Expiry Date - 14/06/2024

Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/0510/24 **Recommendation – REFUSE**

Site: **24 Glynde Avenue Worthing West Sussex BN12 5BH**

Proposal: **Rooms in roof consisting of flat roof dormers to side elevations, new gable windows to front and rear elevations. White render and timber cladding to external walls. Re-roof of pitched roof areas using grey concrete tiles, and removal of 2No existing Velux windows and addition of a square rooflight to proposed flat roof dormer.**

Date of site visit: 22/04/24

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Site and Surroundings

The site is located to the east side of Glynde Avenue, close to the junction with Goring Way, within a residential area of Worthing. The property comprises a detached bungalow with bay window and gable to the front, hipped roof to the rear and brick elevations. There is an attached garage to the north side at the rear of the building and a lean to structure to the south side and a small garden to the rear.

The property has an open frontage on to the road with a concrete driveway and hardstanding to the front. High close board fencing forms the boundaries of the site.

The site 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 a loft conversion including dormers to the side, a hip to gable rear extension and change of materials to white render, timber cladding and grey tiles and removal of two roof lights and addition of a roof light to the dormer.

The hipped roof to the rear (east) would be extended out to form a gable continuing at the same ridge and eaves height as the existing roof. The gable end would have feature glazing to the upper floor and the ground floor openings would be replaced with glazed doors. The front gable (west) would have feature glazing to the upper floor to match that proposed to the rear.

Flat roof dormers are proposed to the north and south side elevations and would each measure approximately 10.9m wide x 2.5m high x 3.35m deep. The dormers would be finished in horizontal timber cladding with three obscure glazed windows to the north (serving the bedrooms and landing) and two windows to the south side (serving the ensuites).

The exterior of the building including the garage and lean to would be updated, the brickwork and timber elevations would be rendered, the white UPVC windows and doors replaced with grey UPVC and the brown roof tiles and roof felt replaced with grey tiles throughout.

Internally the loft conversion and extension would provide 2 bedrooms both with ensuite and a landing with small study and roof light above. The ground floor bedroom at the rear of the property would be converted to a dining area as part of the open plan kitchen/diner.

It should be noted that the lean to extension to the south side is currently a timber construction with felt roof that tucks in under the eaves and is not a brick and tile structure that extends above the eaves, as shown on the existing drawings. The changes to this structure have therefore also formed part of the consideration under this application.

Relevant Planning History:

None relevant

Consultations:

None required

Representations:

Goring and Ilex Conservation Group – *The committee wish to object to the application due to the overbearing design and size of the dormers which appear obtrusive and out of place in the local area consisting of bungalows, a few of which have a single small dormer added. This proposal suggests a final result more akin to a cube than the pitched and hipped roofs of the locality suggesting overdevelopment and resulting in a loss to the general amenity of the area.*

Two objections received from adjacent occupiers at No.231 Goring Way and 22 Glynde Avenue, as summarised below:

No.231 - We wish to register our strong objections to the application on the following grounds: Being overlooked, loss of privacy and loss of light - The proposed dormer on the north side comprises almost the full length of the side of the building and will cause our gardens to be overlooked from the proposed dormer windows. From these windows you would also be able to see directly into our kitchen through our windows on the south side. Because of the height of the proposed dormers and the close proximity to our property there would also be loss of light to our gardens and kitchen.

The proposed gable end on the east side similarly causes our garden on that side to be overlooked by the proposed window. We have a spa on the east side of our property which would be directly overlooked from the window taking away the privacy we currently enjoy in that area.

The proposed scale of the development is intended to make more room inside allowing this 2 bedroomed bungalow to become large 3 bedroomed house. The size of the bedrooms planned for roof development lends itself to future development of another bedroom or 2 thus is at risk of enabling “house in multiple occupation” (HMO).

