## DELEGATED APPLICATIONS ASSESSMENT SHEET

**APPLICATION NO./ADDRESS:** WB/09/0455/FULL – Glaxo Smithkline, Southdownview Way

**DATE OF SITE VISIT:** 02.07.09

**NEIGHBOURS CHECKED:** Y

**ADDITIONAL NEIGHBOUR NOTIFICATIONS:** N

**SITE AND SURROUNDINGS:**

The application site relates to 'Glaxo Smithkline' pharmaceutical research laboratory industrial premises within the East Worthing Trading Estate. The site comprises a large number of industrial outbuildings and structures, up to 20 metres in height. The site is located between further industrial development to the south and west, and with residential development to the northwest and beyond the other trading areas to the west and southwest. The site adjoins open fields to the east and northeast.

**PROPOSAL:**

Planning permission is sought for the erection of new palisade fencing to the northwest corner of the site, forming part of the boundary of car park number 2 adjacent to numbers 48 Clarendon Road to the west and 66 Clarendon Road to the east.

The new fencing will be manufactured from galvanised steel powder coated green palisade fencing to match existing palisade fencing around the site. The fencing will have a height of 2.4 metres and will be positioned slightly inside the boundary of the site.

**RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY:**

None relevant to this proposal but the site has a complex history with numerous applications for alterations and new buildings having been granted, dating back to the 1950's.

**RELEVANT PLANNING POLICIES:**

**Worthing Local Plan 2003**
BE1, H18

**The South East Plan 2009**
CC6, BE1, SCT3

**REPRESENTATIONS AND RELEVANT CONSULTATION RESPONSES:**

None received.

**PLANNING ASSESSMENT:**

The principal issues raised by this proposal are its impact on the amenity of neighbouring residential properties and its effect on the character and appearance of the area.

The proposal is located in a large industrial complex within a designated trading area. As such it is in conformity with the Local Plan designation, and would act to improve business functions, providing additional security and can be supported in principle.

The proposed palisade fencing matches the height, materials, design and colour of existing palisade fencing around the boundary of the site and is considered appropriate. The nature of the site is industrial and the character and purpose of the fencing reflects that usage.

Both new fencing locations are set back from Clarendon Road with restricted views from the public realm and they are not considered to have an adverse impact on the appearance of the street scene or the character of the area.

In terms of neighbouring amenity the proposed fencing is only 0.4 metres above the height allowed as permitted development and its see-through nature and green colour helps to soften its appearance. The fencing will be within the site boundaries and are not considered to give rise to any significant neighbouring amenity issues. The fencing is remote from protected TPO trees.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Permit subject to conditions (summarised below).

1. Standard time limit

**REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION:**

It is considered that the proposed fencing will not significantly harm the living conditions of neighbouring residents, and it will not detract from the character and appearance of the trading estate or the wider area. Therefore, it is considered that the proposal is acceptable in light of Saved Policies BE1 and H18 of the Worthing Local Plan 2003 and Policies CC6, BE1 and SCT3 of The South East Plan 2009.

**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
Sign.....[redacted].....Date...31.07.09.....

Authorising Off
Sign.....[redacted].....Date....3.8.09.....