DELEGATED APPLICATIONS ASSESSMENT SHEET

Application No: 11/0054/FULL	Recommendation – Approve subject to conditions
Site	51 Half Moon Lane Worthing West Sussex BN13 2EP
Proposal:	Ground and first floor side extensions, single storey rear extension, alterations to existing ground floor elevations and erection of detached double garage in frontage. Revisions to roof extensions and deletion of front garage.

Date of Site Visit:16.5.11

Neighbours Checked: Y

Additional Neighbours Notified (List Addressess): N

Site and Surroundings

The application property is an inter war chalet bungalow which has been much extended and altered over the years. It resides in an outer residential suburb just south of the A27 comprising mainly detached one off houses and chalet bungalows dating from this period and late twentieth century. These are generally set in relatively large and mature landscaped plots and recessed from the road by deep front gardens and lying on elevated ground. Half Moon Lane is a narrow, bendy road which rises from south to north and features dense planting including many mature trees and has a semi rural ambience.

The area also possesses a number of listed buildings from an earlier period in nearby Salvington Rd and these and the overall pattern of development and landscaping and terrain led to the area's designation as a Salvington Conservation Area.

The application property itself comprises a chalet cottage with a gable frontage and front dormer, large ground floor bay window and porch . It is faced in render and tudorbethan timbers with plain tiled roof. A flat roofed and very deep single storey extension (formerly a garage but now converted to living accommodation) has been added to its southern flank which also includes a larger roof terrace. A single storey flat roofed extension has also been added to the northern flank. Both sit forward of the front of the main chalet and feature bays and are finished to match the parent building. A two storey flat roof extension has been added to the rear and also a large conservatory. A 1957 Tree Preservation Order protects one tree in the front garden, close to the pavement.

The front garden is large and contains open parking for several vehicles. It is partly soft landscaped and is substantially screened from Half Moon Lane by several mature trees. It sits on rising ground and benefits from al large rear garden , largely screened from the neighbour properties by substantial fences, outbuildings and vegetation. The exception is a two storey extension to No 53 to the north which forms the common boundary at this point and includes a high level window.

No 53 to the north is also a much extended house, sitting on higher ground and set back behind No 51. The facing elevation of the two storey side/front extension is blank save

the ground floor high level window above and a small secondary window to that appears to be a bedroom (primary window is faces west), it features a substantial single storey rear extension and large pitched roof garage just in front of the two addition referred to above. A large beech tree also marks the common boundary at this point.

No 49 sits to the south on slightly lower ground and is a modest chalet bungalow set back from the common boundary but on a similar building line. Its facing north elevation is blank save for a secondary window to a bedroom(primary window faces east). Planning permission for substantial extensions were granted in 2008 but are unimplemented.

Details of Proposal

The proposal has been revised following negotiations to improve its quality of design and reduce its bulk adjacent to its flanking neighbours and remove a detached garage in the forecourt.

The current scheme comprises the addition of a second storey above both of the existing single storey flank extensions and replacement of the existing conservatory with a larger addition. The southern extension is half hipped with small front and rear roof dormers, pitched and flat roofed respectively. The northern flank extension runs of the existing ridge of the main roof and is gabled at the front and hipped at the back with flat roofed dormer. It sits back slightly form the existing single storey building. The front gable is rendered and timbered to match the existing building and the conservatory runs the width of the extended building, excepting it is set in 2 ms on the northern edge. The front porch is also extended and another bullseye window added. There are no new flank windows in the upper floors except an obscure glazed window apiece in the southern and northern wing extensions which serve a bedroom and bathroom respectively .

Consultations and Representations

Council arboriculturlaist

The beech tree on the neighbouring 53 Half Moon Lane has a significant fault which may result in a considerably reduced Safe Useful Life Expectancy of 5 years which would mean that a TPO was not suitable. The holly and group of small conifers and maples in the back garden are not prominent enough to be significant in the Conservation Area.

No 53 Half Moon Lane

Having previously viewed the original proposed plans at your offices in February of this year, we are not fully sure of the difference between those and the plans you have sent us a copy of now. However, the objections made in our previous correspondence (copy enclosed for your convenience) still stand so please read in conjunction with our further comments thus:-

ANY first floor extension (highlighted on the plan for clarification) added to next door within one metre of our common boundary would result in the overall bulk over-shadowing and dwarfing our property, given it's elevated position of further up the hill. It is worth pointing out at this stage that the roof-line of the ground floor building here has already been raised more than a foot.

The proposed first-floor storey would face the side of our property (highlighted on the plan for clarification) where our back door provides access to and from our rear garden and amenities which is in daily use,

and, therefore, would be totally over-bearing and constantly 'in your face' every time we used said door and facilities.

I trust our objections and comments will be considered seriously and fairly, as the granting of permission for such an unnecessarily-huge over-development would certainly be detrimental to our enjoyment of our own facilities.

2 Lowther Rd

Thank you for your letter of 10th February regarding the application for planning permission of extensions and alterations to 51, Half Moon Lane. Having inspected the plans on 11th February, we now wish to submit our objections to the proposal to build first floor side extensions, as the first floor will overlook our property and deprive us of our privacy. 51, Half Moon Lane is already on considerable higher ground than our property, so a first floor extension on the side (south) of 51, will dominate the area to a considerable degree. We have no objections to the other proposed alterations.

However, we would like to bring to your attention the fact that the owner of 51, Half Moon Lane has already started work this week at the south side of his property, apparently raising and strengthening the roof and putting in a window, of what we believe is the present garage, so we are quite worried that he is going ahead without planning permission having been granted!

