Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/0724/24 Recommendation: Approve

Site: 69 Lime Tree Avenue, Worthing

Proposal: **Proposed conversion of roof space with front and rear dormers including partial hip to gables and extension to front roofslope. Single storey rear and side extensions**

Last visited: 16.04.2024

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: Y Revised description notified 30.07.24

Site and Surroundings

The site relates to a traditional detached hipped roof bungalow on the west side of Lime Tree Avenue. It has two hipped roofed rear projections and a conservatory at its rear. There is a separate garage on its north side. Dwellings on this side of the street sit lower in relation to those on the east where ground levels rise to the east.

This is a predominantly residential area comprising mainly of bungalows on this side of the street but with some variation in their design. Some bungalows to the south of the application site have been extended into the roof with barn-hip gable extensions and front dormers but appear to maintain the original ridge level.

Proposal

Permission is sought for a hip-to-part gable /barn-hip extension to both the north and south sides and altering the front roofslope to continue over the front bow windows. Two pitched roof dormer windows are proposed to the front elevation and a dormer extension is proposed to the rear which would include a Juliet balcony. Tile hanging is proposed to the dormer and gable walls.

A single storey extension is proposed, following removal of the existing garage and conservatory, which would wrap around the side (north) and rear (west) of the bungalow. It would extend approximately 3 metres in depth beyond the rear projection on the southern side of the rear elevation, and continuing at this alignment across its width to the north side where it would extend approximately 1 metre beyond the rear projection at the northern end and extend a further 3.1m in width to the north side. It would have a flat roof with false pitch wrapping around each side measuring approximately 3.7 metres in height as measured at the frontage, with ground levels sloping to the rear. Matching brickwork is proposed

Relevant Planning History:

AWDM/0246/24 - Proposed single storey side extension; part one-, part two-storey rear extension; demolition of existing garage and conservatory; conversion of roof space including raising height of ridge and rear roof extension, hip to barn end style gables, front facing dormers and roof window; and rear timber balcony. Withdrawn 07.05.2024

Consultations:
None

Representations:

Three representations have been received in response to the original consultation from the occupiers of No. 62 Lime Tree Avenue opposite the site and the immediate neighbours at No. 67 and 71 Lime Tree Avenue and with one additional representation received following the revised description from the immediate neighbour to the south at No.67, objecting the application on the following grounds as summarised:

- Loss of privacy/overlooking – new rear dormer windows and Juliet balcony will cause overlooking into gardens if not obscure glazed or restricted in their method of opening. Dormer windows at No. 67 were required to be obscure glazed.
- Juliet balcony – concern over potential to form balcony
- Objection to any alteration to the skyline or plane of the roof being altered on design grounds

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

Barn hipped gable extensions have generally been accepted in the vicinity of the site with several examples of extended bungalows and there is some variation in design, but they generally retain a sense of uniformity in the overall scale of the roof, the extent of gable wall, modest pitched roof front dormers and retaining the original ridge height.

The previous application AWDM/0246/24 was withdrawn following concerns over the scale of the proposals resulting in a dominant and overbearing impact. The current application has taken a different approach by not altering the ridge height and

reduced the first floor additions including a reduced extent of gable as well as deleting the rear raised terrace previously proposed.

The current scheme would appear more sympathetic in relation to surrounding bungalows, retaining the ridge line and with the deletion of the rear two storey element and reduction in the extent of gable wall with a lower barn-hip design and with front dormers being similar to others in the vicinity. This would not appear unduly dominant or out of character in relation to the other examples seen nearby or in relation to the scale of other neighbouring dwellings to the north that have not been extended into the roof.

The extension to the front roofslope would continue the roof over the existing bow windows. No.69 already appears generally forward in its alignment at the frontage compared to its immediate neighbours where the full width of its front elevation sits forward compared to others which have projecting or recessed elements at this point. However the general building line in the street has some staggering or stepped elements and the proposals would not appear excessive with a small projection to the roofslope where it would be angled to overhang further at the frontage and no extension to the front wall itself.

An amendment to the position of the proposed front dormers was requested to give a more balanced appearance by setting them further over the ground floor windows but the applicant has not agreed to this amendment. However, as proposed the dormer windows would be reasonably sympathetic in their proportions and design and would not cause any significant harm to visual amenity in this instance.

At the rear, a large dormer extension is proposed which would give a relatively top-heavy and bulky appearance at the rear. However, it would be set well in from the side wall and set in from the edges of the roof where the full extent of the dormer extension would not be readily visible in the streetscene. There are also other examples of large dormer extensions in Lime Tree Avenue and given that in this instance the proposed dormer would not appear as a prominent feature in the streetscene, a refusal on design or visual amenity grounds would not be justified.

