DELEGATED APPLICATIONS ASSESSMENT SHEET

APPLICATION NO./ADDRESS: WB/11/0201/FULL – 12 Shermanbury Road

DATE OF SITE VISIT: 18/05/11

NEIGHBOURS CHECKED: Y

ADDITIONAL NEIGHBOUR NOTIFICATIONS (LIST ADDRESSES): N

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS:

The application site is on a residential road predominately characterised by pairs of inter-war period two-storey domestic properties. There is regular spacing between buildings that provide a distinctive rhythm in the street.

The application property is one such building, being one of a pair. It is brick faced. The property has been extended in the past via a small single storey rear extension. There is also a freestanding single storey garage, which sits close to the main house, along the west boundary (shown to be demolished).

The neighbour to the west (No. 14) has itself been extended in the past via a flat roof single storey extension. There is a single ground floor window and door in its flank facing the application site. The window serves a kitchen, but it is a secondary light source. This room is dependant upon the larger expanse of rear facing glazing for the majority of its light.

The adjoining neighbour to the east (No. 10) has also been extended. This extension takes the form of a mono-pitched conservatory, single storey in height. This abuts the shared boundary with the application property. It is brick faced up to eaves height above which it is glazed.

PROPOSAL:

The development sought for has been advertised as proposed single storey side and rear extension

The proposal consists of:

- Single storey hipped to flat roofed L-shaped side and rear extension to measure (at max) approx; 3.2 metres in height, 11.2 metres in length, 8.8 metres in width

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY:

None

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 contamination condition be imposed.

One letter of objection received from occupier of No. 14 Shermanbury Road, content summarised below:-

- *Design, appearance and character not in keeping with style of houses*
- *Out of character with similar properties in the road. Largest of its kind*
- *Similar extensions have been refused*
- *No. 30 has similar but smaller side extension*
- *Consulted with residents of No. 28. They unhappy with extension as caused significant loss of light.*
- *Significant amount of light to be lost from our kitchen*
- *Would not give permission for adjoining wall between our property and No. 12 to be altered and for any aspect, such as guttering to overlap boundary*
- *Maintenance of extension would mean access to our property necessary, loss of privacy*
- *Significant noise and disturbance during building stages*

PLANNING ASSESSMENT:

Introduction

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

Construction noise and disturbance would not be of a scale to warrant the imposing of a planning condition restricting time of works. Sufficient control is available under Environmental Health legislation. Maintenance is not a material planning consideration.

Although Environmental Health has requested a precautionary contamination condition be imposed, the site is not identified as one at risk from contamination so an informative is sufficient to raise the applicant's awareness of the risk.

Visual

The development's design and style is similar to the interwar design of the host building so it is architecturally integrated.

It is recognised the 'gap' between the application property and the property to the west, No. 14, would be diminished by the presence of the extension.

Nonetheless it is substantially set back from the front face of the host dwelling. This reduces its visual prominence and ensures it would be 'read' quite separately to the building it is attached upon. Its scale is correctly proportionate to its function and relates satisfactory to the adjoining building.

Some proposals for single storey side extensions in the street have been declined on the basis of their own individual merits. But throughout the wider street there a number of examples of similar extensions that have been built out, including at Nos. 4, 6, 30, and 36. Many are more prominent visually than the current proposal. These have been integrated into the wider street scene without detrimentally changing its overall character and appearance. This would remain the case if the current proposal were built out.

All this ensures the development would not be obtrusive in the street, and not disrupt its established rhythm and pattern of buildings within it to any materially detrimental degree. The distinctively regular spacing between buildings in the street would still be distinguishable.

Neighbours

The neighbours principally affected is that one to either side (the extension is removed from the remainder with satisfactory distances to avoid undue overlooking).

Neighbour to west

The proposed extension abuts the shared boundary with this neighbour for some length. This would reduce some light and outlook to the kitchen window at the side. However this kitchen receives the majority of its light and outlook from its rear facing glazing, which remains unaffected by the development. Therefore the resultant overshadowing and loss of daylight and sunlight would be within acceptable tolerances.

Moreover, the extension is flat roof along the majority of this length. This reduces its physical presence, and allows for the retention of commensurate views outward from the kitchen. So any overbearing effect would not be unacceptable, and outlook not unduly curtailed.

No windows and/or glazing are proposed in the flank so direct overlooking is negated. The roof lanterns allow for only limited views upward onto the neighbour, so the opportunity for mutual overlooking would be diminished.

Neighbour to east

The proposed extension becomes flat roofed closest to the shared boundary with this neighbour. This allows for some light to still enter the glazed flank of the neighbour's conservatory. Some overshadowing and loss of outlook is inevitable.

However the conservatory obtains the majority of its light and outlook from its rear facing glazed roof and fenestration. These remain unaffected by the

proposal because the depth of the proposed extension is no greater than the adjoining conservatory. For this reason the effects of overbearing and overshadowing would not of an adverse nature, and potential overlooking is negated.

Conclusion

For the above reasons the proposal would not have an unacceptable impact upon identified amenities. Therefore, approval should not be resisted.

RECOMMENDATION:

Approve subject to:

1. Standard time limit
2. Plans as approved
3. Materials and finishes to match existing
4. Notwithstanding "pd" no windows/ openings in flanks
5. Flat roof not used for amenity purpose

+ Precautionary contamination 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?

~~N/A~~ Yes

DELEGATED

Case Officer
Sign..... [redacted] .....Date..... 8/06/11.....

Authorising Officer
Sign..... [redacted] .....Date..... 8 6 11.....