These proposed plans both in size and design are not in keeping with the area. We moved to this area because it had great character, all bungalows and were looking forward to enjoying our garden with the privacy that bungalows provide. If we had looked at this property and we had seen this proposed development next door we would never have purchased it. This would be soul destroying if it is accepted. We would struggle to sell our property now as many people would find this proposed massive extension claustrophobic. Waiting for the outcome is causing a lot of anxiety and sleepless nights.

No.22 (photos also provided to highlight concerns)

We have the following objections to the application:
Design, appearance, materials & character - The proposed development is of a design that is out of keeping with the other properties in Glynde Avenue and of an entirely different appearance to them. All other properties are bungalows and the imposing extent of the dormers proposed on either side of the roof to extend the whole length of the roof will produce a development out of character with the rest of the bungalows in the avenue. The proposed construction materials are also out of character with the traditional brick walls and roof tiles of the bungalows in Glynde Avenue.

Overlooking, loss of privacy and light
The adjacent walls of our bungalow and 24 Glynde Avenue are approx. 2.9 metres apart. The roof of 24 Glynde Avenue extends 4.7m in front of and beyond our front bedroom where we sleep which will mean the proposed construction of a full length roof dormer will cause loss of light to our front bedroom. The roof line of 24 Glynde Avenue extends 2.1m beyond and in front of our living room bay window causing loss of light by a dormer construction along the full length of the roof. Our bathroom windows face north to 24 Glynde Avenue and when our windows are open any open dormer windows on the south side will have sight right into our bathroom. A full length roof dormer as proposed will further reduce light to our north facing bathroom.

The proposed windows in the east facing gable end will overlook our garden.

Planning considerations regarding the utility room - The utility room on the south side of 24 Glynde Avenue, shown in the drawings "GROUND FLOOR PLAN - EXISTING" has been drawn with shaded walls of a thickness that would indicate a substantial construction. It is in fact a lean-to of timber construction

with a flat, slightly pitched bitumen roof covering, built off the kitchen door on the south wall of 24 Glynde Avenue. It has external timber doors at either end so as to provide access from the front of the property to the rear, but these doors are not shown on the plan, giving the impression it is a substantial existing extension. The construction of this nature of utility area to the side of properties in the Goring Hall area, providing access from the front to the rear garden, is commonly seen, but they are usually constructed with UPVC material for the doors & walls, often accompanied by glazing. These may not comply with planning regulations and the existing lean-to construction encroaches over onto our side of the border. Furthermore, if any internal reinforcement of the timber walls of this construction by using brick or blockwork has already taken place we believe this would contravene planning regulations. The drawings do not show the timber access doors at either end of the utility and portray the construction as being substantial when it is not so. We would hope there is no intention to make this construction more substantial in the absence of a specific planning application to do so.

Hesketh Estates - Properties in the Goring Hall area, including Glynde Avenue are subject to restrictive covenants placed on the land sold by Hesketh Estates to the builder developers responsible for the construction of the properties. Development of this nature without permission from Hesketh Estates is in contravention of those covenants.

Officer response: Restrictive covenants imposed on land or buildings that are not applied by the Council are private legal obligations and therefore out of our control and would need to be adhered to by the applicants.

Relevant Planning Policies

Worthing Local Plan policies (WBC 2023): SP1, DM5
National Planning Policy Framework (DLUHC 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.

Policy Context

The National Planning Policy Framework paragraph 131, advises that *'good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, creates better places in which to live and work and helps make development acceptable to communities'*. Paragraph 135 indicates that development should: (b) be visually attractive as a result of good architecture and (c) sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment, and in paragraph 139 states: '*Development that is not well designed should be refused especially where it fails to reflect local design policies and government guidance on*

design, taking into account any local design guidance and supplementary planning documents such as design guides and codes'.