The single storey extension would wrap around the north and west elevations and would include a false pitch to each side. An amendment has been sought to set the side extension element back from the front wall to appear more subservient and overcome an awkward junction between its front ridge tile and the main roofslope, but the applicant has not been willing to alter this element further. Nevertheless, as a single storey structure it would not appear particularly dominant, and whilst it would be visible from views at the north side, the full extent of the side/ rear extension would not be readily visible in the streetscene and would be well screened on the south side and enclosed by gardens at the rear.

Subject to the use of matching materials, design and impact on visual amenity is considered acceptable.

Residential Amenity

The main impact arising from the proposals would be to the occupiers of No.71 to the north and No.67 to the south. Neighbouring dwellings to the front and rear would be sufficiently remote from the proposed development to avoid any significant impact and with the dormers having a similar relationship with neighbours to the front and rear as other extended bungalows and their neighbours opposite and would not cause any significant loss of privacy.

To the north No.71 has its main front wall set back from the front of No.69. There is one window to the south side of No.71 affected by the proposals but this is a secondary window with main outlook being to the rear (west) and with a bay window to the front elevation closest to the application site. There is a low boundary fence to the side boundary with shrubs providing some screening towards the rear of No.71 at present. The existing garage at No.69, which is sited immediately adjacent to the north boundary, would be removed and the new single storey extension would be set in from the boundary by approximately 1 metre. There would be a separation distance of approximately 5.7 metres between the side wall of the neighbouring dwelling to the new gable wall and with the proposed dormer extensions set in from the edge of the extended roof and would not pose any significant threat to the amenities of No.71 in terms of light or outlook given the relationship on this side. Whilst the single storey proposals would extend closer to the boundary and extend approximately 1 metre beyond the existing rear wall of No.71, this would be for the single storey element only and would not extend significantly beyond the rear of No. 71. The roof extension would be well separated to avoid any significant impact and having regard to the relationship with No.71 the proposed extensions would not pose any significant threat to residential amenity. Glazing in the rear dormer would offer views down the garden but this relationship would be similar to others within the street that have extended into the roof. A condition is recommended for the proposed ground floor side window to be obscure glazed in the interests of protecting privacy.

On the south side, No. 67 is an extended bungalow with a part gable/part hipped roof extension and gabled rear projection positioned closely to the boundary with the application site which extends beyond the rear of no.69. It also has a gabled front projection with which the existing front wall of No.69 roughly aligns There are side windows contained within the north wall of No.27, two of which are obscure glazed and appear to serve the bathroom/wc and one clear glazed window which is towards the rear of the side gable wall and is understood to provide sole outlook to a bedroom/study which is enclosed at the rear by the neighbours own rear extension and the existing relationship with No.69 encloses to the north. There are also rooflights in the side roofslope of the rear kitchen extension facing the application site but with main outlook to the rear room being to the rear (west).

The revised application proposes a lower gable element at approximately 4.45 metres high, compared with 5.2m for the previous scheme, and has deleted the extent of first floor accommodation at the rear. The extended roof and side gable wall would be closely sited to no. 67 as before but given the height proposed, site orientation and the relationship with No.67 where the main bulk would be sited largely forward of the main side window, and dormers would be set in from the side walls, it is considered that there would be no significant impact to the amenities of the neighbouring occupier. Comments raised in the representations concerning loss of privacy from the rear Juliet balcony are noted but this would be similar to the

impact of a rear window and given the presence of other dormer windows with rear outlook, and having regard to permitted development allowance which would permit a similar relationship. lt would not be reasonable to require obscure glazing to the habitable rooms at the rear in this instance. Whilst the neighbours' comments point towards their own rear dormer window being required to be obscure glazed, this window as approved was to a rear shower room where obscure glazing would provide privacy for the occupiers without compromising outlook from any habitable room (02/01020/FULL refers). The occupier of No.69 would be able to install obscure glazing to the proposed bathroom window to protect their own privacy.

In relation to the single storey extension, whilst this would be sited relatively closely to the neighbouring dwelling, aligning with the existing south side wall of No.69, and higher than the existing conservatory that it would replace, it would not be as deep or extend beyond the neighbours own rear extension. Having regard to its size and the relationship with No. 67 the proposed extension would not pose any significant threat to the amenities of No.67. Side windows are indicated to be at a high level and would not cause any significant overlooking and a condition to prevent any further windows being installed in the side walls is recommended in the interests of protecting privacy.

Recommendation

APPROVE subject to Conditions:-

1. Drawing Numbers
2. Standard time limit
3. Matching materials
4. Obscure glazing (north elevation)
5. No further side windows/openings (north and south)

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? Y

Case Officer: Rebekah Hincke Date: 14.08.2024

Authorised by: Louise Prew Date: 20/08/2024