DELEGATED APPLICATIONS

ASSESSMENT SHEET

APPLICATION NO./ ADDRESS: WB/10/0908/FULL 1 Mendip Crescent

DATE OF SITE VISIT: 6 December 2010

NEIGHBOURS CHECKED : Y

ADDITIONAL NEIGHBOUR NOTIFICATIONS (LIST ADDRESSES): N

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS:

The application site comprises a two-storey terrace house located on the corner of Mendip Crescent and Mendip Road. It forms part of a carefully geometrically laid out estate of similar two-storey dwellings. There is an earlier row of purpose-built flats to the east. The site has a side garden to the north of the existing end of terrace house which has a maximum depth of 10 metres and a maximum length of 22 metres. The site is in the middle of a residential estate north of Salvington Road. Mendip Crescent slopes gently southwards.

PROPOSAL:

This is a revised application, following the dismissal of an appeal to infill with a new 2-bedroom house to the existing flank wall of No.1 Mendip Crescent forming a terrace of five houses.

The proposed house would be approximately 4.9 metres in width attached to the north elevation of the existing building and designed to generally match No.1 in terms of the roof form, front and rear fenestration and matching materials but with four additional windows to the north elevation.

The accommodation would comprise a small recessed porch, living/dining room, and kitchen on the ground floor with stairs leading to two bedrooms and a bathroom on the first floor, generally matching the layout of No.1.

The existing property would be left with a 7 metre deep rear garden and personal door to the garage with a car parking space retained in front for the existing house. A 4.3 metre deep rear garden and 5.8 metre wide side garden would be formed for the new dwelling to the west of the garage driveway. A shed, which could be used as a cycle store, is proposed within the rear garden of the new dwelling. The existing fencing is proposed to be retained.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY:

Planning permission was refused on 8 December 2009 for the construction of a 2 storey two bedroom dwelling on the north wall of the existing terrace of properties (WB/09/0935/FULL) and then for a revised 2 storey dwelling with hipped roof (WB/10/0132/FULL) for the following reasons:

Having regard to the existing building lines in Mendip Road, the carefully planned symmetrical form of Mendip Crescent with its spacious character and the general openness of the surrounding development, particularly in respect of the corner properties, the proposed dwelling would, by reason of its scale, position, design and roof form, be obtrusive in the streetscene and detrimental to the spacious corners of the estate. As such the proposal conflicts with Saved Policies BE1and H18 of the Worthing Local Plan 2003, Policies CC6 and BE1 of the South East Plan 2009, PPS1: Delivering Sustainable Development and PPS3: Housing.

At appeal the Inspector made the following comments:

'In my view the proposed house would not be unduly prominent in the street scene when passing along either of these 2 roads. The new house would project only slightly in front of a notional line drawn between the front corners of the buildings in Manor Road either side of the site...The ground level of the proposed dwelling is also noticeably lower than that of Manor Road, which would also reduce the visual impact of the building. The appeal site is already surrounded by a 1.8m high fence and thus does not contribute significantly to the openness of the area. There would remain an adequate garden at the side of the new house to avoid the building appearing cramped on the plot...

...In most respects, the design imitates the adjoining dwelling, but there are 2 main differences. Windows facing Mendip Road are proposed in the side of the new house, whereas there are no such windows in the side wall of No 1 or the side wall of other properties adjoining junctions. But I consider that the windows would add interest to what are otherwise rather stark, blank walls and would be an acceptable modest variation to the existing style of the estate.

The other main difference is the proposed fully hipped roof for the new house. The hipped roof would be a readily noticeable difference to the other end of the terrace. It would appear incongruous given that all the terraces forming part of this estate have gabled walls. It would make the new house stand out as a later addition to the terrace. I appreciate that the hipped roof has been proposed by the appellant in response to the Council's refusal of a similar proposal with a gabled wall. But the Council's concern appears to have been the principle of building on this plot rather than the design...I consider that this inappropriate aspect of the design would make the development harmful to the character and appearance of the area and would conflict with the aim of policy BE1 of the Worthing Local Plan 2003.'

No. 5 Mendip Crescent – Planning permission was granted in 2006 for the construction of a dwelling adjoining 5 Mendip Crescent (WB/06/0218/Full refers).

