Expiry Date - 31/07/2023

Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/0776/23 **Recommendation – REFUSE**

Site: **28 Terringes Avenue Worthing West Sussex BN13 1JE**

Proposal: **Proposed rooms in roof consisting of hip to gable roof extension with rear dormer and Juliet balcony.**

Date of site visit: 19/07/23

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Site and Surroundings

The site is located to the north side of Terringes Avenue within a residential area of Worthing. The property comprises of a semi-detached bungalow with brick plinth, soldier course and quoining detail and light grey rendered elevations beneath a tiled hipped roof. There is a projecting gable to the front which is mirrored on the attached property. The building is set back from the road behind a low wall and paved driveway. There is a good size garden to the rear of the property.

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 hip to gable roof extension and rear dormer with Juliet balcony.

The roof ridge would be extended to the east side of the building to form a gable. The pitched roof would be finished in Redland 49 interlocking tiles to match the existing roof. Three roof lights are proposed to the front roofslope, serving a bedroom and closet/storage room. The side gable would be finished in UPVC grey board cladding. Three windows are proposed to the gable end, serving the closet/storage, stairs and bathroom. The application form states that these windows are to be obscure glazed.

The proposed rear dormer would measure approximately 7m wide by 2.9m high by 3.9m deep. The dormer would be finished in UPVC grey board cladding with a flat roof. Two windows serving a shower room and a bedroom and a Juliet balcony serving a bedroom are proposed to the rear of the dormer. The Juliet balcony would have a glazed balustrade.

An existing window to the ground floor east elevation would be removed.

Expiry Date - 31/07/2023

Relevant Planning History:

None relevant at application site.

No.26 Terringes Avenue:

AWDM/1453/19 - Side hip to gable extension to west elevation, with rooms in roof, rear dormer to north elevation and 3no. rooflights to front (south) elevation and second floor window to West elevation – Withdrawn following officer advice that we would not support the use of cladding to the gable or dormers. Resubmitted as a Lawful Development Certificate under AWDM/1731/19, using matching materials - Certificate of Lawfulness for proposed hip to gable roof extension to west elevation, rear dormer to north elevation and 3 rooflights to front (south) elevation and second floor window to West elevation – Permitted

No.36 Terringes Avenue:

AWDM/0885/13 - Rooms in roof with rear dormer, rooflights to front and side hip to gable – Permitted

No.66 Terringes Avenue:

AWDM/1887/19 - Single-storey rear extension and rooms in roof including rear dormer and hip to gable - Permitted

Statutory Consultations:

None required

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

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 north side of the road, to the west of the application site is characterised by semi-detached bungalows of the same design, form and materials as No.28. Several properties including numbers 23, 48 and 66 have carried out hip to gable extensions with rear dormers, all finished in tile hanging.

To the south side of the road and to the east of the application site the street scene is characterised by two-storey semi-detached houses of similar design, form and materials. There are many examples of hip to gable extensions to these houses including at numbers 26 (adjacent), 14, 8, 6, (to the east of the site) and 23, 27, 35 and 37 (to the south). Again, all of these extensions have been finished in tile hanging to match.

Despite being adjacent to a two storey house, the east side elevation of No.28 is still clearly visible in the street scene due to the angle of the buildings (No.26 angles away from No.28 at the front) and the large gap between buildings. The proposed gable to the east elevation would therefore be clearly visible and prominent in the street scene. The rear dormer would also be clearly visible and prominent from Rusper Road to the north-west.

The principle of a hip to gable extension and rear dormer are acceptable here and would be consistent with the many examples of similar development in the area. The form and scale of the proposal are similar to existing development in the road, however, the use of UPVC grey board cladding to the gable end and rear dormer would be entirely out of keeping with the surrounding street scene. The use of mismatched materials only serves to accentuate the size and utilitarian form of the rear box dormer which finished in a contrasting cladding to the roof would assimilate less successfully with the appearance of the existing dwelling. The street scene is traditional in character with brick, render and tiles being the predominant materials. Furthermore, all similar developments granted consent in this road have been finished in tile hanging to match the colour of the existing roof tiles. The only exception to this is at No.96 which does not have planning permission.

