DELEGATED APPLICATIONS ASSESSMENT SHEET

Application Number: **Recommendation – Approve**
AWDM/0691/12

Site: **1 Highdown Close Southwick**

Proposal: **Side extension and garage (existing garage removed)**

NEIGHBOURS CHECKED: Yes

ADDITIONAL NEIGHBOUR NOTIFICATIONS (LIST ADDRESSES): No

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS:

The application property is within an outer residential suburb of Southwick in a quiet cul-de-sac consisting of pairs of semi-detached atypical 1970s properties.

PROPOSAL:

Permission sought for a side extension to measure (at max) some 3.4 metres in height and 10.4 metres in length, and 4.4 metres in width.

The agent has confirmed it is applicant's intention to build a front porch under permitted development.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY:

None

RELEVANT PLANNING POLICIES:

South East Plan
BE1, BE6, CC1, CC6

Adur Local Plan 1993-2006 (ADC 1996) (saved policies):
AG1, AH7
SPG Development Control Standard No.3 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings'

CONSULTATION RESPONSES:

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

REPRESENTATIONS RESPONSES
None

PLANNING ASSESSMENT:

Principle

Upgrading of residential accommodation is acceptable in principle.

Visual Amenity

One other property at the end of the cul-de-sac has been extended with an incongruous hipped pitched roof. Although this has not benefited from express planning permission, it has been in existence for more than 4 years so is an established feature in the street, and it has changed the appearance of the cul-de-sac making it more difficult to resist similar proposals when they come forward.

In this case, the widened garage would still appear subservient to the main house in terms of its scale. The change in level between it and the main house means it would not be "read" as part and parcel of the main house. Because a hipped roof is a feature to a property in the cul-de-sac, it would be difficult to resist this development simply because of the applicant's choice of a false hipped roof.

The roof is not hipped on its northern side due to the applicant's future intention of later building a front porch as a separate building operation under permitted development (which will have a lower roof height and will not 'tie-in' with the proposed garage roof). It is being constructed as permitted development as the applicant was advised that a 'wraparound' extension would not have been acceptable if submitted as a planning application.

Neighbours

The development is physically removed from immediate neighbours, so no adverse overbearing and overshadowing effect and/or unacceptable loss of privacy would occur.

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 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, and **South East Plan policies** BE1, CC1, CC6

Subject to Conditions:

1) Standard time limit
2) Approved Plans
3) External materials and finishes to match

Informative:

1) 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?

No

DELEGATED

Case Officer
Sign Matthew Porter Date 17th September 2012.

Authorising Officer
Sign: Peter Barnett Date: 17 September 2012