DELEGATED APPLICATIONS ASSESSMENT SHEET

APPLICATION NO./ADDRESS: WB/11/0242/FULL – 31 West Avenue

DATE OF SITE VISIT: 23/05/11

NEIGHBOURS CHECKED: Y

ADDITIONAL NEIGHBOUR NOTIFICATIONS (LIST ADDRESSES): N

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS:

The site is on a quiet residential street, the immediate section of which is characterised by large detached two-storey domestic properties set back from the street.

The application property is a substantial two storey building with pebble dash rendered walls painted white. It has Mock Tudor finishes to it. The garage to its side has been extended in the past and is now a large building in its own right abutting the shared boundary.

The neighbour to the south is a single dwelling. It has a window serving a kitchen that faces onto the shared boundary with the application site.

PROPOSAL:

The development sought for has been advertised as proposed extension to rear of existing garage

The proposal consists of:

- Single storey flat roof rear extension to existing garage measure (at max) approx; 2.55 metres in height, 6.32 metres in width, 4.42 metres in depth

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY:

11/0008/FULL
Proposed extension to rear of existing garage
Withdrawn 01-03-2011

RELEVANT PLANNING POLICIES:

South East Plan
CC1, CC6, BE1, NRM4

Worthing Core Strategy
15, 16

Worthing Local Plan 2003
H16, H18

Government Advice

PPS1, PPS25

REPRESENTATIONS AND RELEVANT CONSULTATION RESPONSES:

Borough Environmental Health response:

Add precautionary condition (contaminated land) as extension of vulnerable use

PLANNING ASSESSMENT:

Introduction

This application follows on from an earlier application, which was withdrawn (WB/11/0008/FULL) following advice from planning officers over the adverse neighbour impact that would have arisen.

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

The site is not identified as one at risk from contamination, so an informative is sufficient is make the applicant aware of potential contamination.

Visual

The extension's design matches the rudimentary design of the existing garage. The development would be hardly visible from public vantage point, so the character and appearance of the street remains unaffected.

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 one to the south No. 29 West Avenue (the extension is remote from the remainder).

The new extension would bring built form closer to the shared boundary with this neighbour. Some reduced outlook and sense of encroachment, together with a degree of overshadowing, would occur to the neighbour's kitchen window.

However the submitted plans demonstrate using industry recognised guidelines that the loss of light to occur would fall within accepted tolerance. Also because the extension stops short of the neighbour's window outlook from it would not be unduly curtailed. So the severity of any overbearing would not be unacceptable. The applicant has agreed to treat the south facing wall in smooth render painted white. This allows the neighbour's window to benefit from borrowed light.

The absence of windows in the development's flank negates direct overlooking with views arising from its rear windows oblique in nature. Therefore intrusive loss of privacy would not occur.

Flood Risk

To reduce the opportunity for exacerbation of flood risk the applicant has agreed to build the extension with a floor level no lower than that of the existing floor level of the garage, and that any electrical power points and switching will be set at points above flood level.

Such measures would be sufficient to ensure human health is not put at any greater risk than at present.

Conclusion

For the above reasons the proposal would not have an unacceptable impact. Therefore the application should be approved.

RECOMMENDATION:

Approve subject to:-

1. Standard time limit
2. Plans as approved
3. Materials and finishes to match existing
4. South elevation to be finished in smooth render painted white
5. Notwithstanding "pd" no windows in ~~either~~ flank facing adjoining neighbour South elevation
6. Flood resistance measures as agreed to be implemented
7. Flat roof not used as balcony etc
8. Used as incidental to the main dwelling ~~must not be sold~~

+ 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

DELEGATED

Case Officer
Sign..... [redacted] .....Date.....23/9/11.....

Authorising Officer

Sign..... [redacted] .....Date.....27/6/11.....