Expiry Date -08/11/2024

Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/0954/24 Recommendation – APPROVE

Site: 60 Rose Walk Worthing West Sussex BN12 4AT

Proposal: Demolition of existing detached garage and construction of part single and part two-storey rear extension. Cladding in anthracite grey to be applied to the first-floor rear elevation. The installation of 2No. roof lights to the south facing roof slope of the existing dwelling. Retrospective permission to apply anthracite grey cladding to the first-floor front elevation, front gable face, and first-floor side (north) projection.

Date of site visit: 02/09/2024

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: Y – re-notified of change of description and amended plans

Site and Surroundings:

The application property is located on the east side of Rose Walk within a residential area. The property is a detached two-storey house comprising off-white render to lower elevations along with anthracite grey vertical slatted cladding to the upper elevation of the façade and front gable face, a grey tiled gable roof with northerly and southerly catslides and a dormer-like flat roof projection to the northerly roof slope finished in anthracite grey vertical slatted cladding which appears to be original to the dwelling, along with white coloured UPVC openings.

The property is set back from the public realm a moderate distance behind a grey brick wall with brick piers and vehicle access to the southerly side. Projecting from the rear of the dwelling is a single-storey pitched roof extension with another pitched roof extension of a more modest scale projecting to its side (north), both of which are finished in a roughcast render in a blue shade. Single-storey side (north) projections also exist to the original dwelling. The rear garden space is of a generous size and extends relatively deep. The garden comprises predominantly soft landscaping with a patio area flanking the dwelling and fronting the rear extension, along with a variety of shrubberies and trees which mostly border the shared boundaries. A pitched roof garage is located abutting the south boundary with No. 58 which projects into the garden in excess of the existing rear extensions. An outbuilding is located to the south-east of the plot.

Properties in the street scene are similar in terms of their type, set-back position, spacing, and plot size. Some properties exhibit the same character

features as the application property, such as the catslides and dormer-like side projection, but the character of the street scene is generally diverse with individualistic design approaches apparent. Many properties have achieved extensions and alterations to their original build.

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

Proposal:

Permission is sought to demolish the detached garage along with the aforementioned pitched roof rear projections and construct a part single-storey and part two-storey pitched roof rear extension. The extension would create an open plan kitchen/ dining room at ground-floor and additional bedroom at first-floor.

The existing extension project from the rear elevation aligning with the existing north side elevation of the dwelling and in-set approximately 1.1m to the south side elevation. It measures approximately 3.75m deep (the smaller pitched roof element projects an additional approximately 0.95m depth to the north side). The pitched roof measures a maximum height of approximately 4.05m, shallowing to 2.5m at eaves level and the smaller element is approximately 3.1m at maximum height. The replacement single-storey element would comprise matching off-white render elevations, matching grey tiles for the pitched roof, and grey aluminium fenestration in the form of bi-fold doors which would be located to the rear of the extension. 2No. roof lights are proposed to the southerly roof slope. It would project from the rear elevation aligning with the existing north side elevation of the dwelling and in-set approximately 1m to the south side elevation. It would measure approximately 7.7m deep with a matching maximum pitched roof height as exists of approximately 4.05m.

On the other hand, the two-storey element would comprise anthracite grey vertical slatted cladding for elevations, matching grey tiles for the pitched roof, and grey aluminium fenestration in the form of a window which would be located to the rear of the extension. It would project approximately 4m flush with the existing ridge and roof planes of the dwelling and line through with the existing southerly eaves. It would be in-set approximately 1.75m from the northerly elevation.

2No. roof lights are proposed to the existing south roof plane of the dwelling to serve the existing bedroom. These roof lights would be obscure glazed and non-opening below 1.7m.

The application also seeks retrospective permission to apply anthracite grey vertical slatted cladding to the first-floor front elevation, front gable face, and first-floor side (north) projection.

Relevant Planning History:

Expiry Date -08/11/2024

Planning permission granted at the application property for Single storey rear extension under 94/05617/FULL, decision issued 05 Sep 1994.

Planning permission granted at the adjacent property to the north No. 62 for:

- Erection of two storey rear extension under 02/00582/FULL, decision issued 25 Jul 2002.
- Application for a Lawful Development Certificate for Proposed single storey rear extension at ground floor level under AWDM/0570/21, decision issued 26 Apr 2021.

Planning permission granted at the adjacent property to the south No. 58 for:

- Erection of porch to front elevation under 04/00074/FULL, decision issued 25 Feb 2004.
- Proposed part two storey part single storey rear extension under 09/0940/FULL, decision issued 13 Jan 2010.
- Detached pitched roof garage in rear garden under AWDM/1143/15, decision issued 27 Oct 2015.

Refusal at No. 58 for two storey and single storey rear extension and dormer roof extension on side (north) elevation under 09/0317/FULL, decision issued 16 Jun 2009.

Planning permission granted at the nearby property to the south No. 56 for:

- First floor rear extension under 00/00993/FULL, decision issued 20 Nov 2000.

- Single-storey extension to east elevation under AWDM/0574/21, decision issued 25 May 2021.

Consultations:

West Sussex County Council Highways Authority:

'This proposal is for the demolition of existing detached garage and single-storey rear extensions. Construction of part single part 2-storey rear extension. The site is located on Rose Walk, an unclassified road subject to a speed restriction of 30 mph.

