Expiry Date - 17/01/2025

Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/1486/24 **Recommendation – APPROVE**

Site: **25 Lansdowne Road Worthing West Sussex BN11 4NA**

Proposal: **Rooms in roof including raised ridge, proposed rear dormer, two storey rear infill extension to replace existing conservatory, changes to fenestration, provision of air source heat pump and outdoor kitchen.**

Date of site visit: 13/01/25

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Site and Surroundings

The site is located to the south side of Lansdowne Road within a predominantly residential area of Worthing. The site is located outside of but within 50m of the Heene Conservation Area which lies to the west and south-west of the site. The property comprises a two-storey detached house with flint and brick elevations, brick quoins, arched window heads, decorative string course and a balcony above the front door to the frontage and render to the sides and rear. The property has a hipped roof with twin valley to the rear and has been previously extended with a two storey monopitch roof extension. There is a conservatory to the rear corner of the building and a large mature garden. There is an outbuilding to the east side of the building screened behind a high rendered wall that adjoins the side of the house with a pedestrian door through to the garden beyond. Behind this wall is a courtyard area enclosed by a further wall aligned with the rear of the house and to the east side by the boundary wall.

The property is not a listed building. There is a group of protected Yew trees to the north and east boundaries of the site to the front of the building.

Proposal

Planning permission is sought to raise the ridge of the building and add a rear dormer to form rooms in the roof, a two storey extension to the rear, an Air Source Heat Pump (ASHP) to the west side and outdoor kitchen to the east side.

The ridge of the building would be raised by 0.5m and the twin valley to the rear infilled to form a hipped roof to all sides with concealed flat roof to the top with roof light above. The new roof would be finished in tiles to match the existing roof.

A flat roof dormer would be constructed to the rear measuring approximately 2.25m wide x 2.1m high x 3.2m deep. The dormer cheeks and face would be finished in standing seam lead cladding with a GRP flat roof with concealed box gutter and mid grey aluminium framed windows. Two roof lights would be added to the rear, positioned either side of the dormer serving a bathroom and dressing room and one high level roof light to the east side serving the bedroom.

The new accommodation within the roof would provide a master bedroom, dressing room and ensuite bathroom, accessed via stairs within the proposed dormer.

The existing conservatory to the rear south-west corner of the building would be removed and replaced with a two storey extension measuring approximately 3.35m wide x 3.45m deep with a monopitch roof to match the eaves and ridge height of the existing rear extension. The extension would accommodate a utility/drying room at ground floor with doors to the rear and a bathroom at first floor with a window to the rear. The rear extension would be finished in white render and tiles to match the existing building.

Ground floor openings to the rear and east side elevations of the existing and proposed rear extension would be replaced with enlarged multi-pane doors and windows within black painted steel frames.

An air source heat pump is proposed to the west side of the house consisting of an ‘aroTHERM plus’ 12kW unit. The ASHP would be positioned approximately 3.8m back from the front of the house and 14m back from the pavement edge and behind the existing side gate. A detailed specification and MCS 020 Planning Standards Assessment have been submitted with the application.

An outdoor kitchen would be formed within the enclosed courtyard area to the east side of the building, including a polycarbonate roof of 2.1m high supported on steel columns and extract flue above the BBQ.

Various other works are shown on the plans however these do not require planning permission including:

The white painted timber sash boxes would be retained and the single glazed windows replaced within existing openings with double glazed timber frame units to match throughout the property.

Solar panels would be installed to the west side of the main roof and to the south roof of the rear extension.

The existing outbuilding to the east side of the house would be converted to use as a home office.

Relevant Planning History:

Various TPO tree works applications

Expiry Date - 17/01/2025

Consultations:

Environmental Health - The Noise Impact Assessment has demonstrated that the air source heat pump complies with MCS Planning Standards for permitted development of air source heat pumps. Therefore we have no objection to this aspect of the application, providing the air source heat pump is installed in the location where the assessment was undertaken as shown in Plan SK241115-01.

In addition to the above, please may the following conditions be attached to any permission granted, in order to protect nearby residential amenity:

Construction Noise Hours
Works of construction or demolition, including the use of plant and machinery, necessary for implementation of this consent shall be limited to the following times:

Monday - Friday 08:00 - 18:00 Hours
Saturday 09:00 - 13:00 Hours
Sundays and Bank Holidays no work permitted

Any temporary exception to these working hours shall be agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority at least five days in advance of works commencing. The contractor shall notify the local residents in writing at least three days before any such works.

Officer response - The application is a householder application. It is not the Council's normal practice to impose conditions on hours of construction for domestic extensions. It is considered that the recommended condition is not proportionate to the potential risk of harm from noise and disturbance during construction works.

Tree & Landscape Officer - . Although I do not consider that the TPO trees could be affected, I do consider that some tree protection might be appropriate.

My main concern is storage of materials and traffic etc. so recommend:

1. No storage or use of materials, plant or machinery within 1 metre of the trunk of any existing tree to be retained on this or adjoining sites.

The trees in the front garden are adjacent to a hard standing so I do not consider that the protection area needs to be the usual 12 times the diameter of the trunk.

