DELEGATED APPLICATIONS ASSESSMENT SHEET

APPLICATION NO./ADDRESS: 67 Pelham Road, Worthing WB/10/0006/FULL

DATE OF SITE VISIT: Pre-application

NEIGHBOURS CHECKED: Y

ADDITIONAL NEIGHBOUR NOTIFICATIONS: N

PROPOSAL, SITE AND SURROUNDINGS:

The application property comprises one half of a semi-detached pair of 1930s-style houses occupying a wider than average plot on the north side of Pelham Road. The house has previously been extended on the east side by a flat-roofed double garage and linked front porch. The application has been advertised as the conversion of the existing attached garage to habitable accommodation and erection of a first-floor extension above. [In effect, permission is sought for a 2-storey side extension to replace the existing attached garage.]

Permission was granted under WB/07/1532/FULL in 2008 for a 2-storey side addition to this property to create an attached house. This permission has not been implemented and the applicant now wishes to enlarge the existing single dwelling rather than create a separate dwelling unit. Prior to this, an earlier application for a 3-bedroom attached house on this site was refused on the following grounds (WB/07/1060/FULL refers):-

1. *The proposed dwelling by reason of its size, siting and poor design would represent an unsympathetic and intrusive form of development on this restricted plot that would be out of keeping with the character and appearance of existing development. It would appear cramped and overbearing in relation to the neighbouring property and harmful to the streetscene in general. In addition, the proposal would be detrimental to the residential amenities of 69 Pelham Road through unacceptable overshadowing of the first-floor flat and rear garden. It is therefore contrary to saved policies BE1 and H18 of the Worthing Local Plan 2003 and policies CH1 and DEV1 of the West Sussex Structure Plan 2001-16.*

2. *The Council is not satisfied that adequate parking provision to serve both the existing and proposed dwellings can be made on the site to an acceptable standard and therefore the proposed development would be detrimental to highway safety contrary to 'saved' policy TR9 of the Worthing Local Plan 2003 and policies DEV4 and DEV5 of the West Sussex Structure Plan 2001-16.*

The size, form and appearance of the proposed extension would be very similar to that approved under WB/07/1532/FULL. The extension would be 4.9 metres wide (0.4 metres narrower than the approved dwelling), and a

maximum 7.8 metres deep. The main front elevation of the proposed extension would be set back some 1 metre from the main front of the existing house. It would have a hipped and pitched roof positioned approximately 0.4 metres below the main roof ridge. The proposed extension would be of a brick construction, with a rendered first-floor, incorporating a decorative tile-hung panel between the ground and first-floor windows on the front elevation. There are no windows or other opening proposed in the side elevation.

RELEVANT PLANNING POLICIES

Saved Local Plan policies: H16, H18, BE1
South East Plan: CC1, CC6, BE1

RELEVANT CONSULTATION RESPONSES AND REPRESENTATIONS:

No representations have been received from third parties.

PLANNING ASSESSMENT:

There is no objection in principle to the proposal. [There would be no loss of a dwelling under Local Plan policy H10 since the earlier permission has not been implemented]. The main considerations relate to the effects on the appearance of the recipient building and on the visual amenity of the wider area, and the effect on the living conditions of adjoining residential occupiers.

The west part of Pelham Road is characterised by 1930s-style dwellings in terraced blocks of four units, and some semi-detached pairs (including the application property). Whilst the houses are not all identical in appearance, a strong sense of harmony and visual coherence is reflected in the pattern of their layout, scale, proportions and design characteristics. Adjoining the application property to the east (No.69) is a detached, 2-storey flat building (originally built as three garages with a flat over, but with two garages subsequently converted to create a separate ground-floor flat). The building appears within the streetscene as an individual style dwelling, differing in its scale and architectural composition to surrounding development. No.69 marks a transition between the west and east parts of Pelham Road, the latter made up of 1960-70s estate housing of a wholly different style, layout and appearance.

The main front of the proposed extension is sited 0.4 metre forward of the main front elevation of the attached dwelling approved under WB/07/1532/FULL although the latter also incorporated a feature bay window. The overall height of the proposed extension would be approximately 0.3 metres taller than the roof of the approved dwelling, which incorporated an element of flat roof. However, in view of its narrower width, the proposed 2-storey side extension would be some 1.2 metres from the boundary with No.69 at its closest point, compared to the approved dwelling, which was approximately 0.8 metres from this boundary. Although the front of the extension would be sited marginally forward (south) of the first-floor front elevation of No.69, this is compensated for in streetscene terms by the increased separation distance. As such, it is not considered the proposed

extension would appear cramped or unduly dominant in relation to the smaller scale of No.69.

In terms of its relationship to the recipient building, the proportions of the proposed extension would appear slightly over-wide. However, it is considered an adequate degree of subservience would be achieved by the setting back of the front elevation by 1 metre and the lower roof ridge as shown. The omission of the bay window in favour of flush windows, with complementary tile-hung feature panel, also helps the extension appear subordinate to the main dwelling.

The most affected property is the flat building, No.69, to the east. In refusing the initial scheme for an attached dwelling (WB/07/1060 refers), it was considered that the proposed building would have resulted in increased overshadowing of the side of No.69, and its small rear garden, to an unacceptable extent. It was acknowledged as part of that decision that the rooms primarily affected (a living room and bathroom in the first-floor flat) were also served by windows in the front and rear elevations respectively, providing each room with a dual aspect and an alternative source of daylighting. However, it was considered that the cumulative effect, including on the small north-facing patio garden, would be unacceptably poor. Owing to its northerly orientation that part of the garden closest to No.69, is in shadow during the middle of the day, although to a lesser extent in Summer months when the sun is higher in the sky than in Winter. However, as the sun moves over the hipped roof of No.67 the garden currently benefits from late afternoon sunshine. The bulk of the proposed extension would extend the shadow created by No.67 northwards and westwards. However, computer generated shadow path diagrams submitted in respect of the approved scheme (WB/07/1532/FULL refers) successfully demonstrated that during the Summer months, when the garden at No.69 is most likely to be in use, the shadow created by the proposed dwelling would be relatively insignificant. Shadow path diagrams have not been submitted in respect of this latest application. On the one hand the extent of the shadow would now be greater owing to the slighting taller roof of the extension, but this is compensated for by the increased separation distance between the properties in question. As before, it is apparent that the scale and 'bulk' of the proposed side extension *would* result in some additional overshadowing of the west side of No.69 and its small rear garden. However, on basis of the relatively small scale differences to the overall building volume compared to the approved scheme, it would be difficult to argue that the effects of this latest proposal would be significantly worse than has previously been accepted, such as to warrant refusal on this ground alone.

Space for 1 car to be parked on the drive in front of the extension would be retained to serve the enlarged dwelling house. This is within the maximum standard for the resulting 4-bedroom house, although there is scope to increase the amount of on-site parking provision by surfacing the front garden if desired. On-street parking is available in the vicinity of the site.

RECOMMENDATION

APPROVE subject to:-

1. Standard time limit
2. Materials to match (submit samples)
3. No openings on east elevation
4. Precautionary contamination

REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION:

Having regard to the earlier decision for an attached house on this site, it is considered the proposed development can take place without adversely impacting on the character or appearance of the surrounding built environment, and without detracting from the residential amenities of adjoining occupiers.

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 Decision

Case Officer
Sign..... .....Date.....3·3·10.....

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