Expiry Date - 01/11/2024

Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/1137/24 **Recommendation – APPROVE**

Site: **24 Rose Walk Worthing West Sussex BN12 4AU**

Proposal: **Remodelling of existing dwelling, consisting of rooms in roof by raising the roof ridge, new windows to East and West first floor, South facing dormer and roof lights to North and South. New single storey side extension. Render to all elevations.**

Date of site visit: 16/10/24

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Site and Surroundings

The site is located to the east side of Rose Walk within a residential area of Worthing. The property comprises a detached bungalow with render and painted brick elevations, white UPVC windows and doors and a tiled hipped roof with lower projecting gable to the front finished in white cladding. The bungalow has been extended previously with an extension to the rear which has extended the main ridge line over to form a half gable. There is also a flat roofed garage attached to the north side wall and a lean-to addition to the rear of that which forms a utility room. The property is set back from the road behind a paved driveway with parking for several cars.

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 remodelling of the dwelling to include raising the ridge, a dormer to the south side, new windows and rooflights, a single storey side extension and render to the elevations.

The roof ridge of the main building would be raised from 5.32m to 6.7m with a new eaves height of 3.7m. The main front hipped roof would be extended to form a gable and the rear gable would be retained and extended to match the raised ridge height. The lower projecting gable to the front would be retained, as would the existing hipped roof rear extension with a modification to its roof to allow for a first floor rear window.

An eaves dormer is proposed to the south side measuring approximately 3.2m wide x 2.4m high and 2m deep with a half-hip roof. Windows would be added to the front and rear gables and a single roof light to the south side, serving a

landing/study and three roof lights to the north side serving the stairs and a bedroom.

A new side extension to form a shed is proposed behind the existing garage and storage extension to the north side of the building. The extension would measure approximately 3.3m deep x 1.45m wide with a flat roof of 2.4m high. The flat roof would extend along the length of the building above the existing garage and side extension at a height of 2.4m with a false pitch to the front and two roof lights above.

The alterations would be finished in white render to the elevations, grey slate roof tiles, anthracite grey windows and doors, black rainwater goods and grey cladding to the lower front projecting gable.

The roof extensions would increase the first floor accommodation from two bedrooms and a WC to three bedrooms, a bathroom and study to the landing.

The application has been amended to reduce the ridge height to 6.7m, alter the dormer to a half hip and reduce the width of the dormer by 0.6m and to reduce the height of the north side extension from 2.6m to 2.4m high. An amended block plan has also been provided to correct a displaced red ownership boundary.

Relevant Planning History:

AWDM/1899/17 - Addition of first floor to whole of building to provide extra headroom and provide further rooms in roof with four rooflights to each of north and south side elevations. Single-storey side extension to north elevation to replace existing, front entrance porch to west elevation, and alterations to roof form of rear (east) extension – Approved 23.05.2018

AWDM/0296/17 Raising of ridge and eaves to facilitate new first floor with rooms in roof including new roof lights to side and rear elevations, and with single storey extension to side/rear. New windows to first floor level to all elevations. Approved 11.08.2017

AWDM/1412/16 Retention of rooms in roof with side dormer to each of north and south elevations and hip to gable extension to front (west) elevation). Refused 20.12.2016

Consultations:

None required

Representations:

Two representations received from the adjacent occupiers to the north concerning the following:

Comments on revised drawing 02/Rev2.

We have seen the revised drawing, and are pleased to see that our earlier comments as set out in our statement dated 17 September 2024, have largely been addressed. We do still have some concerns, which we believe can be addressed by conditions on an approval.

Overlooking
We are pleased to note that the roof lights directly opposite, and overlooking, our kitchen have been reduced in height. There is not however a specific note about their height or glazing. We therefore ask for a condition that they shall have obscured glass and a cill height of at least 1.7 metres above the floor of the rooms in which the windows are installed.

Extension on North side
We are pleased to note the overall height is now stated on the drawing as 2.4m. We are however still concerned about the construction of this wall for which no detail is stated on the drawing. This wall is not visible to the Applicants and could deteriorate and look unsightly, (as has happened to the existing construction). It therefore needs to be of durable maintenance free materials. We therefore ask for conditions covering the following:

The wall shall be finished on the North side in a cement render to match the existing adjacent garage wall, and shall be painted in a colour to be agreed with the owners of No 26 Rose Walk.

