Expiry Date - 21/07/2023

Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/0694/23 Recommendation – APPROVE

Site: 96 Balcombe Avenue Worthing West Sussex BN14 7RR

Proposal: Proposed single storey rear extension. (Resubmission of AWDM/0276/23)

Date of site visit: 03/04/2023

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Site and Surroundings

The application property is located on the east side of Balcombe Avenue within a residential area. The property is an end-of-terrace two-storey house comprising a decorative mock Tudor façade with pitched roof porch canopy, tiled hipped roof with front gable protrusion, pebbledash to side (south) elevation and white render to rear (east) elevation, along with white UPVC windows. The property's garage attaches to the south, set back from the principal front of the dwelling and links with the garage of the adjacent neighbour to this direction No. 94 Balcombe Avenue. The rear garden of the property is of a generous size and comprises a raised decking area close to the house and grass area with bordering vegetation extending to the rear. A lean-to projects from the southerly side of the rear elevation at a modest depth, extending from the kitchen area. The attached dwelling to the north No. 98 Balcombe Road has an identical lean-to to the opposite side of their respective rear elevation owing to the mirrored layout of this property. The mirrored lean-to's are a common feature amongst properties along Balcombe Road; many properties have infilled the gap left between the lean-to and adjacent boundary with extensions and the like or demolished the lean-to completely and constructed a full-width extension in its place. Properties along Balcombe Road have a strong sense of uniformity in terms of their form, design (notably the mock Tudor façade), alignment, massing, footprint and plot size.

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

The application is a re-submission of the withdrawn application under AWDM/0276/23 upon request from the agent.

Proposal:

Permission is sought for the demolition of the existing lean-to which would be replaced with a single-storey rear extension. The extension would comprise matching white render elevations, a flat roof, and rear facing bi-fold doors.

The existing lean-to projects from the southerly side of the rear elevation by approximately 1.2m, has a width of 3.8m, and height at maximum of 3.1m, shallowing to 2.4m to eaves level. By contrast, the proposed extension would project approximately 4m, have a width of 6.1m, and flat roof of 2.5m. This proposal differs from the withdrawn application's proposal by way of roof form and height (pitched to flat) and depth reduction from 4.3m.

Relevant Planning History:

Previous application for a single-storey rear extension under AWDM/0276/23 withdrawn upon request from the agent.

Planning permission refused at the adjacent property to the south No. 94 for a two-storey side extension under 90/05030/FULL, decision issued 09/07/1990.

Consultations: None.

Representations: None received.

Relevant Planning Policies and Guidance
National Planning Policy Framework (HCLG 2021)
National Planning Practice Guidance
SPG 'Extending or Altering Your Home' (WBC)

Worthing Local Plan (2023) 2020-2036
SP1 (Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development)
DM5 (Quality of the Built Environment)

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 positioning of the extension to the rear of the house means that there would be limited views of it from the public realm. The extension would only be visible above the garage when viewed between the gap of the application property and No. 94. Thus, the extension would nearly be completely screened from the street scene and would pose no material harm. The extension would span the entire width of the property and proposes a flat roof form, which differs from the existing tiled finish of the lean-to and previously proposed pitched roof rear extension. The flat roof form is considered acceptable owing to the extension's positioning to the rear of the property and

in view of the multiple examples of flat roof rear extension or the like along Balcombe Avenue and the wider area. The property will continue to enjoy a generous sized garden. There are no visual amenity grounds to resist the proposal.

Residential Amenity

The above-mentioned SPG states that single-storey rear extensions to semi-detached and terraced properties should not normally exceed 3m in depth in order to avoid unacceptable impact upon the receipt of light to and outlook from windows serving principal rooms in neighbouring properties.

Concerns had been raised to the agent during discussions regarding the previous proposal and the overbearing and overshowing impact it would have on the nearside living room window of the attached neighbour to the north No. 98, which would be recessed as a result of the proposal. That proposal was for a pitched roof extension with 4.3m depth where-as the proposal the subject of this application is for a flat roof extension with 4m depth. The extension would be set in approximately 0.3m from the boundary; an amendment was sought for a minimum gap of 0.5m which was subsequently declined by the agent. Although this revised proposal is of a reduced scale and depth compared to the earlier proposal, concerns remain regarding the impact to the residential amenities of No. 98. However, taking account of the now very low roof of the extension and the particular site circumstances in relation to drainage, which prohibits foundation works being implemented within a 500mm radius, it is considered that, on balance, the revised proposal is satisfactory and the impacts on the amenities of No. 98 would not be so severe to justify refusing the application.

To the southerly side, the extension is not considered to result in a materially detrimental impact on the residential amenities of No. 94 owing to the separation distance and situation of this neighbour's property to the south.

There would be no loss of privacy for neighbours as the only openings proposed would face into the applicant own deep garden to the rear (east).

The proposal would not result in material harm to the residential amenities of surrounding neighbours.

Recommendation:

APPROVE subject to Conditions:-

1. Approved Plans
2. Standard Time Limit
3. Materials
4. No Openings Side Elevations

Informatives:-

1. 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: Jason Albon Date: 20.07.2023

Authorised by: Jo Morin Date: 20.07.2023