Policy DM5 of the Worthing Local Plan 2023 requires that the materials used for development should respect and enhance the prevailing character of the area. This requirement is detailed further in the council's SPG - *Extending or altering your home*: '*The facing materials of any extension should ideally match those used for the existing house. If identical materials are not available, the nearest possible alternative should be used. When selecting materials, you should ensure that they match the originals in size, shape and texture.'*

The use of UPVC grey cladding is therefore contrary to the above policy and design guidance and fails to respect the prevailing character of the area resulting in an uncharacteristic appearance that would be visually intrusive in the street scene causing significant harm to the visual amenities of the locality.

The adjacent property at No.26 applied for planning permission under application AWDM/1453/19 for a hip to gable extension and rear dormer finished in cladding. This application was withdrawn following officer advice that the use of cladding for the gable and rear dormer would not be supported

due to its prominence in the street scene and the fact that it did not relate well to the more traditional character of surrounding buildings. The size of the rear dormer which encroached on to the roof of the adjoining property was also considered an issue for this application. An amended application for a lawful development certificate was submitted and approved, using tile hanging to match the existing building and a dormer contained within the application boundaries.

The Council's advice to applicants and the planning permissions granted have been consistent in this area, with tile hanging approved as the predominant material for these roof extensions. To allow UPVC grey board cladding at the application site would undermine previous planning decisions and advice given to applicants and dilute the traditional character of the street scene having a significant and harmful impact on the visual amenities of the locality.

Officer response to the report submitted by the agent on 23/08/23 to support the use of cladding for the application property.

The agent for the application submitted a report following the case officer's request for amendments to the scheme to be finished in matching tiles. This report was submitted a month after the original request for amendments. The contents of the report are intended to support the use of cladding for the gable end and rear dormer.

The first property referenced in the report is No.66 Terringes Avenue for which planning permission was granted for a hip to gable extension and rear dormer under application AWDM/1887/19. The photo in the agent's report actually shows No.96 Terringes Avenue for which no planning permission has been sought or granted. The Building Regulations application for a loft conversion at No.96 was submitted in 2022 and therefore the matter of unlawful and unauthorised cladding has been passed on to enforcement to investigate.

Referring back to the agent's analysis in respect to consideration of the planning application AWDM/1887/19 for No.66, the agent states that the list of materials on the application form '*does not reference the finish of the box dormer or the gable*' however, the fact that the materials were clearly specified on the submitted drawings has been overlooked. The plans specified the use of tile hanging for the dormer and render to the side gable. A condition was applied to this application to confirm the use of materials to match the existing building and the works have been carried out in accordance with this condition. Cladding was not proposed here, was not approved by the Council and is not part of the works carried out at No.66. The statement by the agent that the materials were *'overlooked or not thought relevant'* is therefore incorrect, as cladding was not proposed as part of this application and he is in fact referencing the wrong property for which no consent has been sought.

Policy DM5 was not mentioned in the report for No.66 as this policy was only adopted in March 2023 and did not exist at the time of determination for the application in 2019. The relevant policies at the time of determination were H16 of the saved Local Plan and Policy 16 of the Worthing Core Strategy both

quoted in the report and both of which had the same requirements as the current policy DM5.

The report also asserts that the gable end would be less visible in the street scene, however the gable end would be clearly visible from the road to the east and the dormer from the road to the north-west.

Other properties in this road have successfully carried out the same development using matching tiles. Whilst they may not exactly match the type of tile, the colour and appearance is a close match which satisfies the requirements of planning policy; to use materials that reflect the existing building and street scene. Tile hanging to the proposed gable and dormer, matching the colour and appearance of the existing tiles, could easily be achieved at this property, as demonstrated at all the other examples in this road.

It is recognised that in some areas of Worthing cladding has been approved however this is only in cases where the street scene has a much more varied character in respect of design and materials. In those areas where the character and materials are traditional, the use of cladding has generally been resisted with amendments sought to applications prior to approval to remove cladding. Some box dormers that are not visible from the road have also been approved using cladding. However, the above exceptions do not apply here where the character and materials are traditional and both the gable and rear dormer are visible from the road.