Planning Assessment:

The principal issues raised by this proposal are:-

- Principle of development
- Impact on the amenity of neighbours
- Impact on the integrity of the design of the property and character of the townscape/Conservation Area.

As such the proposal should be assessed against;

Saved Worthing Local Plan policies H16 and H18
Core Strategy Policy 16
Planning Policy Statement 3: Housing
Planning Policy Statement 1: Delivering Sustainable Development
PPS5: Protecting the Historical Environment
Salvington Conservation Area Appraisal
Worthing Borough Council Supplementary Planning Guidance: Altering Or Extending Your Home

Principle of development

The proposal upgrades living accommodation at this family house largely at upper floor level and leaves a large garden.

Impact on the amenity of neighbours

The extensions are individually large and cumulatively substantial. However, whilst both flanking neighbours to the north and south would suffer some impact, this is not considered to be sufficient to justify refusal, following the revisions negotiated to reduce their bulk adjacent to these neighbours.

The south wing extension sits a metre off the common boundary and altogether some 2.5 to 3 ms from the neighbour at No 53; is hipped with low eaves; lacks any clear windows in its southern flank at upper floor level (a rooflight serves a bedroom which is obscure glazed) and only marginally oversails the rear wall of No 53. This neighbour has only one

secondary window in this facing flank and no windows in the north facing two storey element of the building which faces north, nor in its approved two extension. Notwithstanding the small difference in ground levels, no unacceptable loss of light or outlook or unacceptable overlooking would arise for this property or its nearest garden area given the above and the fact that their principal rear garden lies to the south unaffected. Whilst the rear dormer does overlook the garden of No 49, this is no more than the existing rear dormer and far less than the current invasive overlooking from the adjacent roof terrace which would be removed in the scheme.

The north wing extension lies to the south of No 53 and does sit forward of this neighbour. However, whilst the extension is some 1.5 ms from the neighbour, it only marginally oversails the two storey element at the rear and omits any windows in its facing north flank. Moreover, the two storey element of No 53 is also largely blank on its facing south elevation. The only upper floor window in the facing elevation of No 53 is a secondary window on its western end. Given this relationship and the fact that the rear part (west) of the proposed upper floor extension is hipped with flat roofed dormer, well set back, no unacceptable impact would result. Moreover the only facing widow in the new extension at upper floor level serves a bath room and would be obscure glazed.

An upper floor window of no 53 in its east (front) elevation would suffer some loss of outlook and light but the separation distance and the set back of the new gable wing from the front of the existing building, together with the fact that this window is already screened by the large garage in front and still taller very closeby mature beech tree, do mean any unacceptable impacts are avoided.

There is a ground floor window in south face of the two storey element of No 53 facing the application site. Whilst the proposed replacement conservatory sits reasonably closeby, its form has been revised to be set back some 3.5 ms from this window which is at high level anyway and itself occupies a rather invasive an unneighbourly position on the common boundary. No objections have been received from this neighbour.

The neighbours at the rear are unaffected due to the separation distance and screening

Impact on the integrity of the design of the property and character of the townscape/Conservation Area.

The existing building has seen significant unsympathetic enlargement and alterations over time and consequently the character has been diluted and degraded and the composition now lacks coherence. Following the design refinement negotiated, the scheme would upgrade the quality of the property's appearance substantially by sensitive additions which respect and reinforce the period character of the building; are sympathetic in terms of scale and form and integrate the diverse and incongruous additions into a coherent whole.

The property as extended would be large but set back from the road, substantially screened by the extensive tree cover ad sympathetically designed, it would not appear obtrusive or incongruous, especially given the character of the majority of the properties along this stretch of the road and the characteristic gaps above single storey level would remain between the buildings. Certainly it would not overpower the neighbour properties due to its form and scale especially the low eaves and hipped roof adjacent No 49. A large and leafy garden would remain.

The Council arboriculturalist indicates the beech tree close to the north wing extension is in poor condition and its protection is not justified, despite the proximity of the proposed extension. Some cutting back of the crown may be necessary but is acceptable in amenity terms. The loss of a small tree to build the north wing extension is of no consequence for public amnesty.

The deletion of the incongruous and intrusive originally proposed double garage in the forecourt is most welcome improvement.

There is consequently no harm to the character or appearance of the Conservation Area or the semi rural ambience of Half Moon Lane.

Recommendation:

Approve, subject to the condition(s):

Time; build in accordance with plans ; reserve architectural details; no new windows in north and south upper floor flanks; obscure glaze flank upper floor windows; materials to match existing; no use of flat roofs as balcony; protect trees during construction; store equipment on site; dust suppression; restrict working hours during construction

Reasons for Recommendation:

The proposal would upgrade the living accommodation. Whilst the extensions are substantial, the scheme would not result in unacceptable amenity impacts on the neighbours due to the scale, form, siting and design of the extensions as amended and design and layout of the neighbouring properties themselves. The design is sympathetic to the period character of the property and the street and would not harm the Conservation Area . As such the proposals complies with Saved Worthing Local Plan policies H16 and H18; Core Strategy Policy 16; Planning Policy Statement 3: Housing; Planning Policy Statement 1: Delivering Sustainable Development ;PPS5: Protecting the Historical Environment; Salvington Conservation Area Appraisal; Worthing Borough Council Supplementary Planning Guidance: Altering Or Extending Your Home

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 the level of development proposed would not cause undue harm in terms of additional noise, disturbance and loss of privacy and that, on balance, existing residential quality of life would not be 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?

/Yes/

DELEGATED

Case Officer
Sign..... Date 28.11.11

Authorising Officer
Sign..... Date 28/11/11