DELEGATED APPLICATIONS ASSESSMENT SHEET

APPLICATION NO./ADDRESS: 9 Cissbury Drive WB/11/0178/FULL

DATE OF SITE VISIT: 16.12.2010 (WB/10/0896/FULL)

NEIGHBOURS CHECKED: Y

ADDITIONAL NEIGHBOUR NOTIFICATIONS: N

PROPOSAL, SITE AND SURROUNDINGS:

The application property comprises a detached, 1930s-style house occupying a spacious plot on the west side of Cissbury Drive. It has been enlarged by an attached, flat-roofed garage/rear utility room which extends almost to the northern site boundary, and together with a flat-roofed entrance porch, projects forward of the main front elevation. The rear has been enlarged by a modest, single-storey extension attached to the north part of the rear elevation. The external finishes consist of smooth, white-painted render and a profile-tiled roof.

The surrounding area is suburban low density residential in character. The wider area is made up of a diverse range of dwelling types including a mix of houses and bungalows. However, the application property sits within a short row of similar detached 2-storey houses with attached garages, occupying similarly generous plots. The detailing and external finishes of the individual houses is varied, but all are characterised by a hipped roof with short east-west ridge and an overall sense of spaciousness between the dwellings, which lends a sense of visual cohesion to this part of the road. The building line on this side of Cissbury Drive is staggered to reflect a bend in the road, so that the front of the adjoining house to the north, No.11, is sited further to the east (forward) than the front of No.9, and No.9 sited further east (forward) than No.7. Ground levels slope down from east to west.

Permission is sought to erect a first-floor side extension (approximately 3.7m wide and 8.3m deep) and to infill the recessed area in-between the single-storey elements at the rear together with a new lean-to roof. The side extension would extend as far as the existing garage, almost to the northern site boundary. The front and rear walls of the first-floor extension would align with the front and rear walls of the main dwelling. It would have pitched roof around a new central area of flat roof extending north from the existing ridge. The proposals would provide study on the ground-floor with an additional bedroom and bathroom on the first-floor.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

Planning permission was refused in December 2010 (WB/10/0896/FULL) for a 2-storey side and rear extension on the following ground:-

"The proposed side extension, by reason of its size, scale, shape, design and massing would appear as an unduly dominant and unsympathetic form of

development that fails to achieve a satisfactory subordinate visual relationship to the existing dwelling and would detract from the visual coherence of surrounding built form and by infilling the space between the flank wall of the existing dwelling and the northern site boundary at 2-storeys would interrupt and detract from the distinctively spacious character of existing development. In addition, by reason of it orientation, depth, siting, height and massing, the proposed extension would have an unneighbourly overbearing and overshadowing impact on the rear of No.11 detracting from the amenity and enjoyment of the adjacent garden area. The proposed development is therefore contrary to saved Worthing Local Plan policies BE1, H16, H18, South East Plan policies CC6 and BE1, Submission Core Strategy policy 16 and adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance 'Extending or Altering your Home'."

RELEVANT PLANNING POLICIES

Worthing Local Plan: H16, H18, BE1 and SPG 'Extending or Altering Your Home'
South East Plan: CC6, BE1,
Worthing Core Strategy: Policy 16

RELEVANT CONSULTATION RESPONSES:

The Executive Head of Health, Housing and Community Safety recommends a precautionary condition relating to possible contamination.

REPRESENTATIONS

A letter of **objection** has been received from the occupiers of 56 Limetree Avenue commenting that they are already overlooked by first-floor windows at 9 Cissbury Drive, also the first-floor extension would fill the first-floor space between 9 and 11 which would give the effect of terracing , almost a solid line of housing, which would be out of character.

Two letters of support have been received from the residents of 7 and 10 Cissbury Drive.

PLANNING ASSESSMENT:

There is no objection in principle to proposals to improve and up-grade the existing housing stock, subject to the effects on the visual and residential amenities of the locality.

The effects on the appearance of the dwelling and surrounding streetscene
Saved Local Plan policy H16 states (amongst other things) that in order to be acceptable, proposals for extensions and alterations should have regard to scale, design and materials in relation not only to the property concerned, but also any predominant characteristics of the area.

Moreover, the above-mentioned SPG states the size and shape of any extension should normally be designed to ensure the original house remains

the larger and more dominant feature. In this case, the extension has been deliberately designed to appear integral to the original dwelling, rather than as an addition. It would create an overtly horizontal form and emphasis that would be distinct from the immediately neighbouring properties. The size, scale and 'bulk' of the proposed first-floor extension would interrupt the existing rhythm of built form and result in a less spacious feel between properties.

