Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/0902/23 Recommendation: Approve

Site: 22 Rogate Close, Worthing

Proposal: Removal of existing detached garage building and erection of single-storey side/rear extension including garage. (Revision to AWDM/1954/22)

Last visited: 28.02.2023

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

The application site relates to a semi-detached two storey dwelling located on the west side of Rogate Close. The pairs of dwellings either side are staggered in their positioning, with the pair at No.23 and 24 to the north side positioned forward of No's 22 and 21 and those further south set back in their alignment. The neighbouring dwelling to the south at No.21 has been extended to the side and rear with single storey additions. Durrington Recreation Ground is to the rear of the site.

Permission is sought for the construction of a single storey side and rear extension following removal of the existing detached garage which is positioned to the rear of the dwelling at present. The rear extension would measure approximately 5.2 metres in depth from the main rear wall and would extend across the width of the building and continuing to the side for a further 2.4 metres in width, wrapping around the rear corner of the building. The side extension would be set back from the front wall of the house by approximately 6.5 metres. A flat roof is proposed up to 2.7 metres in height for the side extension and with a false pitch and flat roof up to 3.2 metres in height for the rear element and with a protruding roof lantern.

This application follows an earlier scheme AWDM/1954/22 for a two storey gabled rear extension and single storey side extension which was withdrawn following concerns over its unneighbourly and overbearing impact.

Relevant Planning History:
As above

Consultations:

The **Highway Authority** raises no objection and has made the following comments:

This proposal is of similar nature to AWDM/1954/22 and seeks an approval for removal of existing detached garage building and erection of single-storey side/rear extension including garage.

There are no proposed alterations to the existing vehicular access. An inspection of data supplied to WSCC by Sussex Police over a period of the past five years reveals that there have been no recorded injury accidents within the site vicinity. Therefore, there is no evidence to suggest that the existing access is operating unsafely or that the proposal would exacerbate an existing safety concern.

Given the small-scale nature of proposal, the Local Highways Authority (LHA) would not anticipate material intensification of use onto Rogate Close or the wider road network.

The proposal may result in a loss of a parking space due to the demolition of the garage. However, it is unclear if the existing garage was used for parking, as the passage through to the garage appears narrow to accommodate standard size vehicles. The proposed single garage does not meet the minimum requirements of 3x6m as outlined in Manual for Streets (MfS) guidance. The LHA does not consider that the potential overspill parking would result in an unacceptable impact on the highway safety, however the LPA may wish to consider any implications on on-street parking from an amenity perspective.

Conclusion
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 111), and that there are no transport grounds to resist the proposal.

Representations:
None received

Relevant Planning Policies
Worthing Local Plan 2020-2036: SP1, DM5
National Planning Policy Framework (HCLG 2021)
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 proposed extension would be set back from the front of the house where it would not appear as a prominent feature or cause any significant harm to the symmetry of the pair of dwellings in the streetscene. The full depth and size of the extension would not be readily visible in the streetscene given its positioning and relationship with neighbouring buildings and the higher roof section at the rear would not be prominent. Whilst a standard flat roof is proposed for the side extension where it would be most visible at the frontage, given its rearward position and that the current scheme has

reduced the height of this to 2.7 metres (from 3.2 metres previously), this would help minimise its impact. Subject to the use of matching materials, design and impact on visual amenity is considered acceptable.

Residential Amenity

The main impact arising from the development would be to the occupiers of No. 23 to the north and the adjoining dwelling at No.21 to the south of the site. Other dwellings on the east side of Rogate Close would be sufficiently remote to avoid any significant threat to residential amenity.

To the south side, the adjoining dwelling at no.21 has itself been extended to the rear with a single storey extension positioned adjacent to the boundary with the site. Whilst the proposed rear extension would be relatively deep, it would align with the neighbouring extension on this side and with the roof height to match including a false pitch to its rear. Having regard to this relationship, there would no significant harm to the amenities of the adjoining occupier as a result of the proposals.

To the north, No.23 is set forward in its alignment compared with the application dwelling and is separated by the intervening driveways to both dwellings. There are two windows and a patio door with windows at the rear which appear to serve the kitchen and dining room and there is also a glazed side door to the kitchen in the south elevation. There is a separate garage at the rear adjacent to the existing rear garage for No.22.

The proposed side extension would infill the space along the boundary between the rear of No.22 and the existing garage and continue forward adjacent to the side boundary with No.23. Although the existing garage would be removed, the neighbours own garage would remain to the rear of this with the extension coming forward of this by more than 6 metres. To the north side of No.23, the adjoining dwelling at No.24 has also extended with a two storey addition adjacent to the boundary. However, having regard to the separation distance on this side of approximately 3 metres between the side wall of No.23 and the proposed extension, and given the reduced scale of the proposals including to the height the side extension which would be to 2.7 metres, it is considered that the proposals would not cause any significant loss of light or outlook to the occupiers of No.23. A condition is recommended to prevent any side windows to the north elevation of the extension in the interests of protecting privacy.

Other issues

The Highway Authority has highlighted that the proposed garage would not meet the minimum width as recommended in the Manual for Streets guidance. However the width is constrained by the width of the existing driveway within the plot and it is noted that the remaining driveway would be approximately 15 metres in length which would provide an appropriate level of parking for a dwelling of this size. No objection has been raised by the Highway Authority.

Recommendation

APPROVE subject to Conditions:-

1. Drawing Numbers
2. Standard time limit
3. Matching materials
4. No further windows (north elevation)

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? N

Case Officer: Rebekah Hincke Date: 16.08.2023

Authorised by: Gary Peck Date: 16 August 2023