DELEGATED APPLICATIONS ASSESSMENT SHEET

Application Number: **Recommendation – Approve**
AWDM/0947/12

Site: **2 Park Lane Southwick**

Proposal: **Two storey rear extension and rooflights over first floor bedroom (Revisions to AWDM/1035/11)**

NEIGHBOURS CHECKED: Yes

ADDITIONAL NEIGHBOUR NOTIFICATIONS (LIST ADDRESSES): No

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS:

Two-storey detached and semi-detached period dwellings, with uncluttered hipped and gabled roofs, together with staggered building lines, wide roads and Southwick Green contribute to the character and appearance of the heritage asset, the Southwick Conservation Area.

The application dwelling, with its traditional features and modest and uncluttered proportions and appearance is consistent with and contributes positively to this character and appearance.

PROPOSAL:

Permission sought for two-storey rear extensions, each measuring (at max) some 6 metres in height and 2.5 metres in length, and 1.8 metres and 1 metres in width respectively, together with the insertion of 2 no. roof lights in rear (west) elevation of existing roof slope.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY:

AWDM/1035/11
Two storey rear extension and rear dormer positioned at eaves height
Refused 10.02.2012
Appeal dismissed

RELEVANT PLANNING POLICIES:

South East Plan
BE1, BE6, CC1, CC6

Adur Local Plan 1993-2006 (ADC 1996) (saved policies):
AG1, AH7, AB4
SPG Development Control Standard No.3 ‘Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings’
SPG Southwick Conservation Area Character Appraisal and Management

Strategy (July 2009)

CONSULTATION RESPONSES:

Adur Conservation Area Advisory Group: *agreement to these applications being approved.*

Worthing & Adur Councils: *Environmental Health officer* requests *precautionary contamination condition*

REPRESENTATIONS RESPONSES

Objections from residents of 4 Park Lane, 19 and 21 The Green Southwick, summarised below:

- *Still double storey extension with roof lights. Cannot see any of my previous objections have been removed.*
- *State the same that the extension will over shadow my property/garden and reduce amount of light. I have limited light, therefore value what light I get. The property will be overdeveloped. It will reduce lighting and devalue my property.*
- *Do not wish to repeat myself as essentially the same objections raised previously against the earlier application; Overlooking, loss of privacy and light, noise and disturbance, as well as smells, consequent loss of earnings, design and appearance, highway safety, traffic and parking*
- *Currently no upper storey windows on west side to overlook my patio, where I sunbathe and teach in summer. Do not wish any further deterioration to my privacy. Substituting roof lights for the previously proposed dormer does not in any way mitigate loss of privacy as windows at same height!*
- *New profile of extended southwest corner to upper storey will sill cut winter light. Intends to demolish and rebuilding shed. Intends to turn it 90 degrees and placing deeper in on the property.*
- *Such extensive rebuilding work will cause noise, disturbance and dust. I work from home. Need quiet, peaceful environment. Will lose all sources of income and further impoverished.*
- *Complete ground plan of 2 Park Lane not presented. Gives impression it is a small house. Looks squeezed on to its plot. Already has attic conversion so no shortage of space. Any further enlargement completely our of keeping*
- *Park Lane is bus route with restricted parking; double yellow lines and this part of road on a dangerous blind bend with two junctions where parking is already quite wild. Access for any builder's vehicles will be very restricted. Where would pneumatic drilling equipment be placed?*

- *Still a two storey extension. Will still block out the light to the rear of my property. I am north of their property and will suffer loss of light. Feel this is unacceptable and overdevelopment. Will devalue my property. Light will be restricted into my sun room*

PLANNING ASSESSMENT:

Principle

Upgrading of residential accommodation is acceptable in principle, subject to meeting the statutory test for new development in the Conservation Area.

Visual Amenity and Conservation Area

The two modest sized extensions on either side of the projecting westerly wall would respect the building lines and the catslide roof of the existing dwelling. As a result they would blend in satisfactorily with the host dwelling and the street scene.

In the previous application, an incongruous rear dormer was proposed. In this application this has been omitted. Discreet rooflights are now suggested instead. Provided these rooflights are of a Conservation Style they would sit comfortably on the existing roof and not be obtrusive, with only a marginal protrusion beyond the existing roof profile.

Neighbours

The neighbours principally affected by the proposal as those to the rear and side (the application is remote from the remainder).

Neighbours have reiterated their objections which were submitted against the earlier application. Yet the previous application was not refused on neighbour amenity grounds since it was assessed that no material harm would arise onto the living conditions of immediate neighbours.

At appeal the Inspector agreed with this judgement, and wrote:-

The proposed extension would be lower than the main ridge of the dwelling and would not project further into the garden than the existing projecting westerly wall. At the same time there is an open gap between the Appeal dwelling and the dwelling at 4 Park Lane. As a consequence the proposal would not have a materially adverse impact on the living conditions of the occupiers of 4 Park Lane due to loss of sunlight, daylight or privacy.

The concerns relating to parking, highway safety, noise, smell, the intensity of the development and health issues have been taken into consideration, but do not add to the conclusion on the main issue.

A distance of over 14 metres is retained between the proposed development and the immediate neighbouring building at the rear. The flank of the

development is at least 5 metres from the immediate neighbouring building to the north.

In both cases, these distances mean the shadow cast by the development would be largely onto the rearmost part of the gardens of either neighbour, with the windows of any habitable rooms unaffected. So adverse overshadowing would not occur. This distance also means adverse overbearing effect onto the living conditions of either neighbour is avoided, and their outlook not unduly curtailed.

Overlooking from the roof lights differs from that of a dormer. This is because the proposed rooflights would sit within the angle of the existing roof slope, so avoiding direct overlooking and unacceptable loss of privacy. No windows are proposed in the north elevation of the development, so overlooking onto the immediate neighbour to the north is negated.

Other legislation controls noise and disturbance and parking on the highway.

Contaminated Land

The site is not contaminated so an informative would suffice to raise the applicant's awareness of this risk

RECOMMENDATION:

APPROVE for the reason:-

The proposed development can take place without detriment to the local environment and would not detract from the established character or appearance of the Conservation Area. It would not result in any detriment to the amenities of neighbouring properties and consequently does not conflict with **Adur Local Plan 1993-2006 (ADC 1996) (saved policies)** AG1, AH7, AB4 and **South East Plan policies** BE1, BE6, CC1, CC6

Subject to Conditions:

1) Standard time limit
2) Approved Plans
3) Roof lights to be conservation style
4) External materials and finishes to match existing
5) No windows in north elevation

Informative:

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

IS RECOMMENDATION CONTRARY TO LETTER (S) OF REPRESENTATION?

Yes.

DELEGATED

Case Officer
Sign Matthew Porter Date 10 September 2012.

Authorising Officer
Sign: Peter Barnett Date: 11 September 2012