Policy DM5 – Quality of the Built Environment, of the Worthing Local Plan requires that; *All new development (including extensions, residential annexes, alterations, ancillary development, change of use and intensification) should:*

i) be of a high architectural and design quality and respect and enhance the character of the site and the prevailing character of the area. This will include consideration of proportion, form, design, context, massing, siting, layout, density, height, size, scale, materials, detailed design features and landscaping;
ii) enhance the local environment by way of its appearance and character, with particular attention being paid to the architectural form, height, materials, density, scale, orientation, landscaping, tree canopy, impact on street scene and layout of the development;
iii) make a positive contribution to the sense of place, local character and distinctiveness of an area;
viii) not have an unacceptable impact on the occupiers of adjacent properties, particularly of residential dwellings, including unacceptable loss of privacy, daylight/sunlight, outlook, an unacceptable increase in noise giving rise in significant adverse impacts, or vehicular movements resulting in severe cumulative impacts on the road network, or loss of important open space of public value (unless it satisfies any of the exceptions set out under Policy DM7 – Open Space, Recreation and Leisure);

and …

Ensuring Good Design
d) Development must reflect government guidance on design and take into account any local design guidance and supplementary planning documents such as design guides and codes. Weight will be given to outstanding or innovative designs which promote high levels of sustainability, or help raise the standard of design more generally, so long as they fit in with the overall form and layout of their surroundings.

The Council's SPG - Extending or altering your home, requires that:

The design of your extension achieves an appropriate relationship with the design of the existing house and; that it also takes into account any impact on the street scene.

The size and shape of any extension should normally be designed to ensure the original house remains the larger and more dominant feature.

In order to ensure that your extension relates well to your house, its design should be consistent with your existing property's style and shape.

The facing materials of any extension should ideally match those used for the existing house. If identical materials are not available, the nearest possible

alternative should be used. When selecting materials, you should ensure that they match the originals in size, shape and texture.

Roof extensions and dormers are often highly visible and alien features which greatly alter the appearance of a dwelling. Dormers should never be allowed to dominate the roof by being overly large. Hipped roof or gable ended dormers are often preferable to those with flat roofs, because they reduce the overall "bulk" of the extension. This also avoids the horizontal emphasis that is produced by large flat roofed dormers.

The above policies and relevant sections of the Design Guidance, SPG – 'Extending or altering your home' clearly set out the expectations for development and require that extensions are well designed to reflect the predominant characteristics of the local area, do not adversely affect the appearance of the street scene, are of a scale that is proportionate to existing and surrounding development and do not detrimentally affect the amenities of local residents.

Visual Amenity

The area is characterised by detached bungalows of modest scale, finished in traditional materials of brick, tiles and render. There are two distinct forms and design of bungalow in the immediate area, the majority have a lower, narrower projecting hipped roof form to the front and the rest have a full gable (or barn hip) and bay window to the front, as at the application property. This gable form is also seen at No.31 opposite the site and Nos.18, 16 and 6 Glynde Avenue and No.45 Thakeham Drive, further to the south. Most properties have added single storey side or rear extensions and a few have added dormers to the side. Where dormers have been added these are small in scale and finished in materials to match; most do not benefit from planning permission and were likely to have been constructed under permitted development or pre-date current regulations.

The application property is clearly visible in the street scene and sits further forwards in its plot than the properties directly to the south, with an open frontage to the street. The large scale dormers proposed to both sides of the roof would appear as alien and intrusive additions to the building. The excessive scale of the dormers together with their uncharacteristic flat roof design would almost entirely subsume the original roof of the building, resulting in an extremely dominant form of development that cannot be considered subsidiary in scale or form. The unsympathetic box like design fails to assimilate well with the existing building or surrounding buildings and would entirely dominate the roofscape.

A key prevailing characteristic of the area is the general uniformity of elevational treatment, which would be disrupted in this case by the proposed timber cladding. The proposed timber cladding to the dormers within this traditional street scene would not only be extremely out of keeping with the character of the area but would also serve to highlight their large scale and lack of subservience and cohesion with the existing building or other development in

the surrounding street scene. The large feature glazing proposed to the front elevation would further exacerbate the inability of the design to integrate with its surroundings.

