



**DECISION NOTICE
LITTLEHAMPTON TOWN COUNCIL
NOTICE OF DECISION MADE BY THE PLANNING AND TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE
MEETING DATE: MONDAY 7TH DECEMBER 2015**

APPLICATION No.	SITE ADDRESS	WARD
LU/311/15/HH	6 Carvel Way Littlehampton BN17 6RJ	Brookfield
DESCRIPTION: Single storey rear extension & first floor side extension over garage. (Resubmission following LU/161/15/HH)		
DECISION: <i>Councillor Purchase re-declared his personal and prejudicial interest in this matter as the applicants' daughter was a close personal friend of his and he left the meeting.</i> 107.2.1 The Committee received a report from the Planning Officer on the matter. He explained that this revised scheme had been submitted following the refusal of a previous application which proposed the construction of single and two storey extensions to the property. He stated that the revised scheme had resolved the concerns identified in the previous application regarding the impact on residential amenity. However, the proposed tile hung extension was out of keeping with the area and the proposed construction materials meant that the extension would not integrate with the host dwelling. The application was therefore recommended for refusal. 107.2.2 The Committee then heard, under Public Speaking, from Mr Gander, the Agent who spoke in support of the application. Mr Gander stated that although the original proposals were based on an existing extension on the adjoining property, working with the Planning Department he had produced revised scheme which had received a favourable response from Officers. Details of the materials had not formed part of the pre-application advice given and his client had been distressed that the revised scheme was not supported. He explained that the improvements to the property were required to support his client who had health issues. Observing that there were a variety of different styles of extensions throughout the Beaumont Park Estate, he stated that in his clients view, the proposals would enhance the property and the vicinity. However, if the design was contentious, he confirmed that his client was willing to work with the Planning Authority to resolve these issues. In conclusion and noting that there were no objections, he sought the support the Committee for the revised scheme. 107.2.3 The Committee then heard, under Public Speaking, from Councillor Gammon, the Ward Councillor, who spoke in support of the application. Councillor Gammon explained that he had undertaken a site visit and examined the proposals. Noting that the proposed alterations were within the footprint of the property as originally constructed, he considered that the plans would significantly improve the front elevations of the property. Bearing in mind the applicants' willingness to work with the Planning Authority on the design, he therefore urged the Committee to support to the revised scheme. 107.2.3 In response, the Planning Officer highlighted the key considerations in determining the application regarding the need to ensure that any proposed changes were both sympathetic to the host dwelling and in harmony with the surrounding street scene. The revised scheme as it stood did not conform to these requirements. However, if the Committee was minded to approve the scheme he stated that these issues could be partly addressed by way of a condition regarding suitable materials. 107.2.4 The Committee went on to consider the application in more detail and discussion focussed on the size of the extension and the impact it would have on the surrounding area. Members recognised that there were a variety of different styles of extensions in the immediate vicinity. In view of the fact that the property was at the end of a terrace, the extension was not considered overbearing. The Committee did however acknowledge the Officers concerns regarding the proposed materials. Noting the applicants' willingness to work with the Planning Authority on the design, the Committee considered that the issues with materials could be resolved. It was therefore RESOLVED that: <u>The application be approved with a condition that the materials used are sympathetic to the host dwelling and in harmony with the surrounding street scene.</u>		
VOTE: FOR: 3 AGAINST: 0 ABSTENTIONS: 0 PETER HERBERT Town Clerk		