Expiry Date - 15/05/2024

Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/0383/24 Recommendation – APPROVE

Site: 35 Mulberry Lane Worthing West Sussex BN12 4QU

Proposal: Single storey rear extension

Date of site visit: 13/04/24

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Site and Surroundings

The site is located to the west side of Mulberry Lane within a predominantly residential area of Worthing. The property comprises a semi-detached, two storey house with brick and rendered elevations and a hipped roof. The property is elevated above road level with a sloping driveway up to the house. The building is set back from the road behind a hedge and gravel parking area. The garage to the rear and adjacent to the south boundary and rear extension have already been demolished. There is a good size garden to the rear.

The property is not within a conservation area, is not a listed building and there are no protected trees on site.

Proposal

Planning permission is sought for a single storey rear extension measuring 4m deep adjacent to the north boundary and 8.5m deep set in 0.75m from the south boundary. The deeper part of the extension would be 3.5m wide and set in from the north boundary by 2.7m. The shallower part of the extension would extend the width of the building. The extension would have a flat roof of 3.2m high with a roof light above. The extension would be finished in bricks to match the existing building.

The extension would form an open plan kitchen/dining room with high level windows and a door to the south side, double doors and a window to the rear elevation and a door to the north side.

The application has been amended to reduce the depth of the extension (north) by 0.5m and reduce the width of the extension (south) by 0.5m.

Relevant Planning History:

AWDM/0135/20 - Demolition of existing rear conservatory and garage. Proposed single-storey rear extension to west elevation – Approved

Expiry Date - 15/05/2024

Consultations:

None required

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 property is elevated above road level and set back approximately 13.5m from the road to the front. The proposed extension is to the rear of the property with a small section projecting 0.75m wide beyond the side of the house at approximately 24.5m back from the road. This part of the extension would be visible from the front however due to its set back position, the extension would not appear dominant or intrusive in the street scene.

The extension is low in height and would utilise the footprint of previous structures on site (rear extension and garage, both demolished) but would extend further in depth and width. A similar scheme was approved in 2020 but the depth adjacent to the north boundary has been reduced and the width of the deeper section (adjacent to south boundary) has been slightly increased. The proposal would be subsidiary in form and scale to the existing building and would retain a good proportion of garden space.

There would be no significant adverse impact on the visual amenities of the locality as a result of this application.

Residential Amenity

The most affected properties are the neighbours to the side at No.33 and No.37.

No.33 is located to the south side and has a similar extension to the side/rear which extends up to the boundary and for the full depth of the proposed extension. A small section of the extension would project to the front of the neighbour's extension however this part of the building would be 0.75m from the boundary and approximately 2m from the neighbour's house. There is a

small window to the side of the neighbour's property but this is obscure glazed and serves a shower room and therefore no overlooking or loss of privacy would occur from the new door proposed to the south side of the extension. The extension would not appear overbearing or oppressive to these occupiers or result in loss of light to their house or garden.

No.37 is the adjoining property to the north side and has a single storey rear extension of approximately 2.7m deep. The proposed extension would project 1.3m further to the rear, adjacent to the boundary. The extension would be low in height and would not extend beyond a 45 degree line projected from the midpoint of the neighbours nearest habitable room window. There would be no significant overshadowing or loss of light to the neighbour's home or garden and the extension would not appear overbearing or oppressive. The deeper part of the extension would be positioned 2.7m from the boundary, extending a similar depth to the demolished garage and would not result in overshadowing or loss of light to the neighbour's house or garden. The only opening proposed to the north side of the extension is a door which would look out on to the boundary fence and would not result in overlooking or loss of privacy.

There would be no significant detrimental impact on residential amenity resulting from this proposal.

Recommendation

APPROVE subject to Conditions:-

1. Drawing Numbers
2. Standard time limit
3. Matching materials
4. No additional openings to north side elevation of extension

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? N

Case Officer: Amanda Haslett Date: 13/05/24

Authorised by: Jo Morin Date: 13.05.2024