reduce the amount of light entering the ground floor habitable rooms of this neighbour, which face into their garden.

However the new development replaces an existing flat roof extension that has been built off the present garage. This is some 2.2 metres deep and some 2.4 metres in height.

So the test is whether the additional reduction in light to the windows of the neighbour would be materially harmful compared to the present circumstance.

At the point closest to the shared boundary, the new development is single storey in its design and set off 750mm from the boundary with its roof hipped away from the boundary. Given this, the degree of overbearing and overshadowing over and above what is currently experienced would not be unacceptable in its nature. The same applies to the reduction in the neighbour's outlook which is already restricted by planting along the boundary. Loss of privacy is negated by the absence of windows/openings in the flank.

Neighbour to west

Turning to the rear addition for similar reasons already detailed with regard to the neighbour to the east, the impact arising onto the neighbour to the west would not be unacceptable (even more distance is retained between the extension flank and the shared boundary).

In relation to the two-storey element side extension, this would impact to a greater degree simply by reason of its scale. However along the stretch of boundary closest to the proposed two-storey element, the neighbour has erected a number of lean-to structures. These have reduced the amount of light entering any of the side windows facing the application site, and curtailed outlook from them.

So, again the test is whether the level of impact is materially unacceptable compared to the present situation.

The presence of those structures on the neighbour's side ensures the reduced outlook and additional overshadowing arising from the two-storey element would not be adverse, and that unacceptable overbearing effect is avoided. Subject to obscure glazing of the utility room and w.c. windows, the absence of first floor windows in the flank facing the neighbour is successful in avoiding material loss of privacy.

Flood risk

The building abuts an area designated at risk from surface water flooding. The proposal significantly increases the building's roof area. So it is necessary the development does not exacerbate the existing risk to human health from increased flooding.

To ensure this as no details of disposal of surface water are given, a condition is suggested to provide details that the proposed soakaways accord with BRE 365.

Conclusion

For the above reasons the proposal would not have an unacceptable impact upon identified amenities.

RECOMMENDATION:

Approve subject to:-

1. Standard time limit
2. Plans as approved
3. Materials and finishes to match existing (ase bonnet tiles on hips)
4. Notwithstanding "pd" no windows in flanks facing adjoining neighbours
5. Ground floor w.c. and utility room to be obscure glazed and top hung
6. Details of soak away to be agreed surface water drainage

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 ccnsidered 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.....21/3/11.....

Authorising Officer
Sign.....Date.....21·3·11.....