DELEGATED APPLICATIONS ASSESSMENT SHEET

Application No: 11/0176/FULL	Recommendation – Approve Application
Site	1 Garrick Road Worthing West Sussex BN14 8BE
Proposal:	First floor side 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/11/0176/FULL – 1 Garrick Road DATE OF SITE VISIT: /0/11 NEIGHBOURS CHECKED: YADDITIONAL NEIGHBOUR NOTIFICATIONS (LIST ADDRESSES): NSITE AND SURROUNDINGS: The triangular site is on a corner of a quiet residential street with a pedestrian footpath running along the western site boundary. The surrounding properties are two-storey with inter-war period properties. The application property is one such property. It is one of a pair. It has rendered walls with tiled roof. PROPOSAL:The development sought for has been advertised as First floor side extensionThe proposal consists of: • First floor hipped roof side extension with hipped roof to existing single storey extension to measure (at max) approx; 5.5 metres in height, 8.6 metres in length, 3.4 metres in widthRELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY: 05/0824/FULLSingle storey extension to the side elevationGrant conditional consent 07-11-2005RELEVANT PLANNING POLICIES:South East PlanCC1, CC6, BE1Worthing Core Strategy16Worthing Local Plan 2003H16, H18Government AdvicePPS1REPRESENTATIONS AND RELEVANT CONSULTATION RESPONSES:Borough Environmental Health requests precautionary contamination condition be imposed.Borough Engineers comments relate to the disposal of surface water. In the absence of any ground investigation details or drainage details in support of the application we request that should approval for this extension be granted it be conditional such 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: IntroductionThe principle planning concerns with this development is its impact visually, and upon neighbours.Although Environmental Health has requested a precautionary contamination condition be imposed, the site is not identified as one at risk from contamination so an informative is sufficient to raise the applicant's awareness of the risk. The condition suggested by Engineers can be imposed as it is reasonable under the advice of PPS25 to avoid exacerbation of flood risk by increased surface water runoff.Visual The extension's design and style is similar to the inter-war design of the host building so there is some architectural integration. Its roof shape and form fits comfortably alongside the existing integral garage and house.Although the extension will unbalance the pair of properties, to a certain extent this has already occurred by the building out of a single storey side extension. Moreover the pair at situated on a corner plot the two properties, so are never 'read' truly face on. This allows for some additional built form onto

either end flank without unduly disrupting their symmetry. The set back of the extension from the front face of the host building so reduces its visual prominence.For these reasons, there is not sufficient justification to withhold permission on visual grounds alone.NeighboursThe neighbour principally affected is that one to the west (the extension is removed from the remainder).There is substantial distance between the extension and that neighbour, thus negating any adverse overbearing and overbearing effect. Some views would be afforded onto this neighbour but these would be oblique in nature and not invasive.ConclusionFor the above reasons the proposal would not have an unacceptable impact upon identified amenities. Therefore, approval should not be resisted.RECOMMENDATION:Approve subject to:-1. Standard time limit2. Plans as approved3. Materials and finishes to match existing 4. Full details for the disposal of surface water5. Notwithstanding "pd" no further windows/openings+ Precautionary contamination informativeREASONS 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?

6. Notwithstanding plans trick quisining to be installed.

N/ADELEGATED Case

OfficerSign.....[redacted].....Date.....24/5/11.....Authorising OfficerSign.....[redacted].....Date...26/5/11.....

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..... [redacted] .....Date.....24/5/11.....

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