There are no proposed changes to the existing access arrangement. The proposed development is not anticipated to give rise to a material intensification of use of the existing access point.

A single-bay garage will be lost as part of the proposals. However, it should be noted that the existing garage does not meet the minimum internal specifications for single-bay garages of 3m x 6m as outlined in Manual for Streets (MfS). Therefore, the LHA would not consider the existing garage for parking provision, as it is likely too small to accommodate modern sized cars.

It is not unreasonable for the LHA to assume the existing garage may be being used for other purposes, such as storage.

As such, no concerns are raised regarding loss of existing parking provision. An existing driveway is to be retained with provision for 1-2 cars.

The LHA does not consider that this proposal would have an unacceptable impact on highway safety or result in 'severe' cumulative impacts on the operation of the highway network, therefore is not contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework (paragraph 115), and that there are no transport grounds to resist the proposal.'

Representations: None received.

Relevant Planning Policies and Guidance
National Planning Policy Framework (Revised December 2023)
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 proposed works would be located to the rear of the property and set-back a good distance from the street scene. Whilst the bulk of the proposal would be removed from visible points of the street scene by virtue of its siting behind the existing dwelling, some of the development would still pose an alteration to views owing to its generous scale and spacing between adjacent properties. Following concerns raised by the Council in respect to the intrusive flat roof first-floor extension which was originally proposed, the scheme has been amended to greater sympathise with the existing form, proportions, and layout of the dwelling. The proposal as amended is considered to be well-related to the existing dwelling and would not present an incongruous form of development.

Weight is also attached to the fact that many rear extensions, both single-storey and two-storey, have been achieved along this side of Rose Walk, namely at No. 56 given its original build and the first-floor extension achieved, both of which have parallels with the application in-hand.

The applicant's intention to modernise the property by way of applying anthracite grey/ grey finishes in the form of cladding, roof tiles, and

fenestration is not considered to result in an adverse impact on the street scene owing to the diversity in the design of surrounding properties. Whilst cladding is not a widely established finishing material in the street scene and locality, its application would not give rise to a harmful precedent owing to the surrounding context and it is considered would improve the appearance of the property giving it a more coherent identity. A condition which restricts the application of cladding to the approved locations only will sufficiently mitigate any adverse impacts arising from the further application of cladding in the future.

The extensions and alterations proposed would not be dominant and it would not harmfully detract from the character of the existing dwelling or street scene. There are no visual amenity grounds to resist the proposal.

Residential Amenity

The most affected neighbours would be at the adjacent properties to the north (No. 62 Rose Walk) and to the south (No. 58 Rose Walk).

The proposed works would generously increase the scale and massing of the existing dwelling. Notwithstanding, this is not considered to be at the cost of residential amenity given the relationship with adjacent neighbours and the merits of the scheme as amended.

The situation with No. 62 to the north would largely remain the same given the positioning of this neighbours large outbuilding alongside the shared boundary which would provide screening from the increased depth of the proposed extension. This neighbour exhibits no windows to their nearside side (south) facing elevation and the dwellings are spaced a good distance apart.

Similarly, the additional depth of the rear extension would not pose a harmful impact on the amenities of No. 58 to the south in view of its form, its siting which would not compromise the existing gap between properties, the demolition of the garage which is in-situ abutting the shared boundary and poses the most prominent feature from No. 58's property, and the fact that this neighbour is located to the south. The proposed first-floor extension to the southerly side of the dwelling would not exceed the depth of No. 58's two-storey rear extension located to their respective northerly side, which is of a greater height and massing.

The deep garden and stretch of mature trees abutting the rear boundary means that there would be no safeguarding concerns in relation to neighbours located to the rear (east)

The only openings proposed to the extension would be positioned to the rear, facing into the applicants own deep garden. The proposed 2No. south facing roof lights on the existing dwelling to serve a bedroom/ office would be obscured glazed and non-opening as agreed with the agent and indicated on the submitted plans. The continued use of the windows as such can be

secured by a condition of planning permission. No unneighbourly overlooking would occur.

The proposal would not give rise to any material overbearing, overshadowing, or overlooking impact to neighbours and there are no residential amenity grounds to resist the proposal.

Other

The proposals would result in the existing first-floor rear bedroom reliant on the above-mentioned rooflights for daylight, with no direct outlook. The approved drawing indicates that the roofllights would be positioned sufficiently high on the roof slope to enable them to be openable for ventilation purposes whilst safeguarding the neighbour to the south from overlooking. The Building Control Officer has confirmed that compliance with BRs can be achieved by providing a protected route with fire doors to the stair circulation space. Consequently whilst this habitable room can be provided with satisfactory daylight and ventilation, the lack of outlook is not an ideal. On balance, the proposals are considered acceptable, taking into account the enhancements as a whole to the accommodation of this dwelling.

Recommendation:

APPROVE subject to Conditions:-

1. Approved Plans
2. Standard Time Limit
3. Materials
4. No Openings Side Elevations Extension
5. Obscure Glazed Non Opening Roof Lights
6. No Additional Cladding

Informatives:-

1. 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: Jason Albon Date: 07.11.2024

Authorised by: Jo Morin Date: 08.11.2024