Expiry Date - 29/01/2025

Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/1568/24 Recommendation – APPROVE

Site: 19 Lime Tree Avenue Worthing West Sussex BN14 0DJ

Proposal: Single storey front lobby extension with open porch; single storey rear extension to connect existing extension to garage; glazed canopy to replace timber workshop; and existing raised terrace extended.

Date of site visit: 30/01/2025

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Site and Surroundings

The site is located on the western side of Lime Tree Avenue in Findon Valley. The property has a large two storey detached building with a detached garage to the rear of the site with driveway to the north and parking to the front. The property has already undergone a number of alterations including a single storey rear extension and the installation of a workshop to the side of the garage.

The neighbouring property to the north (no.21) of the site has a single storey rear extension to approximately 2.8m. The neighbour to the south (no.17) also has a garage to the rear of the site but on the southern boundary away from the application site.

There is sufficient space for car parking within the site. There is also on street parking available throughout Findon Valley. With the size of the properties along Lime Tree Avenue there are a number of varying styles including properties with porches and rear extensions of varying scales.

Proposal

The application relates to the introduction of a single storey extension to the rear of the site connecting the detached garage and ‘workshop’ to the host dwellings existing rear extension. The garage would then be converted to the new ‘workshop’ with a store to the front. To the side of the garage the existing ‘workshop’ would be converted to a glazed shelter. The other aspect of the proposal relates to the introduction of a lobby and front porch.

The side/rear extension is proposed to measure 3.25m depth, due to the sloping plot the maximum eaves height would be 2.8m to the back with the front having an eaves of 2.5m. The pitch would then be at 4m to the front and 4.5m to the rear of the site.

Relevant Planning History:
08/0751/FULL – Demolition of existing garage and conservatory and proposed rear extension to enlarge kitchen and dining room and form garage. Approved 08/09/2008.

Consultations:
None

Representations:
None

Relevant Planning Policies
Worthing Local Plan policies (WBC 2023): SP1, DM5
National Planning Policy Framework (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
Due to the nature of the application it will be visible from within the street scene with a front porch and a side/rear extension.

The front porch will be screened from view due to the boundary treatment to the front and side of the site being formed of mature shrubbery. The scale of the porch is also considered to be subservient to the host property at single storey with a relatively small footprint increase. Whilst the shrubbery to the front of the site could be removed, due to the scale, it is not considered that a small lobby and front porch would be visually obtrusive and result in an out of character appearance. The As such the front porch is considered to be acceptable in terms of visual amenity.

The extension by virtue of its location and height will be visible from within the wider locality. The height to the front of the site would be 4m at the ridge with the eaves at 2.5m. The existing garage has a height 0.5m below that of the maximum of the proposal. The garage is visible from the street scene but due to the separation from the front boundary it is not dominant. With the extension being 0.5m higher and protruding 5.7m closer to the front of the site there would be more of an impact from the proposed extension. Due to the scale of the host property this still allows for approximately 10m to the principal elevation which is then separated by approximately 7m to the front boundary. Resultant of this 17m separation from the front boundary the height is considered to be acceptable.

The glazed structure is a minor alteration to the side of the garage. It would have no impact on the streetscene and is of an acceptable scale.

As such it is considered that overall, the proposed development would be acceptable in terms of visual amenity.

Residential Amenity

The front porch, due to the location is not considered to impact the amenity of the neighbouring properties. This is due to the separation of the property from the neighbour to the south. The neighbour to the south has their own front extension.

The proposed extension to the rear by virtue of its location will have a greater impact on the property to the north. This neighbour (No.21) will be impacted by the proposed development due to the location on the boundary. The height of the proposed extension being at 4.5m is going to have some impact on the neighbouring property. The eaves will also be at 2.5 rising to 2.8m to the rear. However, due to the topography of the site it is not considered to be dominating. This is assisted through the pitch of the roof heading away from the boundary. Whilst there will be some sense of enclosure to the access for the neighbour, with the existing garage and the detached nature of the properties this would not be to a level that is detrimental to the application. The light to the neighbouring property's side will be reduced slightly however, with the flank elevation only hosting an obscure glazed door it is not considered to be significantly detrimental to the application.

The property to the south is not considered to be impacted by the proposed extension due to the separation distance and the existing relationship by the extensions and the garage itself.

There is not considered to be any overlooking to either neighbour as a result of this application. This is due to the single storey nature of the proposal and the omission of windows in the side elevations facing the neighbouring properties.

With the use of the existing garage changing to a 'workshop' a condition has been added to the permission ensuring the use is ancillary to the host dwelling and not during unsociable hours. This is to ensure that there is not an unacceptable noise pollution or impact that would be unneighbourly.

The glazed shelter that is proposed to be connected to the 'workshop' is to replace the existing timber structure and will not provide any overbearing or overshadowing that is not already in place. The alteration to glazing from the timber structure will allow for some additional overlooking towards the neighbouring boundary. However, due to the steep topography of the site this is considered to be mitigated. The boundary screening with the sunken nature of the glazed shelter will mitigate any potential overlooking to an acceptable level.

Next to the glazed shelter there is proposed to be a minor extension to the existing terrace to the rear of the site. This will extend the terrace by approximately 1m. With the boundary treatment and the existing relationship

with the neighbouring property the extension of this terrace is not considered to result in a loss of amenity.

As such the proposed development is considered to be acceptable in terms of residential amenity and compliant with Policy DM5 of the Worthing Local Plan.

Recommendation

APPROVE subject to Conditions:-

1. Drawing Numbers
2. Standard time limit
3. Matching materials
4. No openings to side elevation of extension
5. Use of 'workshop' to be ancillary to the host dwelling

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: Finlay Gardner Date: 31/01/2025

Authorised by: Louise Prew Date: 04/02/2025