Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/1321/23 Recommendation: Approve

Site: 15 Wallace Avenue, Worthing

Proposal: AMENDED DESCRIPTION: Alterations to roof of existing rear extension to include replacement roof tiles and construction of a parapet to side (south) wall.

Site visit: 07.11.2023

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: Y Amended plans and revised description notified 6.12.2023

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

The application site relates to a two storey semi-detached house located on the west side of Wallace Avenue, on the corner at its junction with Latimer Road. It has a hipped roof to its main roof with plain tiles and a two storey rear projection, all with a decorative band of brickwork at first floor level, mirroring the overall form of the adjoining dwelling at No.13. Both No.13 and No.15 have been extended to the rear, infilling to the side of each rear projection and towards the common boundary, with a conservatory at No.13 and single storey lean-to extension at No.15. Historic aerial photos indicate that the extension at No.15 replaced a smaller lean-to structure. An application for prior approval was submitted for a rear extension in 2019 under the householder permitted development rights for larger extensions and those proposals were considered to be permitted development (AWDM/1702/19 refers). Building Control records indicate that a single storey extension was completed in 2022.

The current application proposes to replace the roof tiles for the existing rear addition with Sandtoft 20/20 interlocking Tuscan tiles. It was previously confirmed that matching materials would be used as part of the prior approval permitted development application, but it is understood from the applicant's agent that the particular tiles used were unsuitable for the roof pitch, causing weather ingress and damage. The rooflight windows would remain as existing. Amended plans have also been received which includes a proposed new parapet wall on the south wall of the extension with a hopper drain in response to concerns over drainage. The south wall would be built up to approximately 2.76m in height.

Relevant Planning History:

AWDM/1702/19 - Householder application for permitted development for prior approval for single-storey extension to rear of property measuring 4.420m from rear wall of the original house, maximum height 3.5m and height of eaves of the extension 2.5m.
STATUS: NOPA 9th December 2019.

AWDM/1706/19 - Application for Certificate of Lawfulness for proposed hip to gable roof extension to North elevation, rear dormer and 3no front facing roof lights
STATUS: APP 18th December 2019.

Consultations:
None relevant

Representations:

Two representations have been received from the occupier of the adjoining dwelling at No.13 following the original submission for replacement roof tiles, objecting to the proposal on the grounds as summarised below:

- The prior approval application was not objected to based on the measurements and that it would be within the curtilage of No.15.
- Inaccuracies/misleading information
- The extension is not within its curtilage/encroachment over boundary/party wall issues
- Matching materials have not been used
- Damage being caused from water ingress – replacement tiles alone won't resolve this
- Noise nuisance from extension
- Inadequacies of roof system
- Noise/disturbance/dust during construction

Following consultation on the revised plans and description to include the parapet wall detail, four further representations have been received from the occupiers of No.13 stating that alternative planning permission should be sought to remove the extension, reiterating issues of inaccuracies/misleading information, noise issues, materials, and the design causing water ingress, and with the following additional issues raised as summarised below:

- Overlooking/loss of privacy from rooflights towards bedroom window
- Light intrusion from rooflights
- Further enclosure from increasing height of extension/overbearing
- Loss of light
- Impact on proposed new Marine Gardens conservation area (under consultation/review)
- Materials should be specified
- Design with parapet would not be in keeping with the original building

Relevant Planning Policies
Worthing Local Plan 2020-2036: SP1, DM5, DM18
National Planning Policy Framework (HCLG 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.

It is noted in the representations that reference is made to the existing extension not being Permitted Development. In terms of its size the drawings indicate that the extension would be within the height and depth limitations as stated in the Prior Approval application. For clarity the applicant's agent has also since confirmed that the extension is 2.9 metres in width (and can also be confirmed on the elevation drawing provided) which would be less than half the width of the original house. The use of blockwork for the side wall, which is not readily visible was considered in terms of expediency and a decision was made that no further action would be taken in this regard. The brickwork used for the remainder of the extension has a similar appearance to those used for the existing house as required in the conditions of permitted development.

The agent has also reconfirmed that the extension has been built entirely within the applicant's own land. It is clear that there is a narrow space to the boundary line as shown on the plans (approx. 0.1m from the edge of the roof) and from the site visit it is apparent that the neighbours own extension is sited in close proximity and where guttering has been installed in the narrow intervening space to both structures. The painted outline of a previous boundary wall/structure is visible between the two neighbouring structures. Certificate A has, however, been signed and any boundary dispute would be a private legal matter.

The application as originally submitted has been made on the basis of the replacement roof tiles only as these would not match the existing building and so it is on this basis and the impact of the proposed parapet wall as revised that the application has been considered.

Visual Amenity

The existing extension is a relatively modest addition to the house and the tiled roof is not readily visible in the streetscene (or from the proposed conservation area as noted in the representation) due to its position at the side of the rear projection and is angled away with only the edge visible. The proposed roof tiles, although not an exact match to the plain tiles clay of the main roof, would appear reasonable in the context of the site and would not cause any significant harm to visual amenity.

The proposed parapet wall would be higher and visible above the height of the neighbouring extension eaves level with a capping detail indicated on the drawings. However given its position and scale it would not cause any significant impact to visual amenity subject to the use of matching brickwork for this section of wall to help blend with the extension.

Residential Amenity

The comments raised in the representation are noted, but the proposals for replacement roof tiles to the existing extension would not cause any significant impact to residential amenity.

A new parapet wall has been included in response to concerns over drainage between the extension and the neighbouring lean-to at No.13 to allow a gully to channel surface water run-off to a hopper drain on the rear elevation. There would be an increase in height on the south wall as a result of the proposed parapet detail but the overall height and scale of the extension would be reasonable in relation to the neighbouring lean-to and although the adjoining dwelling has side windows facing directly towards No.15, main outlook from the neighbours own addition is towards the rear and there would be no significant impact in this respect. Views and light from the rooflights would remain as existing and would have been previously allowed under the permitted development criteria. It is considered that the proposals would not cause any significant harm to residential amenity.

Other issues

Matters raised in the representation over the roof structure/composition and drainage issues are dealt with under the Building Regulations. In terms of drainage issues however, the applicant's agent has clarified that surface water drainage would be re-routed to help deal with water ingress/damp issues and as highlighted above the parapet detail has also been included in response to this issue.

Recommendation

APPROVE subject to Conditions:-

1. Drawing Numbers
2. Standard time limit
3. Matching brickwork to parapet wall and tiles as indicated.

Informative
The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by identifying matters of concern within the application (as originally submitted) and negotiating, with the Applicant, acceptable amendments to the proposal to address those concerns. As a result, the Local Planning Authority has been able to grant planning permission for an acceptable proposal, 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? Y

Case Officer: Rebekah Hincke Date: 03.01.2024

Authorised by: Jo Morin Date: 03.01.2024