The larger schemes referenced in the agent's report are not comparable to the scheme under consideration and relate to much larger redevelopment schemes where cladding formed part of the overall design ethos for the building, rather than an extension to a single residential property.

There is no property address given for the photo in the report showing grey cladding to the front gable of a bungalow and therefore it has not been possible to check whether this has consent or not. It is however likely that either the gable was previously finished in white cladding (as seen at other properties in the wider area) or that consent was not sought.

In conclusion therefore, the report submitted by the agent is not considered to justify support of the application for cladding, contains a number of inaccuracies and refers to schemes that are not of similar type or scale as the development proposed.

Residential Amenity

The most affected neighbours are those to the sides at No.26 and 30 and to the rear at No.2 Rusper Road.

No.26 is to the east of the application site and consists of a two story house that has carried out a hip to gable and rear dormer development. The scale and form of the roof extensions would not appear overbearing or oppressive to

the neighbours. The side windows proposed to the gable would be obscure glazed and serve non-habitable rooms and would not result in overlooking or loss of privacy to No.26.

The rear dormer would not result in any significant overlooking or loss of privacy to the neighbours at No.26 or 30, with views directed across the applicant's own garden with only oblique views to neighbouring gardens. The Juliet balcony could increase the potential for overlooking however this is not considered to cause significant harm in this position.

The side boundary to the garden of No.2 Rusper Road adjoins the rear boundary of the application site at approximately 18m from the proposed dormer. The proposed dormer and Juliet balcony are not considered to significantly compromise the amenities of No.2 in terms of overlooking or loss of privacy.

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

Procedural Matters

An email was sent to the agent for the application, from the case officer on 21/07/23, 10 days prior to the decision due date, requesting that the materials were changed to tile hanging. An extension of time request was sent the following week after no response was received. The agent emailed the council on 14/08/23 confirming he had been on holiday and that the applicants were also on holiday and that he would need to discuss and take instructions from them before replying. The case officer replied the same day offering a further extension of time, to which no response was received. On 23/08/23 the case officer emailed the agent to request an update and advise that a further extension of time would be required and a further extension of time request was sent. A response from the agent was received the same day stating that the *'client is adamant that there is a persuasive argument to change to tile hanging'* and attached a report in relation to the use of cladding within the parish. This email also referred as follows; *'In regard to the extension of time I am instructed to request that the application is determined within 14 days of the date of this email, otherwise my client will appeal on the basis of non-determination within the statutory period'.*

As detailed above, the agent was contacted prior to the decision due date and offered the opportunity to amend the application to secure a recommendation of approval. Extensions of time were also offered and every effort to engage with the agent to resolve the issues were undertaken, supporting proactive working. It is therefore considered that an appeal on the basis of non-determination within the statutory period would be unjustified.

Recommendation

REFUSE for the reason:-

The proposal due to the use of UPVC grey cladding to the gable and rear dormer, would appear visually prominent and intrusive and fails to respect or enhance the prevailing character of the site or the local environment, or to make a positive contribution to the traditional character and distinctiveness of the area, resulting in disruption to the visual cohesion of the street scene and appearing significantly out of keeping in the locality. The proposal would have a significant and harmful impact on the character and visual amenities of the street scene. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy DM5 of the Worthing Local Plan, Supplementary Planning Guidance 'Extending or altering your home' and the revised 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 discussing those with the Applicant. Unfortunately, it has not been possible to resolve those matters within the timescale allocated for the determination of this planning application. However, the Local Planning Authority has clearly set out, within its report, the steps necessary to remedy the harm identified within the reasons for refusal - which may lead to the submission of a more acceptable proposal in the future. The Local Planning Authority is willing to provide pre-application advice in respect of any future application for a revised development.

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

Case Officer:	Amanda Haslett	Date: 31/08/23
Authorised by:	Jo Morin	Date: 01.09.2023