DELEGATED APPLICATIONS ASSESSMENT SHEET

Application No: 11/0154/FULL	Recommendation – Approve Application
Site	1 Beachside Close Goring-By-Sea Worthing BN12 4JQ
Proposal:	Alterations and extension to the rear of the property to provide a larger kitchen.

Date of Site Visit:

Neighbours Checked: Y

Additional Neighbours Notified (List Addressess): N

Site and Surroundings & Details of Proposal:

DELEGATED APPLICATIONS ASSESSMENT SHEETAPPLICATION NO./ADDRESS: WB/11/0154/FULL – 1 Beachside Close DATE OF SITE VISIT: 20/04/11 NEIGHBOURS CHECKED: YADDITIONAL NEIGHBOUR NOTIFICATIONS (LIST ADDRESSES): NSITE AND SURROUNDINGS: The site is on a quiet residential cul-de-sac, near to the sea. The street is characterised by detached bungalows.The application property is one such property. It is an atypical hipped roof inter-war building with brown tiled roof. A single storey conservatory has been built off the rear of the building. This is in a poor state of repair. Boundary treatments to the site are characterised by close boarded fencing, supplemented by trellis and shrubs.The property to the north is also a bungalow. It has an extension built off its rear wall, close to the shared boundary with the application site.PROPOSAL:The development sought for has been advertised as alterations and extension to the rear of the property to provide a larger kitchenPlanning permission is sought for a gable ended single storey rear extension to measure (at maximum) approximately; 4.575 metres in height, 3.850 metres in length, and 6 metres in widthRELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY: 00/00659/FULLErection of single storey rear extensionRefused14-08-2000

Consultations and Representations

Consultations/Comments

REPRESENTATIONS AND RELEVANT CONSULTATION RESPONSES:Borough Environmental Health requests precautionary contamination condition be imposed.

Planning Assesment:

PLANNING ASSESSMENT: IntroductionThe principle planning concerns with this development is its impact visually and upon neighbours.Although Environmental Health has requested a precautionary contamination condition be imposed, an informative is sufficient to raise the applicant's awareness of the risk.Visual The extension has a contemporary design, which is a conscious move away from the interwar style of the existing building. Nonetheless its scale is in keeping with the receipent building with a roof

pitch that matches that of the present roof. It is also visually integrated with matching roof tiling. And sympathetic timber cladding is well used to the building's exterior.For these reasons, the proposal would not detrimentally impact visually.NeighboursThe neighbour principally affected is that one to the north as the extension is removed from the remainder.A previous application for a single storey hipped roof rear extension was refused due to an unacceptable impact arising onto the neighbour (00/00659/FULL refers). With a length of some 5.4 metres this far beyond the steer given to acceptable development set out in the Council's adopted guidance.In the current proposal the extension's depth is much less, at 3.850 metres (although notably, the hipped roof has been replaced with a gable end). Impact upon the neighbour's living conditions is inevitable. A noticeable reduction in light entering the conservatory would occur, alongside a degree of overshadowing. The physical presence of the extension would create a sense of enclosure, curtailing outlook from within the conservatory.Whilst all this would happen; the test to the development's acceptability turns on the severity of these impacts. The applicant has used recognised industry standards set out in Building Research Establishment (BRE) Report 209, "Site layout planning for daylight and sunlight - a guide to good practice" to demonstrate arising loss of sunlight and daylight and overshadowing effect would not be demonstrably adverse. The calculation indicates the proposed extension is within accepted guidelines, i.e. less than 25 degrees measured from a line of the centre of the lowest window in the northern flank of the conservatory. Further sufficient opportunity exists for the neighbour to 'escape' the worst of any arising overbearing effect, with the principal living space of the main house and the vast majority of their garden unaffected.ConclusionFor the above reasons the proposal would not have an unacceptable impact upon identified amenities. Therefore, refusal of this application cannot be resisted.RECOMMENDATION:Approve subject to:-1.Standard time limit2. Plans as approved3. Roof flank materials and finishes to match existing 4. Notwithstanding "pd" no windows/openings in north flank+ Precautionary contamination informativeREASONS 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/ADELEGATED Case
OfficerSign.....Date.....Autho
rising OfficerSign.....Date.....

Recommendation:

Approve, subject to the condition(s):

OR

Refuse for the following reason(s)

Reasons for Recommendation:

The proposal complies/conflicts 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 refused, would have some impact on the applicant's Rights. However, it is considered that the harm caused by the development outweighs these and that in the public interest the application should be refused. Accordingly it is considered that this decision complies with the Human Rights Act 1998, with regard to Article 8 and Article 1

OR

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 refused, would have some impact on the applicant's Rights. However, it is considered that the harm caused by the development outweighs these and that in the public interest the application should be refused. Accordingly it is considered that this decision complies with the Human Rights Act 1998, with regard to Article 8 and Article 1

Is recommendation contrary to letter (s) of representation?

No/Yes/NA

DELEGATED

Case Officer
Sign.....[redacted].....Date.....27-4-11.....

Authorising Officer
Sign.....Date.....