Expiry Date - 29/10/2024

Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/1133/24 Recommendation – APPROVE

Site: 49 Parklands Avenue Worthing West Sussex BN12 4NG

Proposal: Front extension (East elevation). Removal of chimney and relocation of existing log burner flue to North side elevation

Date of site visit: 02.10.2024

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Site and Surroundings

The application relates to a mid-late C20 detached house occupying a corner plot fronting the west side of Parklands Avenue and adjoining the south side of the residential service road which runs parallel to the main carriageway of Goring Road (A259). The dwelling is located toward the south side of its plot, set back 7.4m from the edge of the highway in Parklands Avenue. It has been enlarged by a single-storey rear extension. A substantial proportion of the remaining rear garden is taken up by a detached garage accessed from the above service road, and attached outbuilding. The garden on the north side has been enclosed by a brick wall with timber insert panels proximately 1.8m high overall. The front garden, primarily laid to lawn, is enclosed by a low brick wall.

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 for a single-storey front extension 1.8m deep x 5.8m wide with a lean-to roof 3.4m high (where attached to the existing house). It would have brick elevations with a tiled roof and 3no roof lights. It would provide an enlarged entrance lobby and lounge/snug.

It is also proposed to remove the existing chimney stack in the centre of the main ridge and erect a flue (for a log-burner) towards the front on the north side elevation. The flue (0.15 diameter) would project 1.1m above the adjacent front roof slope.

Relevant Planning History:

WB/08/0271/FULL Retrospective application for the erection of side and front boundary walls consisting of brick piers and featherboard fencing at side to

enclose side section of garden and brick wall with wrought iron balustrades with spear head finials to front. Refused – Allowed on appeal 21.04.2009.

AWDM/1838/15 Single storey rear extension. Permitted12.02.2016.

There is no formal record relating to the large outbuilding in the rear garden, but site notes show this was in situ at the time of the above application in 2015.

Consultations:

EHO (Public Health): No objection. An informative is recommended advising the applicant to ensure the log burning appliance is installed in accordance with relevant Building Regulations.

Representations: The Goring and Ilex Conservation Group object on the ground the extension would be forward of the general building line by a substantial amount and would detrimental to the amenity of the area. The roof lights on the mono pitch roof are an incongruous feature.

Relevant Planning Policies

Worthing Local Plan policies (WBC 2023): SP1, DM5
National Planning Policy Framework (MHCLG 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 relatively shallow depth, 'lean-to' roof form and matching materials of the extension, slightly set in from the side walls, would be subsidiary in scale and in-keeping with the appearance of the host dwelling. An amendment to the proportions of the proposed front windows has improved its visual integration. Roof lights are a feature typical of the wider residential area and whilst they would be clearly visible on the lean-to roof, it is considered they would not appear unduly unsightly or particularly incongruous in this context.

The Conservation Group has pointed out that the extension would project forward of the general building line on this side of Parklands Avenue and would be harmful to visual amenity as a result.

The application property is one of 2 dwellings of this particular style/design, including No.47 to the South. The latter has been enlarged by a 2-storey side extension which has disrupted the original uniform appearance of the pair of

dwellings. The properties further to the South on this side (before the entrance to 'Courtlands') are of a chalet type design, occupying deeper dwelling plots than that of Nos 45/47. The consistent depth of the existing frontages contributes to the generally well-spaced character of development in this run of dwellings. Officers have sought to negotiate a reduction in the depth of the extension, but it is argued this would severely compromise any benefit in undertaking the works. On balance, it is considered the proposed extension would not appear overly dominant in the street scene, and the resulting impact on the pattern of existing development would not be so harmful to justify refusal in this case.

The removal of the existing small chimney stack on the ridgeline will result in a minor change in appearance. The proposed flue on the north side is shown with a relatively slender diameter and its appearance would be consistent with a domestic environment.

Residential Amenity

The only affected property is No.47 to the south. There will be a gap of 1.6m between the south side of the extension and the common site boundary. The layout of No.47 is a mirror of No.49 so the extension will sit alongside the front entrance to the latter. Given the relatively open character of the frontages it would be reasonable to impose a condition restricting the insertion of any future window in the south side wall.

The EHO has no objection to the flue subject to compliance with the necessary building regulations.

Recommendation

APPROVE subject to Conditions:-

1. Drawing Numbers
2. Standard time limit
3. Matching materials
4. No openings to south side elevation

Informative

Pro-active amendment

Applicant is advised to ensure that the proposed log-burning flue adheres to the relevant building control requirements.

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

Case Officer: Jo Morin Date: 21.10.2024

Authorised by: Louise Prew Date: 21/10/2024