Expiry Date - 10/07/2024

Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/0627/24 **Recommendation – REFUSE**

Site: **6 Greenland Close Worthing West Sussex BN13 2RP**

Proposal: **Two storey side extension to include ancillary annexe accommodation for a relative**

Date of site visit: 17.06.2024

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Site and Surroundings

The application relates to a mid-C20 2-storey end-of-terrace house occupying a wider than average plot on the west side of Greenland Close, a cul-de-sac located within an outer residential suburb of the town. The terrace consists of 6no dwellings with a distinctive part pitched, part flat roof. A variation of this unusual roof design is replicated on the other terraces which make up the cul-de-sac.

The application property has been previously enlarged by a rear roof extension and a conservatory attached to the north side.

The dwelling is accessed by a footpath set back from the road carriageway at the head of the cul-de-sac behind a wide grass verge. There is a shallow, fenced front garden which wraps around the north side and rear (west) of the dwelling. Another shorter terrace of 4no dwellings (Nos 7-10) lies to the north of the application property, sited at 90º to Nos 1-6. The dwellings Nos 7-10 are accessed from a footpath that adjoins, and runs parallel to, the northern site boundary of No.6.

A garage compound made up of 2no rows of garages lies to the south of the terraced block Nos 1-6, accessed from Greenland Close.

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

Proposal

Permission is sought to remove the existing conservatory and erect a 2-storey side extension. The extension would extend the full depth of the original dwelling, have an L-shaped footprint varying in width between 3.05m at the front, to 4.4m to the rear. The narrower front part of the extension would have a mono-pitched roof 6.8m high, with the rear part, including the projecting wider element, having a flat roof 5.8m high. The elevations would be

constructed in brickwork with feature panels in tile-hanging to match the upper part of the front elevation of the main dwelling, or composite cladding. The mono pitched roof would be covered using concrete tiles to match the existing roof.

The accommodation would consist of an enlarged kitchen/lounge/breakfast area at ground-floor, with a separate self-contained entrance towards the rear opening into a lobby and staircase up to a first-floor annexe. The first-floor would consist of a bedroom, bathroom and lounge with kitchen. A door from the lounge would open onto a rear balcony (1.8m x 0.9m).

The floor plan shows an ‘optional connecting door’ between the proposed bedroom and a bedroom within the main dwelling.

The proposed annexe accommodation will be for a family member and would be ancillary to the main dwelling, but with the family member desiring to keep ‘a degree of independence’.

Relevant Planning History: None

Consultations: None

Representations: An objection has been received from the occupier of 11 Greenland Close on grounds of design, highway access and parking, overdevelopment and privacy/light/noise, commenting that this essentially another small house in a small close, which would be greatly affected by the building of another home. Access for lorries, vans and workers would cause major issues when the work is being done, potentially dangerous to other residents with extra noise and dust. There would be less light for the houses directly opposite.

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.

Principle of Annexe Accommodation

LP Policy DM5 states that all new development (including extensions, residential annexes, alterations and ancillary development) should (amongst other things) be: 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, tree canopy, impact on street scene and layout of the development; make a positive contribution to the sense of place, local character and distinctiveness of an area; be well built, accessible, fit for purpose, and adaptable to changing lifestyles; include a layout and design which take account of potential users of the site; and not have an unacceptable impact on the occupiers of adjacent properties, particularly of residential dwellings, including unacceptable loss of privacy, daylight/sunlight, outlook, or an unacceptable increase in noise.

It states, specifically in relation to residential annexes, that they must be designed as ancillary to the main dwelling and be capable of satisfactory conversion for use in association with the main dwelling when it is no longer required by a relative or dependant

The preamble to policy DM5 states at paragraph 5.68:

"Residential annexes can provide a suitable solution for accommodating a relative or dependent within the curtilage of the main dwelling house. Where a totally independent dwelling is not acceptable, (for example where there is a lack of separate curtilage, inadequate parking or a general unacceptable intensity of use), permission may be granted for an annexe subject to conditions or planning agreements limiting occupation to a relative or dependent, and requiring conversion of the accommodation to a use in association with the main dwelling, when it is no longer required for the relative or dependent. Such annexes should be ancillary to the main dwelling both in scale and range of accommodation and facilities, and must not assume a detached or independent identity by design or sub-division of the curtilage of the main dwelling."

The proposed annexe is described as 'ancillary' to the main dwelling, to be occupied by a family member. However, this ancillary relationship is not reflected in the layout of the proposed accommodation or the range of facilities to be provided. The proposed annexe would have its own separate entrance and separate staircase leading to the first-floor. The range of facilities provided includes a lounge with kitchen area, shower room and separate bedroom and would enable the occupier to live independently of the main house with no sharing of amenities or functional dependency on the host dwelling. A separate amenity space would be provided in the form of a small first-floor rear balcony. The inclusion of a separate staircase serving only the proposed annexe would make it difficult to reabsorb the accommodation as part of the main dwelling when no longer required as an annexe, further reinforcing the separate identity of the proposed accommodation and adding weight to the likelihood of it being occupied as a separate dwelling unit.

