DELEGATED APPLICATIONS ASSESSMENT SHEET

APPLICATION NO./ADDRESS: WB/0208/FULL – 290 Findon Road
DATE OF SITE VISIT: **30**/06/11

NEIGHBOURS CHECKED: Y

ADDITIONAL NEIGHBOUR NOTIFICATIONS (LIST ADDRESSES): N

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS:

The application site is situated in an outer residential suburb of the town. The immediate dual carriageway road is well trafficked. Properties along the immediate stretch of its eastern side are atypical early post war detached bungalows.

The application property is one such building with brick faced walls and brown tiled roof. A rear extension has been partially constructed off its rear face. Work on this had ceased at the time of the site visit.

An original detached garage sits within the rear garden, the boundaries of which are demarked by standard height close boarded fencing, supplemented by planting.

PROPOSAL:

The development has been advertised as proposed front extension, rear extension and conservatory, and chimney stack. Rear dormer to be built under permitted development.

Planning permission is sought for:

- Single storey hipped roof front bay extension to measure (at max) approximately; 4.8 metres in height, 5.1 metres in length, and 2 metres in depth

- Single storey L-shaped flat roof rear extension and conservatory to measure (at max) approximately; 2.6 metres in height, 10 metres in length, and 6 metres in width

- Erection of chimney stack to measure (at max) 4.1 metres in height

At the time of the site visit the rear extension was under partial construction.

The submitted plans show a rear dormer. However this is shown for the sake of completeness only as it will be built out as "permitted development" (being a discreet element constructed as separate operation to the remaining extension and meeting the relevant criteria under permitted development)

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY:

None

RELEVANT PLANNING POLICIES:

South East Plan
CC1, BE1, CC6

Worthing Core Strategy
16

Worthing Local Plan 2003
H18, H16

Government Advice
PPS1

REPRESENTATIONS AND RELEVANT CONSULTATION RESPONSES:

Borough Engineers consultation response:-

Only comment relates to the disposal of surface water.

In absence of any ground investigation details or drainage details in support of the application although the applicant has stated his intention to utilise soakaways, request that should approval be granted it be conditional that 'no development approved by this permission shall commence until full details for the disposal of surface water has been approved by the Planning Authority'

Soakage tests in accordance with BRE Digest 365 (1991) would be required to be undertaken on the proposed site to meet this requirement, to ascertain the size of the soakaway required for the new impermeable roof area.

PLANNING ASSESSMENT:

Introduction

The principle planning issues with this proposal is its impact visually and upon neighbours. The issue of the disposal of surface water can be controlled by planning condition.

Visual

The area has a strong suburban character. There is a reasonable cohesiveness along the street due to the consistent design of the interwar bungalows.

Nonetheless some of the frontages of these properties have been altered over time. This has diminished the impetrative to leave those buildings untouched and scope is available for sympathetic change.

In this case the new front bay successfully replicates the style and design of the host dwelling, and the chimney stack is a feature evident on other properties in the street. As such neither would be obtrusive in the street.

The design quality of the rear extension and conservatory is far inferior. But this is not conspicuously visible from public vantage point in the street.

Neighbours

It is the neighbours immediately abutting the site which would be principally affected. The chimney stack is slender and would not diminish neighbour's enjoyment of their properties for this reason.

The front extension is positioned away from neighbouring buildings. Its remote position would not harm the private amenities of adjoining neighbours by way of overbearing and overshadowing. The front bay looks out onto the public street so material harm to neighbours by way of overlooking would not occur.

The flanks of the rear extension and conservatory are positioned a good distance from neighbouring dwellinghouses (4 metres northwards and 6 metres southwards, at minimum). Such distances ensure any casting of shadow would not unduly impact upon the fenestration of the neighbours. This includes the property to the south which has a habitable room window (likely dining room) in its flank facing north. Neighbour's outlook would not be severely curtailed as the single storey extension and conservatory are set off from the boundaries and the latter is predominately glazed; so any overbearing effect would not be unacceptable. There are no windows/openings in the extension flanks and the glazed conservatory is largely hidden behind the boundary fencing onto neighbours. Invasive overlooking onto neighbours is therefore negated.

Conclusion

For the reasons set about in the above paragraphs the front extension would not negatively impact upon identified amenities. The proposal should therefore be supported.

RECOMMENDATION:

Approve subject to the following conditions:

1. Standard time limit
2. Plans as approved
3. External materials and finishes to match existing
4. Details of soakaway to be submitted and agreed
5. Notwithstanding "pd" no further windows in flanks of development
6. Flat roof not used for amenity purposes

REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION:

The proposal complies with relevant Development Plan policies.

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?

N/A

DELEGATED

Case Officer
Sign..... [redacted] .....Date.....6/9/11.....

Authorising Officer
Sign..... [redacted] .....Date.....6 9 11.....