Representations:

None received

Relevant Planning Policies

Worthing Local Plan policies (WBC 2023): SP1, DM5
National Planning Policy Framework (MHCLG 2024)
National Planning Practice Guidance
SPG 'Extending or Altering Your Home' (WBC)

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 street scene is varied in character with a mix of detached and semi-detached two storey houses of different form, scale and appearance. To the east of the site is a house of the same design and form. To the west of the site is a detached two storey house and further west a three storey purpose built block of flats and to the north opposite the site is a four storey block of flats.

The application building is set back from the road behind a flint wall with dense screening to the frontage provided by mature Yew trees all of which are protected trees. Limited views of the property frontage are possible from the driveway opening at the front of the site.

Due to the mature Yew trees that surround the site only very limited views of the roof are possible. The proposal includes raising the ridge by 0.5m but maintains the current roof pitch to form a flat roof area to the top. The increase in ridge height is not excessive and would not appear out of keeping with the differing ridge heights of surrounding properties. The flat roof would be hidden by the hipped roof and ridge tiles and would not compromise the character of the building. The replacement of the twin valley roof with a hipped roof to the rear would only be visible from the rear of the property as the pitch would remain the same. The proposed rear dormer is well designed with a traditional standing seam lead finish that complements the character of the property and proportions that do not dominate the roofscape.

The proposed rear extension would infill the corner of the property with the roof form, materials and height matching those of the existing rear extension. It is also noted that the property to the east (of the same design) has already infilled this corner in the same manner. The extension would be subsidiary in form and scale and would reflect the character and appearance of the existing building. Limited views of this part of the house are possible however the extension is set back at the rear of the property and there would be no harm to the surrounding street scene.

The proposed changes to ground floor openings to the rear and east side of the extension would not be visible from surrounding roads and would complement the character of the property.

The ASHP is located down the side of the house and hidden behind the existing side gate. No part of this addition would be visible from the public realm.

The outdoor kitchen would be hidden behind the existing outbuilding and wall to the east side of the house. The polycarbonate roof and flue would be lower than the adjacent wall which would screen all views of this part of the proposal.

There would be no adverse impact on the character of the property or street scene or harm to the visual amenities of the locality as a result of this application.

Residential Amenity

The most affected neighbours are those to the sides at the flats at No.23 and No.27 Lansdowne Road and to the rear at No.38 and No.40 St Michaels Road.

The flats at No.23 are located over 11.5m to the east side of the application site within a property of the same form, scale and alignment. The boundary to this side is formed by a 2.6m high wall that extends the depth of the house and a fence, mature trees and hedging to the rear garden. The increase in ridge height, changes to the rear roof and addition of a dormer would not result in any loss of light or overshadowing to the neighbour's property. The relatively small scale of the roof extensions would not appear overbearing or oppressive to neighbours. The proposed dormer is centrally located on the rear roof slope and would not result in overlooking or loss of privacy. Changes to openings are at ground floor level and screened by the existing high boundary wall. The east facing roof light is positioned above 1.7m from finished floor level and would not result in overlooking or loss of privacy. The addition of an outdoor kitchen, BBQ and flue would not be considered to increase noise or smells above those typically associated with incidental use of the garden of a dwelling house.

The flats at No.27 are located approximately 4.7m away from the west side of the application property. No.27 is set back further in its plot and extends much further to the rear. The boundary is formed by a fence and trellis to the side of the house and mature trees and hedges to the rear garden. The increase in ridge height, changes to the rear roof and addition of a dormer would be closer to this property but due to their fairly small scale and position away from the boundary these additions are not considered to result in any loss of light or overshadowing to the neighbour's property or appear overbearing or oppressive. The proposed dormer is centrally located on the rear roof slope and would not result in overlooking or loss of privacy.

The main impact on this property is from the proposed two storey side extension to the south-west corner of the building. There are four windows to the east side of No.27 opposite the proposed extension. These windows serve a bedroom at ground floor and living room at first floor but are secondary windows to the main larger openings to the front. The proposed extension would bring the side wall of the existing rear extension closer by approximately 3.35m but would retain a gap of 4.7m. Although outlook from these side windows would be affected, this impact due to the secondary nature of the windows and the

space between properties would not be considered significantly detrimental to neighbouring amenity. Light to these windows would not be significantly diminished by this proposal. The monopitch roof form of the extension would further reduce the impact on No.27. There are no windows to the side of the proposed extension and no overlooking or loss of privacy would occur.

The ASHP would be located 1.1m from the boundary with No.27 and 7.6m from the nearest habitable room assessment position of the nearest dwelling. Full details of the ASHP including the MCS 020 Planning Standards Assessment Form have been provided with the application and these demonstrate that noise from the ASHP would be within the specified limits and would not therefore cause a noise nuisance to neighbours. The unit is tucked away at the side of the house and away from neighbouring windows and would not adversely affect neighbouring amenity.

The boundary with the properties to the rear is over 22.5m from the proposed rear dormer and new first floor rear window and at this distance there would be no significant overlooking or loss of privacy to these neighbours.

There would be no significant detrimental impact on the residential amenities of adjoining occupiers as a result of this application.

Recommendation

APPROVE subject to Conditions:-

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

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: 29/01/25

Authorised by: Date: