Expiry Date - 04/07/2023

Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/0598/23 **Recommendation – APPROVE**

Site: **133 Singleton Crescent Worthing West Sussex BN12 5DJ**

Proposal: **Single storey rear extension; render and cladding to West elevation. Part garage removed (resubmission of AWDM/2003/22)**

Date of site visit: 01/02/23 – previous application

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Site and Surroundings

The site is located to the east side of Singleton Crescent within a residential area of Worthing. The site backs on to the playing fields at the St Oscar Romero Catholic School to the east. The property comprises of a detached bungalow with brick, tile hung and rendered elevations and gables to the front and rear. The property is set back from the road behind a low wall and paved driveway. There is a carport to the side in front of the garage and a conservatory to the rear.

The property is not within a conservation area, is not a listed building and there are no protected trees on site.

Proposal

Planning permission is sought for a single storey rear extension and render and cladding to the front elevation. The existing conservatory and part of the existing garage would be demolished. This application is a resubmission of AWDM/2003/22 and proposes an increase in depth of the rear extension.

The proposed rear extension would be increased in depth by 0.6m from 4.4m deep as previously approved, to 5m deep. All other dimensions would remain as approved at 7.95m wide with a crown roof of about 2.85m high. The extension would be finished in materials to match the existing building with windows and bi-fold doors to the rear. A section of garage to the front of approximately 4.35m long would be demolished to accommodate the extension.

Approved alterations to the front elevation include removing the existing windows and replacing them with two equally sized and spaced windows and a change of materials to render and cladding board in oak. The render and cladding would be divided vertically and off centre. Windows and doors would be removed to the north and south side elevations and a new window inserted

to the north side (serving bedroom 1) and a new door to the south side (serving the utility room).

Relevant Planning History:

AWDM/2003/22 - Single storey rear extension; render and cladding to West elevation. Part garage removed - Approved

97/05773/FULL - Erection of conservatory at rear - Approved

Consultations:

WSCC Highways – This application is re-submission of AWDM/2003/22 and seeks an approval for construction of single storey rear extension; render and cladding to West elevation and partial removal of the existing garage. The proposal does not include any alterations to the scheme that would impact previous highways comments, therefore they would still be considered relevant.

Previous Highways comments:

The site is located and accessed off Singleton Crescent which is an unclassified road subject to 30mph speed limit.

There are no proposed alterations to the existing vehicular access. An inspection of data supplied to WSCC by Sussex Police over a period of the past five years reveals that there have been no recorded injury accidents within the site vicinity. Therefore, there is no evidence to suggest that the existing access is operating unsafely or that the proposal would exacerbate an existing safety concern.

Given the small-scale nature of proposal, the Local Highways Authority (LHA) would not anticipate material intensification of use onto Singleton Crescent or the wider road network.

The proposal may result in a loss of a parking space due to the decreased size of the existing garage. The Local Highways Authority (LHA) does not consider that the potential shortfall of one space result in an unacceptable impact on the highway safety in this location, however the Local Planning Authority (LPA) may wish to consider any implications on on-street parking from an amenity perspective.

Conclusion
The LHA does not consider that this proposal would have an unacceptable impact on highway safety or result in 'severe' cumulative impacts on the operation of the highway network, therefore is not contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework (paragraph 111), and that there are no transport grounds to resist the proposal.

Representations:

None received

Relevant Planning Policies

Worthing Local Plan policies (WBC 2023): SP1, DM5
National Planning Policy Framework (HCLG 2021)
National Planning Practice Guidance
SPG 'Extending or Altering Your Home' (WBC)

Planning Assessment

The principle of development has already been approved by application AWDM/2003/22. The only change proposed by this application is an increase in depth of the rear extension. The key considerations for this application are therefore the effects on the visual and residential amenities of the locality as a result of the increased depth of the extension.

Visual Amenity

The application property is set back behind a deep grass verge with access across to the driveway. The carport and front of the garage are both visible from the road but set back behind timber gates. The proposed extension to the rear would be partly visible due to removal of the front section of garage but would be set back at the rear of the building, would not extend beyond the side walls of the existing bungalow and would continue the eaves detail with a crown roof. The increase in depth of the rear extension would not adversely affect the visual amenities of the locality.

Residential Amenity

The most affected properties are the neighbours to the sides at No.131 and 135.

No.131 is located to the north of the site and has a single storey extension to the rear. The proposed rear extension would extend approximately 3.1m further back than the neighbour's extension and is set in from the boundary fence by 1.75m. The extension (as amended) would not extend beyond a line projected at 45 degrees from the midpoint of the neighbour's rear facing doors and would not appear overbearing or oppressive or affect light to the neighbour's principal rooms or garden. The window to the south side of the neighbour's extension is high level and obscure glazed and would not suffer any significant overshadowing or diminished light from the proposed extension at its increased depth. No openings are proposed to the side of the extension and no overlooking or loss of privacy would occur.

No.135 is located to the south of the application site and does not extend as far as No.133 to the rear. There is a garage and various sheds adjacent to the north boundary within the neighbour's garden and a garage adjacent to the boundary at the application site which would be partly demolished to accommodate the proposed extension. The proposed rear extension would be

screened from No.135 by the high boundary wall and their own garage both of which extend further forwards than the rear elevation and garage at No.133. The extension is approximately 2.5m from the boundary with this neighbour and would have no adverse impact on their amenities. No openings are proposed to the side of the extension and no overlooking or loss of privacy would occur.

There would be no detrimental impact on the residential amenities of adjacent occupiers as a result of the increased depth of the extension.

Parking

Sufficient parking to serve the property would be retained to the front and side of the building. There would be no additional demand for on-street parking as a result of this proposal.

Recommendation

APPROVE subject to Conditions:-

1. Drawing Numbers
2. Standard time limit
3. Materials as specified
4. No openings to side elevations of extension

Informative

The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by assessing the proposal against all material considerations, including planning policies and any representations that may have been received and subsequently determining to grant planning permission in accordance with the presumption in favour of sustainable development, as set out within the National Planning Policy Framework.

Is recommendation contrary to letter(s) of representation? N

Case Officer: Amanda Haslett Date: 23/06/23

Authorised by: Jo Morin Date: 26.06.2023