DELEGATED APPLICATIONS ASSESSMENT SHEET

Application No: 11/0190/FULL	Recommendation – Approve Application
Site	115A South Farm Road Worthing West Sussex BN14 7AX
Proposal:	Erection of a first floor white PVCu conservatory with polycarbonate roof above existing rear extension.

Date of Site Visit:

Neighbours Checked: Y

Additional Neighbours Notified (List Addressess): N

Site and Surroundings & Details of Proposal:

DELEGATED APPLICATIONS ASSESSMENT SHEETAPPLICATION NO./ADDRESS: WB/11/0190/FULL – 115A South Farm Road DATE OF SITE VISIT: /0/11 NEIGHBOURS CHECKED: YADDITIONAL NEIGHBOUR NOTIFICATIONS (LIST ADDRESSES): NSITE AND SURROUNDINGS: The application site forms part of a commercial inter-war period terrace. Parking is available to the front. Residential two-storey properties surround. Worthing High School is nearby.The application property is a residential flat directly above a fancy dress shop. It is access via an external staircase in the outside yard of the shop. The adjoining buildings either side of the application property are similarly arranged with commercial at ground floor and residential over. A brick wall some 1.7 metres in height denotes the shared boundaries to the side but this drops in height after only some 1 metre in lengthPROPOSAL:The development sought for has been advertised as erection of a first floor white PVCu conservatory with polycarbonate roof above existing rear extension• Planning permission is sought for a single storey rear extension to measure (at max) approx; 2.3 metres in height, 3.25 metres in length, and 1.8 metres in widthRELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY: NoneRELEVANT PLANNING POLICIES:South East Plan 2009BE1, CC6, CC1Worthing Core Strategy16Worthing Local Plan 2003H16, H18National AdvicePPS1REPRESENTATIONS AND RELEVANT CONSULTATION RESPONSES:Borough Environmental Health - See atttach precautionary contamination conditionPLANNING ASSESSMENT: IntroductionThe principle planning concerns with this development are its impact visually and upon neighbours. No ground works are proposed so imposing the precuationary contamination condition would be unreasonable.VisualThe extension is an atypical conservatory design and would be elevated so it would be noticeable, especially as its plastic material and finishes would contrast with the exposed brick work of the host building. Nonetheless, it is to be positioned on the 'back end' of the terrace, which exhibits little design merit as the properties along it have been inappropriately altered substantially over time at its rear. Moreover, it would not be conspicuously visible to the wider public as it is positioned along a side access road and a good distance from the more trafficked St Lawrence Avenue.NeighboursImpact upon the living conditions of occupiers of both flats which flank the application property is inevitable as the extension would bring built form deeper onto the boundaries and, in doing so, reduce the light and curtail the outlook to the rooms of each neighbour nearest to each boundary.However the applicant has demonstrated that the shadow cast by the extension onto the window of the adjoining neighbour would be

within an acceptable 'tolerance'. For the same reason overbearing effect would not be unduly adverse.Since the neighbour to the other side is further away than that of the one adjoining, any impact would be of a lesser degree.In assessing the impact, it is also recognised the existing brick walls to each side boundary creates its own negative impact upon light and outlook to the affected rooms.Unacceptable loss of privacy is negated through obscure glazing to the entirely of the sides of the extension.ConclusionFor the reasons already detailed above there is little justification to resist the application.RECOMMENDATION:Approved, subject to the following conditions:1. Standard time limit2. Plans approved3. Obscure glazed to entirely of both flanksREASONS 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/ADELEGATED Case
OfficerSign.....[redacted].....Date....23/5/11.....Autho
rising OfficerSign.....Date.....

Consultations and Representations

Consultations/Comments

Planning Assesment:

Recommendation:

Approve, subject to the condition(s):

~~OR~~

~~Refuse for the following reason(s)~~

Reasons for Recommendation:

The proposal complies/~~conflicts~~ 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 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 this decision complies with the Human Rights Act 1998, with regard to Article 8 and Article 1

OR

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 this decision complies with the Human Rights Act 1998, with regard to Article 8 and Article 1

Is recommendation contrary to letter (s) of representation?

~~No/Yes~~/NA

DELEGATED

Case Officer
Sign..... 23/5/11 .....Date..... 25 .....

Authorising Officer
Sign..... [redacted] .....Date..... 25.5.11 .....