DELEGATED APPLICATIONS ASSESSMENT SHEET

APPLICATION NO./ADDRESS: 24 Salvington Hill WB/11/0206/FULL

DATE OF SITE VISIT: 19.05.11

NEIGHBOURS CHECKED: Y

ADDITIONAL NEIGHBOUR NOTIFICATIONS: N

PROPOSAL, SITE AND SURROUNDINGS:

As originally submitted, permission was sought for a single storey side and rear extension (including new roof over existing garage) plus roof lantern, together with roof extensions involving alterations to the existing side dormers and new front porch/roof canopy.

The application property comprises a detached chalet house dating from the late 1920's, located on the east side of Salvington Hill. It has been enlarged by an attached garage and utility room on the south side and by dormers on the south side. [The existing cat-slide dormer on the north side appears original.]

The surrounding low density residential area is made up of individual style dwellings. The front building line on this side of the road is roughly staggered to follow the angle of the road with most properties having reasonably generous frontages some 8-10m deep. The ground slopes down from north to south, so that the adjoining property to the north, No.26, a traditional, detached bungalow, occupies higher land. The original dwelling at No.22 was redeveloped in 2004 to provide 2 no. detached chalet houses with garages. Of these, Gatun House, adjoining to the south, occupies lower ground. A large tree on the frontage of Gatun House is subject to a TPO.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY None relevant.

RELEVANT PLANNING POLICIES

Worthing Local Plan: H16, H18 and SPG 'Extending or Altering Your Home'
South East Plan: CC6, BE1,
Worthing Core Strategy: Policy 16

RELEVANT CONSULTATION RESPONSES AND REPRESENTATIONS

None.

PLANNING ASSESSMENT:

The dwelling is located within the built-up area and there is no objection in principle to proposals to improve and up-grade the existing housing stock, subject to the effects on the visual and residential amenities of the locality.

The effects on the appearance of the dwelling and surrounding streetscene

Saved Local Plan policy H16 states (amongst other things) that in order to be acceptable, proposals for extensions and alterations should have regard to scale, design and materials in relation not only to the property concerned, but also any predominant characteristics of the area.

The attached garage occupies lower ground than the main dwelling and projects forward of the main front elevation by 1.4m. The front element has a false-pitched roof with a shallower mono-pitch beyond it. The rear of the garage extends into a lobby and utility room. The garage and utility room adjoin the southern site boundary. It is proposed to replace the lobby and utility room in a new extension built to enable floor levels to run through level with the main ground-floor accommodation. The proposed extension would be set in 1 metre from the common boundary and extend 1.7m beyond the rear wall of the new dwelling. It would have a part-pitched/part flat roof incorporating a roof lantern (1m wide and 2m deep). It was originally proposed to extend the new roof forward to encompass the existing garage. Owing to the difference in ground level across the site, the new roof would have an eaves height of 3.1m at the common boundary, with an overall height of 4.4m.

The southern roof slope has been previously enlarged by 2 mis-matched dormers serving a bedroom and bathroom. It was originally proposed to replace these with a new 7.4m long dormer having a part pitched/part flat-roof. It was proposed to incorporate the original cat-slide dormer on the north side into a new 9m long dormer with a part pitched/part flat roof.

A canopy roof is proposed on the front elevation to provide some shelter to the centrally-positioned main entrance and extending over the ground-floor windows on either side.

As originally submitted it was considered that the bulk and form of the proposed garage roof would appear too visually dominant in relation to the dwelling, particularly bearing in mind its forward-projection. In addition, the proposed dormers were considered excessively large; the compromised design of the northern dormer appearing particularly unsightly in views from further up the hill to the north.

Following discussions, an amended drawing has been received reducing the length of the dormers on the north and south sides to 6 metres each, and removing the original cat-slide dormer, to achieve a more symmetrical appearance. As amended, the size of the proposed dormers is now considered acceptable, more in keeping with the scale of the original roof. There is no objection to the proposed tiled, pitched, canopy roof feature on the front elevation.

The roof design has been amended to reduce the ‘bulk’ of the garage roof, whilst retaining the taller roof over the rear extension. The latter would be set back some 4m from the front of the house and whilst resulting in a slightly uncomfortable junction between the two roof elements, would not be a unduly prominent feature, nor detract so significantly from the appearance of the existing dwelling as to warrant refusal.

Effect on living conditions of neighbouring occupiers

Gatun House to the south consists of a modern, chalet style house designed to harmonise with the style of the application property, but with no dormers. An attached flat roof garage/rear utility room attached to the north side adjoins the common boundary with No.24. There is a rooflight on the northern roofslope which serves a landing/stairwell. The rear of the proposed side extension would align with the rear of the garage/utility room at Gatun House. Owing to the difference in ground levels the eaves of the proposed extension would be elevated some 1m in relation to the flat roof of the neighbouring property at Gatun House. However, bearing in mind its position set in 1m from the common boundary it would not be physically overbearing in relation to the latter.

The existing dormer(s) on the south side have 2 windows serving a bedroom and bathroom. Currently the bedroom has only a high level window. The proposed replacement dormer would have 2 windows, also serving a bedroom and bathroom. The bedroom window would be of a standard size allowing views onto the side roof of Gatun House which includes the rooflight window approximately 8-9m distant serving the landing/stairwell. No objection has been received from the neighbour at Gatun House and bearing in mind the rooflight window does not serve habitable accommodation, it is considered, on balance, it would not be warranted to require the proposed bedroom window to be obscurely glazed, particularly as the room has no alternative outlook.

The windows on the north side dormer serve a landing and bathroom and do not require an outlook therefore could reasonably be required to be obscurely glazed to safeguard the amenities of the neighbour to the north.

REASON FOR APPROVAL

As amended it is considered the proposed extensions and alterations would not detract from the built-up environment and can take place without harm to the amenities of neighbouring occupiers. Consequently the proposed development would not conflict with ‘saved’ policies H16 and H18 of the Worthing Local Plan, Worthing Core Strategy policy 16 and policies CC1, CCC6 and BE1 of the South East Plan.

RECOMMENDATION

APPROVE subject to:-

1. Standard time limit
2. Approved plans
3. Materials to match
4. Obscure-glaze windows in north side dormer and eastern-most window in south side dormer
5. No windows in s. side of ground-floor extension

Informative:

Pre-caution against unsuspected contamination

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……..Date……..

Authorising Officer
Sign……..Date……..