The proposed change of materials from brick to render would still be in keeping with the more traditional materials of the street scene and the change from white UPVC to grey UPVC windows and doors would not significantly affect the character of the property. The change of colour of the roof tiles from brown to grey would be more noticeable and would appear stark when viewed in context with the predominantly brown tiles of surrounding properties although it is noted that there are a few examples of grey roof tiles in the wider area and therefore this may be acceptable.

The proposed hip to gable extension to the rear would be less prominent in street views and it is noted that similar development has been carried out at other properties in the area. The extension would follow the ridge and eaves height of the existing building and would not be considered to have an adverse impact on visual amenity. The large feature glazing to the rear gable would not be visible from the road.

The utility room to the side would be reconstructed in brick and tiles, apparently occupying the same footprint as the current lean-to structure but extending above eaves level with a monopitch roof. As the existing timber structure is not shown correctly on the existing drawings, it is difficult to compare the changes, however a small extension of this height and set back from the front of the house would not have any adverse impact on visual amenity.

The proposed dormers due to their excessive size, flat roof design and timber cladding would fail to assimilate with or reflect the predominant characteristics of the existing building or the wider street scene, resulting in an alien and incongruous form of development. The dormers would become the dominant feature of the dwelling, entirely subsuming the modest proportions of the existing bungalow and causing significant harm to the visual amenities of the locality. The uncharacteristic, size, form and materials of the dormers are further exacerbated by the feature glazing to the front gable that is entirely out of keeping with the character of the area.

Residential Amenity

The most affected neighbours are those immediately adjacent to the site at No.231 Goring Way, 229 Goring Way and 22 Glynde Avenue.

No.231 is located directly to the north of the application site with its rear elevation facing on to the side of the application property. There is a single storey extension to the rear and a high close board fence to the boundary. There is a gap of 2.43m between the side elevation of No 24 and the boundary fence and a gap of between 5 and 7m between the bungalows (excluding garage). The buildings are already in close proximity to each other however this is mitigated by the current lack of development above ground floor level and the roofs sloping away from the boundary. The addition of any dormer to

the north elevation and in particular one of the very large scale proposed by this application, would appear extremely overbearing and oppressive to the neighbours, severely compromising their privacy and outlook.

Due to the corner position of the neighbour's property their only private garden space is to the rear (south) and side, enclosed by a close board fence. The proposed dormer would compromise privacy to the entirety of this garden space overlooking the garden seating areas, hot tub and the rear facing kitchen/diner windows and doors to the south of No.231. It is noted that the dormer windows to this side are to be obscure glazed although there is no mention of these being fixed shut. Whilst obscure glazing would help to mitigate overlooking to some extent, the perception of overlooking would still remain and in such close proximity this would cause unacceptable harm to neighbouring amenity. Furthermore the reality is that these windows would be required to open to provide adequate ventilation and potentially fire escape and therefore any mitigation provided by obscure glazing would be undermined by the practical need for opening windows.

The proposed hip to gable extension to the rear and feature glazing at first floor would further exacerbate issues of overlooking with direct views from the main bedroom window to the neighbours hot tub, located in the south-east corner of their garden. This area is currently screened by the fence and lack of openings at first floor level. The hip to gable extension is also likely to increase overshadowing to the kitchen window (classed as a habitable room as it forms a kitchen/diner) and diminishing light to this room, due to its position directly to the south of No.231 and in such close proximity.

The dormer addition due to its size, height, position and windows and the hip to gable extension and first floor rear windows, in such close proximity would be extremely overbearing and oppressive, resulting in an unacceptable level of overlooking and loss of privacy, diminishing light and having a significant and harmful impact on the amenities of No.231.

No.229 is located to the east of the application site with the side garden boundary adjoining the rear boundary of No.24. There is a close board fence to the boundary and a distance of approximately 8.5m between the rear elevation of No.24 and the boundary. The proposed large feature windows at first floor to the rear gable end of the proposed hip to gable extension would provide direct views across the neighbour's private garden space and the privacy of these occupants would be severely compromised.