A 2-storey addition designed to appear subservient to the existing dwelling would be more sensitive to the existing character. However, the applicant is unwilling to amend the design as this would compromise the shape and size of the additional accommodation sought. It is argued in the submitted planning statement that:-

"The terracing effect impacts fully on uniform, linear streets where, properties are identical in size and appearance. Cissbury Drive by reason of the eclectic mix of property styles, scales and building lines, means that the impact of such an effect is diluted fully in relation to the application site."

An overall gap of approximately 3.5m would be retained between the flank of the extension and the side wall of No.11. Although the resulting 'gap' is all contained within the curtilage of No.11 and will compromise the scope for a similar extension to be added to that property, it would be difficult to argue that the enlarged dwelling would appear excessively crowded or cramped within the streetscene. It is also acknowledged that the visual prominence of the extension within the streetscene will be moderated by the forward position of No.11 relative to No.9. The wider suburban context of Cissbury Drive comprises a diverse range of dwelling types and style, such that, on balance, it is considered that notwithstanding the anomalous horizontal form of the resulting dwelling, the effect on the character of surrounding suburban townscape would not be so severe as to warrant refusal on this ground alone.

Unfortunately, the tight relationship of the first-floor side extension to the boundary compromises the eaves design (there being insufficient space to replicate the wide overhanging eaves on the remainder of the dwelling). An amended drawing has been provided which shows the eaves design altered to more closely resemble the existing detail within the space available. Whilst appearing slightly awkward it would not be a conspicuous detail and does not weaken the overall design to an unacceptable extent.

Effect on living conditions of neighbouring occupiers

There would be no adverse impact on the amenities of the neighbouring property to the south, No.7. The main impact would be on No.11 to the north. The main difference compared to the earlier refused scheme is the removal of the proposed first floor rear element of the extension with a new lean-to roof formed over the existing flat roof rear element instead. Owing to the staggered building line, whereas the refused scheme extended some 5 metres beyond the rear elevation of No.11 at two full storeys, this has been reduced to approximately 3 metres. The additional bulk of the proposed extensions would still result in some overshadowing and loss of daylight to the windows in the flank wall of No.11. However, these are all secondary in

nature, and it is considered the impact would not be so severe as to warrant refusal. No.11 has been enlarged by a modest-sized conservatory on the north side of the rear elevation, with an area of timber decking to the south side of it. In refusing the earlier scheme it was considered that the orientation, depth and siting of the extension in relation to the site boundary and built-up construction (owing to the difference in ground levels) would have adversely impacted on the enjoyment of the amenity space of No.11 in terms of overshadowing and overbearing effect. It is considered the reduced bulk of the extensions will lessen the impact on this part of the garden to within acceptable limits.

At present there are two windows in the flank wall of No.9, serving a bathroom and stair landing. The latter is large and clear-glazed providing direct views of the side of No.11, the conservatory and garden. There would be no windows in the flank wall of the proposed extension, and this would result in some improvement for the neighbour in terms of privacy. However, the rear window (shown as serving a bathroom) should be required to be obscurely glazed owing to its proximity to the boundary and increased scope for overlooking from this direction.

There is a separation distance in excess of 45m between the rear of the proposed first-floor extension and the rear of the adjoining property in Limetree Avenue (No.56) and consequently it is considered the proposal would not impact adversely on the amenities of this property.

REASON FOR APPROVAL

The additional bulk and mass of the first-floor extension in relation to the site boundary would interrupt the pattern of existing surrounding development and would result in a less spacious feel to development in this part of Cissbury Drive. However, the impact is alleviated in streetscene terms by the separation distance between the proposed first-floor extension and the flank wall of the No.11, and the forward position of the latter within the street such that the proposed development would not appear excessively crowded or out of keeping within the wider suburban context as to warrant refusal on visual amenity grounds alone. Subject to safeguarding conditions, it is considered the proposed development can take place without resulting in unacceptable detriment to the amenities of neighbouring properties. It would consequently not conflict with 'saved' policies BE1, H16 and H18 of the Worthing Local Plan, Worthing Core Strategy policy 16 and policies CC1, CCC6 and BE1 of the South East Plan.

RECOMMENDATION

APPROVE subject to:-

1. Standard time limit
2. Approved plans
3. Materials to match
4. Obscure-glaze first-floor rear window
5. No additional windows in side

6. Pre-caution re. unsuspected contamination

IS RECOMMENDATION CONTRARY TO LETTER (S) OF REPRESENTATION?

Yes

DELEGATED

Case Officer
Sign.....[redacted].....Date.....18 · 5 · 11.....

Authorising Officer
Sign.....[redacted].....Date.....18/5/11.....