DELEGATED APPLICATIONS ASSESSMENT SHEET

APPLICATION NO./ADDRESS: WB/11/0260/FULL – 64 Sullington Gardens

DATE OF SITE VISIT: 27/05/11

NEIGHBOURS CHECKED: Y

ADDITIONAL NEIGHBOUR NOTIFICATIONS (LIST ADDRESSES): N

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS:

The site is within an outer residential suburb of Worthing. There is a reasonable gradient on the land. The majority of the properties in the street are bungalows, although there are some with upper floor accommodation and a few one-and-half storey properties.

The application property has a quite individual design being one-and-half storey with low eaves at the front, the level of which rises at the rear. There is also a cat slide roof on its north side. It is prominent as it sits somewhat elevated from the street. There is a gradient to the site which falls in a west-to-east direction so the rear garden is terraced.

The neighbour to the north is an atypical bungalow with low eaves. It has a number of windows in its flank which face the application site, including a kitchen. The roof slope is unadorned. The shared boundary consists of a mix of staggered close boarded fencing and brick wall at a height of some 2 metres.

The neighbour to the south is an atypical bungalow with low eaves. It has been extended in the past via a single storey flat roof rear extension. A single storey flat roof garage extension sits between the main bungalow and the shared boundary. At least two windows on this property face the shared boundary. The closest serves a bedroom facing out into the garden. A high-level window serving as a secondary light source to the living room faces onto the shared boundary.

PROPOSAL:

The development sought for has been advertised as two-storey extension to east elevation with 3 no. dormers to first floor and extend existing roof line to north wall of property. Garage and utility room extension to south elevation and conversion of existing garage into habitable room. Conservatory to east elevation and internal alterations (Resubmission of WB/10/0602/FULL)

The proposal consists of:

- L-shaped extension two-storey at side dropping to single storey at the rear to measure (at maximum) some 7 metres in height; 12.4 metres in length; 11.5 metres in length

- Single storey hipped roof rear conservatory to measure (at maximum) some 3.1 metres in height; 4.5 metres in depth; 3.2 metres in width

- Raising of height of existing flat roof side garage with false front pitch to measure (at maximum) some 1.8 metres in height; 6.4 metres in length; 2.6 metres in width

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY:

10/0602/FULL
Single storey extension to east elevation with 3 no. dormers to first floor and extend existing roof line to north wall of property. Garage and utility room extension to south elevation and conversion of existing garage into habitable room. Conservatory to east elevation and internal alterations
Withdrawn 22-09-2010

RELEVANT PLANNING POLICIES:

South East Plan
CC1, CC6, BE1

Worthing Core Strategy
16

Worthing Local Plan 2003
H16, H18

Government Advice
PPS1

REPRESENTATIONS AND RELEVANT CONSULTATION RESPONSES:

Borough Environmental Health requests precautionary contaminated land condition be imposed

Objection received from occupiers of No. 66 Sullington Gardens, content summarised below:

- *Two-storey extension to east elevation will extend beyond rear of my property reducing amount of light to one bedroom window. Some loss of light to extension window on south side*

- *Addition of third dormer is nearer to boundary of my property and will overlook areas of my garden and window on south side resulting in some loss of privacy*

- *Overall extension is substantial; ridge will extend by double the current width toward my boundary and two storey elevation will dominate and overshadow my property. Out of keeping in the area as the majority of extensions are single storey*

No response received on neighbour re-consultation re: amended drawings

PLANNING ASSESSMENT:

Introduction

This application follows a previous proposal that was withdrawn on the basis of concerns raised by planning officers on its impact upon neighbours and visually.

Like previously the principle planning concerns with this development is its impact visually and upon neighbours.

Although Environmental Health have requested a precautionary contaminated land condition but the site is not identified at risk. Therefore the applicant would be made sufficiently aware by way of informative.

Visual

When viewed from the street the building resembles a one-and-half storey property with low eaves. The present oddly "lob-sided" building form would be lost. But this is to be replaced by a sympathetic and balanced roof shape without creating an overtly top heavy character. Such a roof design is evident at No. 66 Sullington Gardens, two properties to the north.

The suggested conversion of the garage to habitable space is done sympathetically, with the extended front dormer also well proportioned and positioned in the larger roof space. The fenestration closely resembles the style of the original house.

Therefore with regard to these alterations, the revised building design would fit comfortably within the context of the surrounding street scene.

The garage extension is less successful as the new roof sits uncomfortably atop the present garage building. This part of the scheme is set some distance from the road. However the site is elevated so it would be a noticeable additional element in the wider street. As its design is less than satisfactory it appropriate to condition this detail for further negotiation to secure a good standard of design.

Neighbours

It is the neighbours to either side of the application site who would be principally affected (the development is removed from the remainder, including the neighbour to the rear with some 40 metres distance retained).

Neighbour to north

The development would impact upon this neighbour substantially. The presence of the two-storey extension would overbear and cast shadow onto the neighbouring building, in particular its bedroom window which faces out into the garden. There would also be a material loss of privacy onto the neighbour's garden.

Nonetheless, the L-shaped extension drops to single storey beyond the rear face of the original building. This reduces the amount of development along the shared boundary. And the affected bedroom window is some distance from this boundary (it sits beyond the neighbour's own garage). This distance

is sufficient to ensure very likely compliance with relevant BRE light standards (although this has not been demonstrated).

Such circumstance ensures that although loss of light and overshadowing arises it would not be materially harmful. The same principle applies to overbearing and loss of outlook, which would not be so unacceptable as to materially harm the neighbour's amenities. The conservatory is light weight and single storey in its design so its impact would not be unduly harmful.

The new first floor side window is obscured and top hung so overlooking from it would not be invasive. The new first floor rear window would create some additional overlooking. But this would be directed onto to the end of the neighbour's garden, away from the neighbouring building itself. Overtly invasive views into the patio area directly off from the rear face of the property would be largely avoided.

Neighbour to south

The garage extension would reduce light entering the flank windows of this neighbour, one of which is a kitchen, and would also curtail outlook and overbear somewhat.

However, the outlook from the kitchen is already restricted by the existing boundary brick wall. The light it receives is similarly reduced.

The garage extension is positioned some distance away from the kitchen window, and is flat roof in its design. Potential overbearing and overshadowing would not therefore be unacceptable.

There are no windows in the extension flank. The new first floor side window is obscure glazed and top hung so negating future direct overlooking. Overlooking from the new first floor rear window would be of oblique onto the neighbour, and so not intrusive.

Conclusion

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

RECOMMENDATION:

Approve subject to:-

1. Standard time limit
2. Plans as approved
3. External materials and finishes to match existing
4. Notwithstanding drawings garage roof be subject to further negotiation
5. No windows in side elevations of development without prior permission
6. First floor windows in side elevations be obscure glazed and top hung

+Precautionary contaminated land informative

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?

Yes

DELEGATED

Case Officer
Sign..... [redacted] .....Date.....8/7/11.....

Authorising Officer
Sign..... [redacted] .....Date.....11/7/11.....

13.7.11