The top of the wall and roof edge shall be capped in a durable material that does not require regular maintenance.

Revised Block Plan
The revised block plan shows the red ownership boundary line displaced (at least on the online copy). On a strict interpretation this denotes that No 26 owns part of our outside area. This is not correct and should be changed.

Comments on original drawings:
The proposal to raise the roof and increase the height of the side extension will have a significant impact on our property. Our bungalow is to the north of the proposals, and our kitchen and side paved area benefit from sunshine over the existing adjacent house. This will be considerably impacted by the proposals. We do however reluctantly accept that raising the roof line of no 24 has been previously approved, and we have to accept the principle of raising the roof ridge is established.

We do however have further concerns about this proposal.

Firstly in relation to overlooking, and secondly in relation to the height of the proposed extension adjacent to our property.

Overlooking.

Our concerns relate to the proposed roof lights on the north elevation. These look directly into our kitchen, which is only 5.5m away. We understand why they are wanted, but ask for a condition that they shall have obscured glass and a cill height of at least 1.7 metres above the floor of the rooms in which the windows are installed.

The height of the side extension.
We welcome the removal of the existing ugly, untidy and poorly maintained extension, but we are concerned about its height.

The existing wall on the boundary adjacent to the proposed extension is 1.910m high. The drawings give a proposed height of 2.6m, but there is also a thick line above the end of the dimension line. It is not clear what this line is supposed to be, but it is about another 200mm thick. This 690mm increase (from 1.91 to 2.6m), is a significant figure, and if the thick line has to be included, it is even worse. This wall is directly opposite our kitchen window, on the boundary, and only 3.57m away. The proposal will significantly reduce the amount of sunlight in our external paved area, where we regularly sit, because it is sheltered from the wind. It will also look very overbearing from our kitchen window.

The existing garage wall on the boundary is 2.6m high, the extension as proposed will therefore be the same height as the adjoining existing wall. We see no reason why the wall has to be so high. The existing garage wall has a parapet about 200mm high, which is unnecessary. If the extension were to have an internal height the same as the garage, then this wall could be reduced by about 200mm below the proposed height, along its whole length, including the existing garage. On the garage this would offer a minor improvement to the outlook from our lounge window, and for the extension, considerably lessen the impact of the reduction in sunlight and outlook from our kitchen. We would accept a wall height of 2.4m.

We are concerned as to how the roof edge and top of the wall will be constructed. The treatment of this roof edge is very visible to us, and its detailing is important. We would not wish to see any material used which requires regular maintenance, because it will not be visible to the Applicants and will likely deteriorate and look unsightly, (as has happened to the existing construction). The 200mm thick black line on the drawing, as referred to earlier, should be clarified.

In summary we would like the following conditions in relation to this wall:

The wall on the North boundary shall not exceed 2.4m high, above the adjoining ground level, along its entire length.

The wall shall be finished on the North side in a cement render to match the existing adjacent garage wall, and shall be painted in a colour to be agreed with the owners of No 26 Rose Walk.
The top of the wall and roof edge shall be capped in a durable material that does not require regular maintenance.

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

The principle of development to form a two storey dwelling with raised ridge has previously been established and approved under applications AWDM/1899/17 and AWDM/0296/17. The current scheme proposes further changes to the design. The key considerations are the effects on the visual and residential amenities of the locality.

Visual Amenity

There is a mix of dwelling types and designs in the immediate vicinity consisting of bungalows, chalet bungalows and two storey houses with a variety of roof heights and forms. The immediate neighbouring properties comprise a similar bungalow to the north side at No.26 and a two storey house to the south side at No.22.

There have been two previous approved schemes for remodelling and a raised ridge extension for the application property under AWDM/0296/17 and AWDM/1899/17. The former approval was for a raised ridge (7.7m) to form a traditional two storey dwelling with a hipped roof and catslide to the front with small dormer and single storey side extension. The latter approval was for a chalet bungalow with first floor accommodation within the roof space, a raised ridge (6.5m), a single storey side extension and changes to the roof of the rear extension.

A very similar scheme to that currently proposed, with a ridge height of 6.7m was also approved at No.36 Rose Walk under application AWDM/0069/22.

