Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/0098/25 Recommendation – REFUSE

Site: 48 Maytree Avenue Worthing West Sussex BN14 0HL

Proposal: Rooms in roof consisting of front and rear dormers and hip to barn end roof extensions

Date of site visit: 18.02.25

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Site and Surroundings

The property comprises a detached bungalow on the east side of Maytree Avenue. The property is set back from the road with parking/driveway/garden to the front and raised up from the road. The bungalow is 'P' Shaped with a forward projection. It has a bonnet style roof with the forward projection with a hipped tiled roof. The forward projection has a bay window. The property is a mixture of render and brick detailing. There is a single storey flat roof extension to the rear.

The three properties to the south are a similar style to No 48 although there is evidence of rooms in the roof space lit by rooflight windows and dormers.

The property to the north is a different style of property and has a small flat roof dormer to the front. The immediate neighbouring properties to the site are bungalows with some full two storey development further down the street.

Proposal

The application proposes extending up the hip end roof to the north and south sides to produce a gable with small hipped end at the top. At the front an offset dormer is proposed with a tiled skirt roof with a flat top. Two casement style windows are proposed to the dormer. Two rooflight windows are also proposed. At the rear a larger dormer is proposed which is set in from the side elevation and set down from the new ridge. The dormer would have a similar tiled skirt roof with a flat top. Two larger casement style windows are proposed to the dormer.

The extension would provide 3 additional bedroom, one en-suite and a bathroom in the created roof space.

Representations:

None received.

Relevant Planning Policies

National Planning Policy Framework (HCLG 2024)
National Planning Practice Guidance
SPG ‘Extending or Altering Your Home’ (WBC)

Worthing Local plan 2023 (WLP)

DM5 - QUALITY OF THE BUILT ENVIRONMENT
DM16 - SUSTAINABLE DESIGN

Planning Assessment

There is no objection in principle to extensions and alterations to residential dwellings within the built-up area. The key considerations are the effects on the visual and residential amenities of the locality.

Visual Amenity

The National Planning Policy Framework advises in Paragraph 131 that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, creates better places in which to live and work and helps make development acceptable to communities. Paragraph 135 indicates that development should: (b) be visually attractive and (c) sympathetic to local character and history, and in Paragraph 139 states: “Development that is not well designed should be refused especially where it fails to reflect local design guidance and supplementary planning documents such as design guides and codes”.

Policy DM5 of the WLP requires all new development to (amongst other things) be of a high architectural and design quality and respect and enhance the character of the site and the prevailing character of the area; enhance the local environment by way of its appearance and character with particular attention being paid to the architectural form, height, materials, density, scale, orientation, landscaping, impact on street scene and the layout of the development; and make a positive contribution to the sense of place, local character and distinctiveness of an area

The Council’s Supplementary Planning Guidance ‘Extending or Altering your Home’ indicates the size and shape of any extension should normally be designed to ensure the original house remains the larger and more dominant feature, its design should be consistent with your existing property's style and shape and that roof extensions and dormers are often highly visible and alien features which greatly alter the appearance of a dwelling.

The existing bungalow is a modest detached bungalow which is in keeping with the scale and form of other bungalows to either side and in the near vicinity of the rest of the street. The proposal would involve hip to gable extensions, albeit with small hip ends, to the roof and large partly flat roof dormers to the front and rear one of which is offset. The extensions would create a whole new roof form and roof additions. The design of dormers would be overly large, clumsy and unsympathetic.

The character of this part of Maytree Avenue is prominently of single storey bungalows. In particular 48 (the site), 46, 44 and 42 are the same style of bungalow with a characterful style of hipped roof and forward single storey projection. Although there are examples, even of this style of property that have gone up to first floor level, these are lit either with rooflights or sympathetic dormer extensions in scale and character with the size of the dwelling.

To create a roof extension to this extent on this simple bungalow would have a significant visual impact on both the architectural form and integrity of the building itself, and the street scene it sits within.

It is also considered that the two proposed windows in the front dormer results in a cluttered appearance which doesn't relate to the design of the windows at ground floor. It contributes to the building feeling top heavy.

As such the proposal would be out of scale and proportion with the existing dwelling and of poor design and appearance impacting on the character of the existing dwelling and the street scene

The proposal would therefore be contrary to the NPPF and local plan policies.

Residential Amenity

The most affected properties are 50 and 46 Maytree Avenue.

In terms of No 50 to the north this property has its garage closest to the property, the main dwelling is therefore set away from the boundary. The increase in gable end wall close to the boundary would have some impact in terms of loss of light and visual impact, however in view of the distances between the properties it is not considered that it would cause undue loss of light or visual impact so as to refuse the application on this basis. There are no additional windows on the flank elevations and as such no additional overlooking. The rear dormer would cause oblique distance overlooking of the garden of No 50, which is not considered to be detrimental.

With regards to 46 to the south, the roof extension would be set away from the boundary due to the existing garage. The extension would be north and although there would be potential for additional visual impact the windows in the north elevation of No 46 are likely to be secondary or non-habitable windows and as such it is not considered that the proposal would have an impact on loss of light or prospect to this property.

There are no additional windows on the flank elevations and as such no additional overlooking. The rear dormer would cause oblique distance overlooking of the garden of No 46, which is not considered to be detrimental.

The properties at the rear off Sullington Gardens are at such a distance not to be impacted by the proposal.

Recommendation

REFUSE for the reason:-

1. The proposed roof extension and dormers by reason of the size, design, bulk and form would constitute a visually discordant addition, out of keeping with the design and appearance of the existing dwelling and surrounding development and detrimental to the street scene. The proposal is therefore contrary to policy DM5 of the Worthing Local Plan 2023, Supplementary Planning Guidance "Extending or Altering Your Home" and the relevant policies of the National Planning Policy Framework

Informative

The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by identifying matters of concern with the proposal and determining the application within a timely manner, clearly setting out the reason(s) for refusal, allowing the Applicant the opportunity to consider the harm caused and whether or not it can be remedied by a revision to the proposal. The Local Planning Authority offers a pre-application service should the applicant wish to apply with a revised proposal.

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

Case Officer: Jackie Fox Date: 19/03/2025

Authorised by: Louise Prew Date: 19/03/2025