

REPRESENTATIONS

14 WORTHING ROAD EAST PRESTON BN16 1AZ EP/93/15/HH



1 INTRODUCTION

- 1.01 These representations are made on behalf of Mr & Mrs Fraser of 16 Worthing Road, East Preston BN16 1AZ.

2 PLANNING ISSUES

Over-development

- 2.01 The proposed development would more than double the footprint of the dwelling; the increase would be about 125%. The proposed building would fill the width of the site and project substantially at the front and rear. The extensions would take the property from an appropriately-sized building for its plot and area to a sprawling structure occupying a disproportionate amount of the curtilage. This would not represent high quality design and layout and would be contrary to Arun District Local Plan policy GEN7, including (ii), and East Preston Neighbourhood Plan policy 4.

Scale

- 2.02 The scale of the proposed extensions would be inappropriately large in relation to the existing dwelling. Their combined size would not relate sympathetically to the existing building. The resultant building would appear cramped on the plot. The combined extensions would not be subservient to the main building but would dominate it. This would conflict with local plan policy DEV19 (i) (ii) and neighbourhood plan policies 1 and 4 and paragraph 4.16.

Out of keeping

- 2.03 The properties in the vicinity are set back from their front boundaries on a building line consistent to the west and graduated to the east, without significant structures in front of the main buildings. There are lawns and landscaping in front of the houses. This is part of the established character of the area. The proposal would result in a substantial volume of building projecting about 6.5m in front of the main house, at odds with the pattern of development. This would fail to accord with local plan policy DEV19 (v).

Design & appearance

- 2.04 The substantial single-storey extensions would subsume and not relate well to the two-storey main house. The extensions are designed in many sections with hipped crown roofs which would not integrate with the rectangular form of the main house and its pitched roof. The side and rear of the application building are open to view from the adjoining Langmead Recreation Ground and from the access path to it. This would increase the impact of the unsympathetic design. The existing projections are modest and preserve the simple form of the building. The roofs of the various extensions would extend up the sill level of the first floor windows. The combined effect of the extensions would be to change the nature of the property. Its form and proportions would be lost to the detriment of its appearance. The proposal would not comply with local plan policies GEN 7 (ii) and DEV19 (i), neighbourhood plan policy 1 and paragraph 4.16, and NPPF paragraphs 56, 58 and 64.

Character

- 2.05 The neighbourhood plan (paragraph 4.28) says preservation of the historic character is the priority in this area and new buildings should be appropriate to a village setting. The location of the proposed extensions in the front garden, their design and the inevitable loss of greenery at the front of the property to provide parking and turning space, would be harmful to the identified character. This would conflict with neighbourhood plan policies 1 and 4 and paragraph 4.16, and NPPF paragraphs 58 and 64.

Impact on 16 Worthing Road

- 2.06 The section of rear extension closest to 16 Worthing Road would project about 7.5m beyond the rear wall of 16 Worthing Road. This would present an

expanse of blank brick wall to 16 Worthing Road with the roof above that. This section of extension would be higher than the others at the rear and extend up to just above sill level of the first floor windows of the application building. This size and projection of building would be overbearing in the outlook from the dining area bay window and in the rear garden of 16 Worthing Road immediately behind the house. The sitting room and garden currently enjoy an open aspect to the west and the proposed extension would be oppressive. The occupiers are concerned that the proposed extension would also take sun light from their garden, dining area and sitting room in the afternoon and evening, to the detriment of their amenity. This would not be in accordance with local plan policies GEN7 (iv) and DEV19 (iii) and NPPF paragraph 17 (bullet 4).

Other points

- 2.07 The west elevation does not show a door which appears on the floor plan.

3 CONCLUSION

- 3.01 The proposal would be harmful to the existing building, to the character and appearance of the area and to the neighbouring occupier. It is not in accordance with development plan policy or with the NPPF.

7 August 2015

SPEER DADE Planning Consultants

29 Kings Drive
Hassocks
BN6 8DX

01273 843737

roy@speerdade.co.uk
www.speerdade.co.uk