Expiry Date - 08/10/2024

Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/1038/24 Recommendation – APPROVE

Site: 25 Rackham Road Worthing West Sussex BN13 1LH

Proposal: Demolition of existing detached garage and erection of single storey extension to East elevation. Render to all elevations. Pitch roof entrance porch to North elevation. Solar panels to East and West roof slopes.

Date of site visit: 03.10.2024

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Site and Surroundings

The application relates to a modest-sized, brick-built, hipped-roof semi-detached bungalow occupying a corner plot at the junction of Rackham Road with Heathfield Close, within an established residential suburb of the town. The roadside elevations are set back behind an L-shaped front garden enclosed by low brick walls. There is a detached garage building accessed from Rackham Road in the rear garden, adjoining the common site boundary with No.23 Rackham Road to the East. Attached to the south is 1 Heathfield Close.

The site is not listed or locally listed or within a conservation area. There are no TPO trees on the site.

Proposal

Permission is sought to demolish the garage and erect an L-shaped rear extension. The extension would be attached to the existing rear-projecting gable of the bungalow, 3.35m wide at this point and having a maximum depth of 8m, wrapping round to be roughly in the same position as the existing garage. It would have a maximum width of 7.4m. The extension would have a pitched roof 4m high, with a new ridge (6m long x 7.4m wide) set just below the ridge of the existing rear-projecting gable. The accommodation would consist of a bedroom with en-suite, utility room, workshop and store.

The remainder of the bungalow would be updated with the insertion of new/enlarged window/doors openings in black frames, with all elevations (including the proposed extension) finished in render.

A new open porch is proposed to the North elevation with a gabled, pitched roof (3.4m high) supported by posts on a brick plinth.

2no arrays of solar panels (3.3m deep x 2.2m wide) are proposed on the East and West roof slopes of the main bungalow.

The application has been amended to omit the previously proposed timber, cladding panels on the roadside elevations.

Relevant Planning History: None

Consultations:

WSCC: The Local Highway Authority has raised no objection noting that the dimensions of the existing garage does not meet the minimum specification for a single-bay garage outlined in Manual for Streets, and that 1 off-street parking space would be maintained on the existing drive.

Representations: None received.

Relevant Planning Policies

Worthing Local Plan policies (WBC 2023): SP1, DM5
National Planning Policy Framework (DLUHC 2023)
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 proposed extension would replace the existing modest garage with a larger-scale building, largely infilling the existing visual gap in the street scene between the existing rear-projecting gable feature and the rear boundary. A gap of 0.7m would be created between the rear (East) wall and the common boundary with No.23. That said, the design of the extension would be well-integrated with the appearance of the existing bungalow, in-keeping in terms of form and massing, and subsidiary in scale; thereby avoiding an overly built-up appearance. The gabled component fronting Rackham Road, comprising the store with garage door, would project 0.75m forward (North) of the flank wall of the existing bungalow. Whilst this element would be more visually prominent than the existing garage building, together with the proposed gabled-porch feature, it will help articulate the Northern elevation without appearing unduly dominant.

It is proposed to modernise the existing traditional appearance of the bungalow through the application of render to all elevations and introduction of black window/door frames, with associated alterations to some existing

window openings, including the West elevation fronting Heathfield Close. The semi-detached bungalows in Heathfield Close have a consistent appearance with plain brick elevations. The proposed change in materials/colours to one half of the existing pair will therefore result in a marked change. However, this corner property is also seen in the context of Rackham Road where the external materials of the bungalows are a mix of brick and render, including No.23 to the East. As such, it would be difficult to argue the proposed changes, as amended to omit the originally proposed timber cladding, would be significantly harmful to local character.

There is no objection to the proposed solar panels which appear to be 'permitted development'.

Residential Amenity

The most affected properties are No.1 Heathfield Close and No.23 Rackham Road.

No.1, attached to the south, has been enlarged at the rear by a modest conservatory set off the common boundary by approximately 2m. The boundary is marked by a solid timber fence approximately 1.3m high with 0.5m trellis on top. That part of the proposed extension attached to the rear elevation would be positioned some 4+m from the common boundary, extending 4.4m rearward (East) before wrapping round at 45 degrees. The rear component would be sited 1m from the common boundary, and 5.4m from the nearest part of the rear elevation of No.1. Having regard to the separation distance of No.1 from the various components of the extension, and its orientation to the south of the development works, it is considered there would be no adverse impacts in terms of overbearing effect or loss of light. There are no windows proposed in the south elevation of the rear component, and this can be secured as a condition of planning permission.

No.23 lies to the East, separated from the common site boundary by the width of a driveway to the side of the bungalow. The main entrance to the bungalow is on this side and there are a number of other windows in this elevation which are clearly visible from within the rear garden of No.25 above the fence line. The existing detached garage building which lies partially along this common boundary provides only an element of screening. The pitched-roof rear component of the proposed extension will be taller, and extend deeper into the plot than the existing garage, but will be set off the boundary by 0.7m. There will be some enclosing impact on the main entrance and forward-most (Northern) window in the side of No.23, which appears to serve a habitable room. However, taking into consideration the overall separation distance at approximately 4.5m and the form of the extension with an eaves (2.35m high) it is considered the effect would not be so harmful to warrant refusal. There are no windows in the East wall of the extension and this can be secured by a condition. Two rooflights in the East roof slope are positioned well above eye-line and would not give rise to overlooking.

No details have been provided as to what the small proposed ‘workshop’ would be used for, but a condition can secure its use as ancillary to the domestic use of the dwelling.

Other

It has been drawn to the attention of the Applicant’s Agent that the introduction of the large bi-fold and French door openings in the West elevation of the bungalow could result in a loss of privacy for the occupiers through overlooking. It has been pointed out that the introduction of tall boundary treatment to address this issue, enclosing the existing frontage garden, would be stridently out of keeping with existing local character and a planning application would be unlikely to be supported.

Recommendation

APPROVE subject to Conditions:-

1. Drawing Numbers
2. Standard time limit
3. Matching materials as annotated on drawing
4. No additional openings to South and East elevations
5. Accommodation to be ancillary to domestic use of dwelling

Informative

Pro-active amendment

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

Case Officer: Jo Morin Date: 17.10.2024

Authorised by: Peter Barnett Date: 17 October 2024