No.22 Glynde Avenue is located to the south side of the application property with a gap of about 2.9m between properties and is separated by a close board fence. The existing lean-to structure currently overhangs this fence and this would need to be rectified by the applicant's in any subsequent application. The small scale and low height of this side extension is unlikely to have any detrimental impact on the neighbour. The proposed dormer to the south side would extend almost the full depth of the building which projects approximately 4.7m in front of the bedroom window at No.22. Although in this position to the north of the neighbour a dormer is unlikely to affect light to their bedroom, the

size and close proximity would appear overbearing and oppressive to these neighbours, severely compromising outlook from their bedroom window. The only windows proposed to the south dormer would serve ensuite bathrooms (non-habitable rooms) and would not result in overlooking to the neighbours property. The windows to the north side of No.22 serve a WC, shower room and utility/kitchen. Due to the close proximity of the proposed dormer to these windows these rooms are likely to suffer some impact in terms of outlook although as these are not habitable rooms the impact would be limited.

The rear hip to gable extension with large feature glazing at first floor would provide opportunities for overlooking to the rear garden of No.22 further compromising the privacy and amenity for these occupants.

The proposal would have a significant and highly detrimental impact on the residential amenities of adjacent occupiers.

Other Matters

Typically officers would give the opportunity for the applicant to amend the application to address concerns, however, in this case the issues are considered so fundamental to the proposal and due to the significant harm identified to both residential and visual amenity, a substantially different approach would be necessary to overcome these concerns. Whilst it is recognised that some works could potentially be undertaken utilising permitted development rights the current application falls to be determined on its own merits assessed in relation to the relevant national and local planning policies.

Recommendation

REFUSE for the reason:-

1. The proposed dormers due to their excessive size, flat roof design and timber cladding would fail to assimilate with or reflect the predominant characteristics of the existing building or the wider street scene, resulting in an alien and incongruous form of development. The dormers would become the dominant feature of the dwelling, entirely subsuming the modest proportions of the existing bungalow and causing significant harm to the visual amenities of the locality. The uncharacteristic appearance of the development is further exacerbated by the use of timber cladding and the large feature glazing to the front gable that are entirely out of keeping with the surroundings. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy DM5 of the Worthing Local Plan, Supplementary Planning Guidance 'Extending or altering your home' and the revised National Planning Policy Framework.

2. The proposed side dormers due to their width, height, position, windows and close proximity to neighbouring properties would result in an extremely overbearing and oppressive form of development that would significantly compromise outlook to the bedroom window of No.22 Glynde Avenue and the kitchen/diner windows/doors of No.231 Goring Way and diminish light to this room. The dormers would result in an unacceptable level of overlooking to the

private garden areas of No.231 Goring Way causing significant harm to the living conditions of these occupiers. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy DM5 of the Worthing Local Plan, Supplementary Planning Guidance 'Extending or altering your home' and the revised National Planning Policy Framework.

3. The proposed hip to gable extension and feature glazing to the rear gable (east) due to its depth, height and position, in such close proximity to neighbouring properties would result in an unacceptable level of overlooking and loss of privacy to the private gardens of No.231 and 229 Goring Way and No.22 Glynde Avenue and would cause overshadowing, diminish light and compromise outlook for the rear kitchen/diner openings to No.231 Goring Way having a significant, harmful and detrimental impact on the residential amenities of adjacent occupiers. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy DM5 of the Worthing Local Plan, Supplementary Planning Guidance 'Extending or altering your home' and the revised National Planning Policy Framework.

Informative

The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by identifying matters of concern with the proposal and determining the application within a timely manner, clearly setting out the reason(s) for refusal, allowing the Applicant the opportunity to consider the harm caused and whether or not it can be remedied by a revision to the proposal.

Is recommendation contrary to letter(s) of representation? N

Case Officer: Amanda Haslett Date: 13/06/24

Authorised by: Jo Morin Date: 13.06.2024