RELEVANT PLANNING POLICIES:

Saved Worthing Local Plan policy BE1, TR9, H16 and H18
South East plan policies CC1, CC6, H1, H5, T4, BE1 and BE2.
Submission Core Strategy Policy 7, 8, 16

REPRESENTATIONS & RELEVANT CONSULTATION RESPONSES :

The **Executive Head of Health, Housing and Community Safety** has raised no objection and required the following condition on the previous application which would be relevant in this case:

If during development, any visible contaminated or odorous material, (for example asbestos containing material, stained soil, petrol/diesel/solvent odour, underground tanks or associated pipework) not previously identified, is found to be present at the site, then no further development (unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority) shall be carried out until it has been investigated by the developer. The Local Planning Authority must be informed immediately of the nature and degree of the contamination present and a method statement detailing how the unsuspected contamination shall be dealt with must be prepared and submitted to the Local Planning Authority for approval in writing before being implemented.

The **Highway Authority** made the following comments:

I refer to your consultation in respect of the above planning application and would provide the following comments.

This proposal is comparable to the previous application at the site; no changes appear to be proposed therefore my previous comments from the 8th March 2010 would still stand.

Previous comments were as follows:

West Sussex County Council was consulted previously on Highway Matters for this location under planning application no. WB/935/09 to which no objections were raised.

The applicant should ensure they have adequate provision for bin storage. There do not appear to be any other alterations which would impact on the highway issues and therefore may I direct you to my previous comments.

Comments from the previous application 09/935 were as follows:

Access will be onto Mendip Road is via an existing access serving the existing property. The applicant intends to maintain the existing parking arrangements for the existing dwelling, with an additional space allocated to the proposed dwelling. This number would fall within the WSCC maximum parking standards. The applicant has indicated that cycle parking will be included this would appear to fall within the WSCC Minimum standards.

In terms of parking layout there is inadequate space to be able to provide a turning facility. This will inevitably result in vehicles reversing onto the public highway. However visibility along Mendip Road is acceptable, with other properties having similar arrangements and given the presumed low number of daily vehicular movements, I would not anticipate this proposal adversely affecting highway safety.

The **Council's Arboricultural Officer** made the following comments in relation to the previous application which are relevant to the current proposals:

The small tree within the existing garden appears to be a plum tree and is too small to support a TPO. There is however a good quality and prominent Hawthorn on the boundary which would be suitable for protection.

PLANNING ASSESSMENT:

The main issues raised by this proposal are: the principle of residential development; the impact on the amenity of neighbours and future occupiers; design and impact on the character of the surrounding area; and parking and access. These matters were considered in detail as part of the previous application and were assessed by the Inspector at appeal and in light of more recent changes to PPS3.

The Inspectors comments are included in the planning history section above and accept the principle and general form of development, highlighting that the reason for refusal in the Inspectors decision relates solely to the hipped roof being an inappropriate design and suggests that a matching roof form to replicate the features of the existing terrace would be appropriate.

The applicant has addressed this issue in the current application by reverting back to the original proposal for a gable to the north side which would match the roof form of the rest of the terrace and would not pose any significant threat to residential amenity. Therefore, in light of the Inspectors comments the proposal is considered acceptable subject to the conditions summarised below.

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 the level of development proposed would not cause undue harm in terms of additional noise, disturbance and loss of privacy and that, on balance, existing residential quality of life would not be adversely affected as a result of the proposal. Accordingly it is considered that it is acceptable with regard to Article 8 and Article 1.

RECOMMENDATION:

Grant planning permission subject to the following conditions:

1. Standard time limit
2. Drawing No's
3. Materials to be agreed
4. Landscaping including tree protection
5. Contamination precaution
6. Code level 3 certificate
7. Screen walls/fence details
8. Surface water drainage
9. Cycle parking facilities
10. Removal of PD rights for extensions, enlargements, buildings, or enclosures

REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION:

The proposed development is within the built-up area and would help meet the need for additional housing without detracting from the existing local urban environment. It can take place without resulting in unacceptable detriment to the amenities of neighbouring properties and without detraction from highway safety. It would consequently not conflict with the relevant 'saved' policies of the Worthing Local Plan (BE1, H18, TR9), the South East Plan (SP3, CC1, CC6, H1, H2,, H4, H5, T4, SCT5), and Submission Core Strategy (7, 8, 16).

The proposal accords with the relevant policies of the Development Plan.

Saved Worthing Local Plan Polices

Policy BE1, TR9, H16 and H18

South East Plan Policies

Policy CC1, CC6, H1, H5, T4, BE1 and BE2

Submission Core Strategy Policies

Policy 7, 8, 16

IS RECOMMENDATION CONTRARY TO LETTER(S) OF REPRESENTATION? N

DELEGATED

Case Officer sign..... [redacted] .....Date...13./12./10.....

Authorising Office sign..... [redacted] .....Date.....14·12·10.....