DELEGATED APPLICATIONS

ASSESSMENT SHEET

APPLICATION NO/ADDRESS: 11/0120 – 46 Falmer Avenue

DATE OF SITE VISIT: 26/4

NEIGHBOURS CHECKED: Y

ADDITIONAL NEIGHBOUR NOTIFICATIONS (LIST ADDRESSES): None.

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS:

Detached house on the east side of Falmer Avenue, one of two identical late 1950s properties, as built, facing the green in an outer residential suburb. The property has pitched roof with gables at the side and a flat roofed porch and distinctive period fenestration and door. The neighbouring property at 44 has added a wider flat roofed porch to its frontage. The two properties are separated by garages. The application property forms part of a group of similar detached houses built in similar period style and clustered around the green on the east side, a number of which display original flat roofed porches.

PROPOSAL

Permission is sought to replace the porch with a larger porch which extends out to the side flank wall. It is proposed with a mono pitched roof and projecting gable detail.

The porch measures 4.9 metres in width and is 1.4 metres deep. It has a maximum ridge height of 3.5 metres.

This application follows an earlier last December for a very similar porch extension.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY:

10/0910 – Construction of new front porch. Refused 8/12/10

RELEVANT PLANNING POLICIES:

BE1, H16 and H18 of the saved Local Plan.
BE1 and CC6 of the South East Plan
PPS1 Delivering Sustainable Development
Policy 16 Submission Core Strategy

REPRESENTATIONS AND RELEVANT CONSULTATION RESPONSES:

No neighbour letters received.

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 the decision complies with the Human Rights Act 1998.

PLANNING ASSESSMENT:

This application follows the refusal of an application for a porch last December. Other than the fenestration detail the proposal is identical to that which was refused. This re-application has not been explained or justified in terms of the previous refusal.

Again the proposed porch is set well away from neighbouring boundaries and will have no direct neighbour implications.

The existing porch is flat roofed as is the extended porch on the neighbouring property and other original porches on neighbouring properties. The proposed porch has a monopitched roof with a projecting gable feature. The scale and design of the roof details are unsympathetic to the character of the original property, introducing an alien and incongruous form to the period vernacular.

Glazing bars have been removed from the front windows and additional windows added to each side elevation. Whilst the design of windows has improved the overall design of the porch is still considered not to reflect the period design of the original porches on these properties and remains at variance with the vernacular. The composition of the roof gable, windows and door is poor and the proposed porch appears as a much heavier addition than the dwarfed walled, flat roofed and much more lightweight original and added porches on neighbouring properties.

The cumulative effect is a very solid, incongruous, obtrusive and unduly assertive porch which is poorly composed and would be harmful to the appearance of the property and the cohesion of the group of which it forms part and, hence, the character of the streetscene. This proposal does not represent good quality design and is inappropriate in its context and harmful to the sense of place. As such it is considered to be contrary to saved Local Plan policies BE1and H18 and PPS1 Delivering Sustainable Development.

A more lightweight, flat roofed structure with sympathetic fenestration, is likely to be acceptable.

RECOMMENDATION

Refuse.

The scale and design of the porch roof and the design of the fenestration and door proposed are unsympathetic to the character of the original house and as such the extension would be harmful to the appearance of the property and the wider streetscene. Consequently the proposal is contrary to saved local plan policies BE1 and H18, South East Plan policies BE1 and CC6 and PPS1 Delivering Sustainable Development.

REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION:

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

IS RECOMMENDATION CONTRARY TO LETTER (S) OF REPRESENTATION?

No.

DELEGATED

Case Officer sign..... Date 27/4

Authorising Officer sign..... Date 28/4/11