DELEGATED APPLICATIONS ASSESSMENT SHEET

APPLICATION NO./ADDRESS: 12 Hazelhurst Crescent WB/11/0118/FULL

DATE OF SITE VISIT: 15.3.11

NEIGHBOURS CHECKED: Y

ADDITIONAL NEIGHBOUR NOTIFICATIONS: N

PROPOSAL, SITE AND SURROUNDINGS:

The application relates to a detached bungalow, previously enlarged by a part-hipped rear gable roof extension, rear conservatory and part flat/part pitch-roofed front extension. The surrounding area is characterised by detached bungalows of a similar but not identical, style interspersed with some chalet-style dwellings.

Permission is sought for a front gable roof extension. It would be formed by enlarging the existing front gable feature and incorporating the area above the existing front extension. The new ridge would be marginally lower than the existing main roof ridge and off-set from the centre, retaining a narrow relic of the original hipped roof on the north side. The addition accommodation would consist of an additional bedroom and en-suite bathroom.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY:

WB/08/0619/FULL Conservatory at rear – approved July 2008.

WB/05/0309/FULL Roof extension to provide part hipped end to rear elevation – approved May 2005.

WB/06/1118/FULL Single-storey extension to front elevation – approved November 2006.

RELEVANT PLANNING POLICIES:

Saved Worthing Local Plan 2003 – BE1, H16, H18 SPG 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings'

Submission Core Strategy – Policy 16

South East Plan – CC1, CC6, BE1

REPRESENTATIONS AND RELEVANT CONSULTATION RESPONSES:

The resident to the north (No.14) has confirmed they have no objection to the proposals.

PLANNING ASSESSMENT:

The proposal, which involves upgrading part of the existing housing stock, can be supported in principle. The relevant considerations are the design of the proposed extension, its effect on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling, and the on wider area, together with the effects on the living conditions of adjoining residential occupiers.

The existing part flat/part-pitched roof front extension appears as a minor subordinate feature and the original hipped roof remains the dominant form in views from the street. [Although the existing bungalow has been enlarged by a rear part-hipped roof gable, this is barely perceptible in views from the street.] The bungalow is one of several on this side of the road which are similar in appearance, their hipped roofs and front-projecting gable features – whilst not identical – nevertheless create a rhythm within the street and are unifying elements. This rhythm would be interrupted by the 'bulk' of the proposed front gable extension which would introduce a more prominent roof form. However, there are chalet style dwellings within the immediate vicinity, so it would be difficult to argue that a gable form would be a wholly discordant feature within the context of this locality. Moreover, a visual remnant of the original hip would be retained on the north side, and the retention of the existing hipped roof over the front bay window would maintain an element of visual harmony. On balance, given the diversity of dwelling types in the immediate vicinity, it is considered that the refusal on grounds that the proposed gable would unacceptably detract from the visual cohesion of the surrounding area would be difficult to justify.

The additional bulk of the proposed front gable would have some limited impact on the windows in the flank of the adjoining bungalow to the north, No.14. However, it is noted that the 2 no. most affected windows are obscurely glazed and it is considered the resulting loss of light and outlook would not be significant.

RECOMMENDATION: APPROVE subject to:-

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of 3 years) from the date of this permission.

   Reason: To comply with Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans except as where specified in any other condition attached to this permission:- 17.2010/01, 17.2010/02, 17.2010/03 17.2010/04, 17.2010/05,

   Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

3. The external materials and finishes of the development hereby permitted shall, prior to commencement of use of the additional accommodation thereby created, be completed to match in design,

colour, bond and texture those of the existing building unless otherwise approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity and to comply with saved Policy BE1 of the Worthing Local Plan.

4. The rooflight windows in the side roof slopes hereby permitted shall be obscure glazed and non-opening (except that part which is above 1.7 metres above the floor of the room in which the rooflight window is installed) and shall not subsequently be altered in any way without the prior consent of the local planning authority in an application on that behalf.

Reason: To prevent overlooking and to comply with saved Policy H18 of the Worthing Local Plan.

REASON FOR APPROVAL

Having regard to the variety of form in the immediate vicinity of the site, it is considered the proposed development which retains a visual relic of the original hipped roof would not detract from the local environment and can take place without resulting in unacceptable detriment to the amenities of neighbouring properties. It would consequently not conflict with the policies of the 'saved' Worthing Local Plan (BE1, H16, H18), the South East Plan (CC1, CC6, BE1) and Submission Core Strategy (16).

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?

No

DELEGATED

Case Officer [redacted]
Sign.....[redacted].....Date.....12·4·11.....

Authorising Officer [redacted]
Sign.....[redacted].....Date.....12 4 11.....