The current scheme for the application site is very similar in proportions and detailing to the last approval but with a slightly steeper pitch resulting in a ridge height of 6.7m. The steeper pitch is considered to enhance the design and would still be well below the original ridge height approved at 7.7m. The ridge height would also match that of the approved and built scheme at No.36 (a very similar proposal). The ridge height would be consistent with other recent approvals in the immediate locality and would not appear out of keeping with the varied street scene.

The main difference between the previous approval and current scheme is the addition of an eaves dormer to the south side, which accommodates a bathroom. The dormer has been amended to replace the proposed pitched roof with a half hip which reduces the bulk of this addition, and to reduce the width of the dormer by 0.6m and although visible from the road, due to its set

back position the dormer would not appear dominant or intrusive in the street scene.

The current design in comparison to the most recent previous approval also incorporates the porch within the existing single storey front gable providing cleaner lines and less clutter to the front elevation. The single storey side extension extends approximately 1.65m further to the rear but has reduced the height from 2.9m to 2.4m and includes a false pitch to the front. The roof to the existing rear extension would be altered from a mansard roof to a hipped roof. These changes are considered to enhance the overall design and would integrate well within the street scene.

The materials would be updated to rendered walls, a grey slate roof, anthracite windows and doors, and grey horizontal cladding to the front lower gable. Subject to the cladding being restricted to the lower front gable only (as currently exists) these materials would not result in any significant harm to the character of the street scene.

Having regard to the variety in the design and form of nearby dwellings in the streetscene and the previously approved schemes at this property, the proposal is considered to respect the character of the area and would not appear out of keeping with the street scene, dominant or intrusive. There would be no significant harm to the visual amenities of the locality as a result of this proposal.

Residential Amenity

The most affected properties are to the sides at No.22 to the south and No.26 to the north.

No.22 is a two storey house and has been previously extended to the north side to form a two storey side extension. The windows to the side of this property serve non-habitable rooms (bathrooms, dressing room, porch, WC). The only additional windows proposed to the south side of No.24 are a bathroom window to the dormer that would be obscure glazed and fixed shut and a roof light to the first floor landing/study that is positioned more than 1.7m above finished floor level. There is already a window at first floor to the rear and an enlarged window in a similar position would not exacerbate any existing views to neighbouring properties. There would be no overlooking or loss of privacy to these neighbours. The proposal would not extend beyond the footprint of the existing building other than for the small north side extension at ground floor and the raised ridge height and extended roof form to the frontage would not significantly diminish light to No.22 or appear overbearing or intrusive.

No.26 is a bungalow with double gable to the front and a garage to the south side. The main outlook for the bungalow is to the front and rear, however, there is a kitchen/dining room window in the south side elevation, facing the application site. Outlook to the south-east from this window is interrupted by the neighbours own garage and looks onto the existing garage and lean to side extension at No.24. The application proposes a small extension to the rear of the side extension, however this would be positioned adjacent to the

neighbour's garage and would not have any adverse impact. The new roof to the garage and side extension at 2.4m high would be slightly lower than the existing roof at 2.5m high and would not have any additional impact on the neighbours. No windows are proposed within this side extension. The only new openings to the north side are three rooflights, serving the stairs and a bedroom. The section drawing shows that the bottom cill of these rooflights would be above 1.7m from finished floor level and therefore would not be considered to result in overlooking or loss of privacy. There would be no further expansion beyond the footprint of the existing building and the increase in ridge height (1m less than the first approval) would not have any significant impact on light or appear overbearing in outlook, to the neighbours. The gabled design to the front and rear was approved by the previous application and there is no change to this roof form other than a slight increase at ridge height of 0.2m (still lower than the original approved ridge height of 7.7m). The bulk of the extended roof would be pitched away from the boundary and separated by the two garages, further limiting its impact.

Neighbours to the rear of the site are over 50m from the proposed extensions and would not suffer any loss of amenity.

The proposal would not result in any significant detrimental impact on the residential amenities of adjacent occupiers.

Recommendation

APPROVE subject to Conditions:-

1. Drawing Numbers
2. Standard time limit
3. Materials as specified
4. Cladding to front lower projecting gable only
5. Rooflights above 1.7m
6. Dormer window south obscure glazed and fixed shut
7. No additional openings to side elevations/roof 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? Y

Case Officer:	Amanda Haslett	Date: 12/12/24
Authorised by:	Louise Prew	Date: 12/12/24