Expiry Date - 08/03/2024

Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/0050/24 **Recommendation – APPROVE**

Site: **22 Dover Road Worthing West Sussex BN11 5NR**

Proposal: **Retention of single storey rear extension**

Date of site visit: 01/03/24

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Site and Surroundings

The site is located to the east side of Dover Road, close to the junction with Pevensey Road and within a residential area of Worthing. The property comprises of a detached, two storey house with brick, render and mock Tudor detail. The main roof is hipped with a central catslide roof and front gable. There is an attached garage with hipped roof to the south side. The property is set back from the road behind a wall and paved driveway. There is a large garden to the rear.

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 the retention of a single storey rear extension constructed behind the existing garage.

The extension measures 4.4m deep x 3.419m wide with a false pitch roof of 2.4m high to eaves and 3.5m high to the ridge. The eaves would line through with those of the existing garage. The extension would form a utility room with a door to the south elevation and window to the rear, internal access would be via the garage and kitchen.

The side wall of the extension will be painted white to match the existing building and the roof has been finished in tiles to match. The side door to the utility has been amended to show obscure glazing to the upper glazed panel.

The building works commenced after the previous consent was granted for a larger home extension. The current application alters the roof form of the previous approval and has been completed since the application was submitted.

Relevant Planning History:

AWDM/0959/23 - Householder application for permitted development for prior approval for single storey extension to rear of property measuring 4.41m from rear wall of the original dwelling, maximum height 3.10m and height of eaves of the extension 2.95m – Approved

Consultations:

None required

Representations:

One objection received from the neighbour to the south:

This application was submitted after I complained about the building work already completed on 7.12.2023. We had reluctantly agreed to the original plan, which would have had a white wall facing our house. However the work done places their back door directly in front of our kitchen sink window & less than 2 metres away. That doorway does not have a door yet, but is blocked with a large board. The proposed kitchen will have folding doors to the garden. This type of door is not amenable to use during less than favourable weather, i.e. outside of summertime. This also applies to the door from the lounge. Therefore the most used access to the garden & bins etc. will be through the door facing our sink window. Furthermore, access from the garage to the outside will mostly be through that door. The proposed door faces directly into our sink window. We will be in full view at our sink or the adjoining refrigerator, the hub of any kitchen. We will lack any privacy when dining at the kitchen table, which we do most evenings. Despite the plan to make the new wall white, the brown roof and even a white door will deprive us of some light. This invasion of our privacy is a travesty!!

Relevant Planning Policies

Worthing Local Plan policies (WBC 2023): SP1, DM5
National Planning Policy Framework (HCLG 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 extension is visible from the road but only in limited views down the side of the house. Being set back behind the existing garage and due to the single storey height of the extension with a lower roof than the garage, the extension would not be prominent in the street scene and would not result in any harm to the character of the area.

The extension is subsidiary in scale and form to the existing building and would be finished in materials to match. The revised roof design as proposed by this application has a more sympathetic roof form and continues the eaves of the existing garage resulting in a more cohesive appearance that reflects the character of the existing building.

There would be no adverse impact on the visual amenities of the locality.

Residential Amenity

The most affected neighbour is No.20 to the south of the application site consisting of a two storey detached house. There is a fence to the boundary and a gap of 1.1m between the extension and the boundary and approximately 2.4m between the side of the extension and the side of No.20. There is a window to the neighbour's property, opposite the extension which serves their kitchen, this window is at a higher level than the utility door.

The footprint of the extension is the same as approved under permitted development for the larger home extension application, the only elements that have changed are the false pitch roof form replacing the approved flat/parapet roof and the addition of a door to the side.

The eaves height of the new roof form is slightly lower than the previous flat roof design and continues the existing eaves of the garage. The tiled section of roof is therefore lower when viewed from the neighbour's kitchen but pitches away from this window. The false pitch roof form and low eaves in combination with the small scale of the extension that does not project beyond the rear of the main two storey building would not result in loss of light to the neighbour's window. The extension is to be painted white rather than its current pebbledash finish and this will help to bounce more light towards the neighbour's property. A single storey extension in this position is not considered to be overbearing or oppressive.

The door to the side serves the utility room for the application property and has been fitted with obscure glass to the top panel and a fixed solid panel below. The plans have been amended to include obscure glazing. Typically, overlooking between a utility room door and kitchen window would not be considered to cause any detrimental impact on neighbours as both are non-habitable rooms. However, due to the position of the utility door directly opposite the neighbours kitchen window additional measures were included to ensure that their privacy is retained and obscure glass installed. The obscure glazing prevents views to the neighbour's kitchen window when the door is closed. It is recognised that clear views would be possible when the door is opened however due to the use of the extension as a utility room this impact is considered to be very limited and is unlikely to occur on a frequent or prolonged basis. Furthermore the addition of openings to a side elevation at ground floor level can usually be carried out under permitted development with no limitations. As the door is referenced on the plans as being obscure glazed we

can ensure that this is permanently retained as such and not replaced with clear glass, thereby protecting the privacy of the adjacent occupiers.

As the door serves a non-habitable utility room and is obscure glazed there is not considered to be any significant harm in terms of overlooking or loss of privacy as a result of this proposal. There would be no significant harm to the residential amenities of the occupiers of No.20.

Recommendation

APPROVE subject to Conditions:-

1. Drawing Numbers - Retrospective
2. Obscure glazing to side door retained
3. South side wall painted white within 1 month
4. No additional openings to south side elevation 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: 05/03/24

Authorised by: Jo Morin Date: 05.03.2024