Expiry Date - 30/09/2024

Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/1003/24 Recommendation – APPROVE

Site: 91 South Farm Road Offington Worthing West Sussex

Proposal: Rear two storey extension with first floor balcony; and single storey side extension.

Date of site visit: 01.10.24

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Site and Surroundings

The property comprises a traditional detached house on the west side of South Farm Road. The property is set back from the road with a low wall to road frontage and parking to the front.

At the rear the property has been extended with a single storey flat roof extension and a part brick, part glazed conservatory on the northern side.

The property has walling and close boarded fencing to the boundaries at the rear. The property has a large garden with a double garage set back on the rear boundary

To the northern side are maisonettes accessed to the southern side of the properties. The first floor maisonette has a staircase from the rear elevation.

To the southern side is a driveway to a garage and further more modern maisonettes/flats.

To the rear are garages off Gaisford Close.

Proposal

The application proposes the demolition of the existing attached store and conservatory on the northern side and the erection of a single storey side and rear extension. The extension would project along the northern boundary for approx. 12m. The existing rear projection on this boundary (although partly set in places) projects approx. 7.5m. The proposes extension would have a brick edge approx. 2.8m with a pitched roof beyond to an approx. height of approx. 3.5m. The extension would be approx. 4m wide. The extension would attach to existing flat roof extension. The proposed extension would have a personal door to the east elevation to the existing side passageway to the property. At the rear would be a window. Further external doors are shown to

the south elevation of the extension as it projects beyond the existing rear extension.

It is also proposed to extend the property at first floor, above existing flat roof extensions. The extensions would be partly to the side and to the rear. At the rear west elevation is proposed a balcony across the two proposed bedrooms.

Relevant Planning History:

None relevant

Consultations:

None undertaken

Representations:

None received

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 extensions would be to the rear of a large detached property on a road of a variety of house types and setbacks. It is not considered that the extensions would be unduly prominent from any public viewpoint

The property is situated in a large plot which has been extended to the side and rear with single storey extensions. The current proposal involves single, two storey and first floor extensions above existing flat roof extensions, although the extensions are large, due to the existing size of the building and the configuration the extensions would be appropriate for the size of the building and the plot with a combination of pitched roofs and flat roofs. The extensions would bring the existing extensions to the rear together which will provide for a more cohesive design for the property.

Residential Amenity

In terms of the impact on Nos 93 and 95.

The proposed single storey extension to the northern side of the property would be situated on the northern boundary for approx. 12m. This boundary forms the southern boundary of maisonettes situated to the north of the application property. The boundary currently comprises an approx. 1.5m high wall which increases in height to 2.5-2.8 in height with a brick wall and brick wall with fence above. This continues down the northern boundary of the property. The maisonettes are set back with one property having a door to the front and one at the side and at first floor at the rear, accessed via steps from the passage between the properties, the steps are open with a glazed porch above. There is a window and door on the southern side of the property at ground floor and small enclosed window at the rear corner. To the rear of the maisonettes is the gardens for the properties and then a large garage block also on the boundary.

The proposed extension would be greater in depth and height than the existing walls and part extensions on the current boundary, projecting further back into the garden. Although incorrectly shown on the existing northern elevation, there is currently potential inter-looking between the properties with No91 having a window facing north at ground floor. The current proposal would increase the wall which would obscure the existing window to no 91. A door will be provided from the single storey extension to the east into the existing passageway to No 91.

In terms of the impact from the single storey extension although it would be south and deeper and higher than the existing boundary height, in view of the existing height of walls the arrangement of the maisonettes with an external staircase and glazed porch at first floor, it is not considered that the extension would cause detrimental loss of light or visual impact to these properties. There would be no additional overlooking from the single storey extension.

With regards to the first floor, two storey extension closest to the maisonettes this would be set off the boundary beyond the single storey extension and although it would provide a balcony at the rear in view of the configuration of the maisonettes, existing external steps to the rear to the first floor maisonette and the distance to the boundary it is not considered the first floor extension would cause detrimental overlooking, visual impact or loss of light. A proposed new window at first floor within the existing building facing north is proposed to be obscure glazed. The balcony screening would be obscure glazed and could be conditioned to be 1.7m in height to ensure that there was not additional detrimental overlooking.

With regards to the southern side neighbours this comprises flats. The flats are set off the boundary with a garage between the southern boundary and the flats. The flats have a similar rear line to No 91, the garage is set back further. No 91 is also set off the boundary by approx. 3.5-4m.

Impact on residents to the south

On the southern side, the single storey elements would remain the same. At first floor the extension would go above the flat roof element to the side and rear and additional two storey. A new window is proposed at first floor of the proposed first floor extension facing south, this is shown as being obscure glazed. A new utility door and patio doors are shown to the southern side these would not cause detrimental overlooking. The balcony is shown as obscure glazed to the southern side and this could be conditioned to a height of 1.7m to ensure that there would not be unacceptable overlooking.

The proposed extension being set well away from the flats and to the northern side would not cause detrimental visual impact, loss of light or overlooking.

Recommendation

APPROVE subject to Conditions:-

1. Drawing Numbers
2. Standard time limit
3. Matching materials
4. No additional openings to side elevations of extension
5. Obscure glazing to balcony 1.7m
6. Obscure glazed windows on plans to remain obscure glazed

Informative

The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by assessing the proposal against all material considerations, including planning policies and any representations that may have been received and subsequently determining to grant planning permission 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: Jackie Fox Date: 15.10.24

Authorised by: Louise Prew Date: 16/10/2024