An 'optional connecting door' is shown but the practicality of its position between bedrooms is questionable since it would severely inhibit the positioning of furniture within the respective rooms.

It can also be questioned whether the accommodation, intended for an older family member and accessible only by stairs would be ‘fit for purpose’ as annexe accommodation, or adaptable to changing lifestyles, as required by policy DM5. The GIA of 31sqm (including the stairs/lobby) is below the Government’s nationally described minimum internal space standard for a 1-person 1-bedroom dwelling. Although policy DM5 does not require this standard to be applied to annexe accommodation, it is worth pointing out that the GIA of the proposed accommodation would not meet minimum LP policy requirements for the creation of a separate dwelling unit.

No details have been provided of how the annexe accommodation would be accessed. However, had the proposal been acceptable in all other respects this could have been a condition of planning permission to prevent the creation of a separate pedestrian access from the footpath running parallel to the northern site boundary (via a new opening in the existing boundary fence).

In the absence of any further explanation as part of the application submission of how the proposed annexe would be occupied as ‘ancillary’ to the main dwelling, it is considered that the proposed accommodation would fail to comply with the key requirements of policy DM5 in relation to its proposed layout and the range of accommodation and facilities provided, assuming an independent identity separate to the host dwelling which would be out of keeping with the established pattern and character of existing development.

Visual Amenity

The form of the proposed part pitched part flat roof of the extension responds to the unusual design of the original roof of the dwelling, with the new ridge set down approximately 0.9m from the main roof ridge. Although it would extend the full depth of the existing dwelling, with no set-back from the front wall, the proportions of the extension would appear subsidiary in scale and appearance to the host dwelling. The flat-roofed side projecting component accommodating the stairs/lobby would be set back over 6 metres from the front of the terrace and in view of its siting and modest width would not appear as an unduly dominant or unsympathetic feature.

Residential Amenity

The most affected properties are those sited at 90º to the north of the property, Nos 7-10.

The proposed extension would vary in height from 6.8m at the ridge, to 5.8m at the flat roof, and 5.15m at the eaves to the front. The 2-storey flank wall of the existing dwelling is sited 13.6m from the front of No.8 and a minimum 13m from the front of No.10. The proposed L-shaped side extension would narrow the separation distance to a minimum 9.35m to the front of Nos 8-9, and a minimum 10m to the front of No.10.

The siting of existing end-of-terrace building currently has an impact on the receipt of light and outlook from the front windows of Nos 7-10. However, the

narrowing of the existing separation distance will have an additional impact, particularly for the occupiers of No.9 whose entire front aspect would be dominated by the extension, the consequence of which would be oppressive and diminish the receipt of light to the front windows to an unacceptable degree.

The proposed ground and first-floor window openings shown in the north elevation of the extension are shown as ‘high-level’ and would not result in unacceptable overlooking of the front of Nos 7-10.

The proposed rear balcony would primarily overlook the modest rear garden of the existing dwelling and beyond that the parking area of Palm Court which adjoins the rear site boundary. There would be oblique views toward the flat buildings within Palm Court sited to the north and south, but the impact in terms of overlooking would not be unneighbourly.

The proposed annexe accommodation would give rise to additional comings and goings by 1 additional person. The compact layout of the terraced buildings and pedestrian-only access arrangement would mean that even this low level of additional activity would be noticeable to the occupiers of Nos 7-10 if a separate entrance to the annexe was to be created from the footpath to the north, resulting in a loss of privacy. However, had all other considerations been acceptable this matter could be satisfactorily addressed by imposing a condition requiring access to the annexe via the front garden of the host dwelling.

A third party has raised concerns about additional parking pressures within the cul-de-sac as a result of the proposed additional accommodation. The cul-de-sac is heavily parked with vehicles, as is nearby Greenland Road. However, any additional parking demand generated by ancillary annexe accommodation, whilst possibly causing inconvenience to others residents of this cul-de-sac, would not be expected to generate any highway safety concerns such as to warrant refusal on this ground.

Recommendation

REFUSE for the reason:-

1. By reason of its siting, scale and massing, the proposed 2-storey side extension would have an unneighbourly and oppressive impact on the neighbouring terrace to the North (Nos 7-10 Greenland Close) resulting in unacceptable loss of light and outlook to the front windows thereof. The proposed development is therefore contrary to policy DM5 of the Worthing Local Plan.
2. Having regard to its design, layout, scale, appearance and the range of habitable accommodation proposed, the Council is not satisfied that the proposed annexe would be ancillary to the use of 6 Greenland Close as a single dwelling, or could satisfactorily be reabsorbed as part of the accommodation of the host dwelling once no longer required. Its potential use as an independent unit of accommodation with sub-

standard internal floor area would be harmful to the residential amenities of the future occupier(s) and out of keeping with the established pattern and character of existing development. The proposed development is therefore contrary to policy DM5 of the Worthing Local Plan and the relevant policies of the NPPF.

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 these concerns. However, the Local Planning Authority has clearly set out within its report the reasons for refusal - which may lead to the submission of a more acceptable proposal in the future.

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

Case Officer:	Jo Morin	Date:	09.07.2024
Authorised by:	Gary Peck	Date:	9 July 2024