Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/0377/24 Recommendation: Approve

Site: 146 Tarring Road, Worthing

Proposal: **Single-storey side/rear extension. Loft conversion Including 2no. rear dormer roof extensions and 2no. front rooflights**

Date of site visit: 07.05.2024

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Site and Surroundings

The application site relates to an end of terrace two storey dwelling located on the north side of Tarring Road, west of its junction with Shakespeare Road. There is a pedestrian access to the immediate west of the site that provides access to a twitten at the rear of the terrace. The main railway line lies to the north of this.

Proposal

Permission is sought for a single storey rear/side extension, and roof extensions and alterations comprising of a dormer extension to the main rear roofslope and to the side roofslope of the rear projection as a wrap-around design, and two rooflight windows to the front roofslope.

The single storey extension would extend to the main rear wall by approximately 6.9 metres in depth and 2.5 metres in width, connecting to the south side of the rear projection. It would have a lean-to roof up to 3.8 metres in height, with an eaves level of approximately 2.5 metres. There would be a cut-out section of flat roof to allow for the existing first floor bathroom window. Matching materials are proposed.

The rear roof extension would measure approximately 4.7 metres in width to the main rear roofslope, 3.9 metres in depth and 2.3 metres in height, set just below the main ridge level. Its eastern end would connect to the proposed side dormer extension stepping down to a lower level to form an L-shaped, wrap-around form. This has been amended during the course of the application and, as revised, this would measure approximately 3.7 metres in width, 3.1 metres in depth and 2.8 metres in height and would protrude above the ridge level of the rear outrigger by 0.7 metres approximately. Tile hanging is proposed to match the existing roof.

Relevant Planning History:
None relevant

Consultations:

Network Rail has confirmed no objection to the application.

Representations:
None received

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.

Visual Amenity

Chapter 12 of the NPPF sets out the policies to achieve well-designed places. In paragraph 126, it advises that 'The creation of high quality, beautiful and sustainable buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve. 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.'

The NPPF emphasises securing high quality design that (amongst other things): is visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping; is sympathetic to local character and history; maintains a strong sense of place using the arrangement of streets, building types and materials to create attractive, welcoming and distinctive places to live; and, with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users (paragraph 135), and that permission should be refused for development that is not well designed, especially where it fails to reflect local design policies or government guidance on design, taking into account any local design guidance and supplementary planning documents such as design guides and codes (paragraph 139).

Policy DM5 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;

iv) respect, preserve and where appropriate enhance, heritage assets and settings;

v) be well built, accessible, fit for purpose, and adaptable to changing lifestyle, demography and climate;

vi) include a layout and design which: take account of potential users of the site; create safe conditions for access, egress and active travel (walking and cycling) between all locations; provide good links to integrated public transport; and have acceptable parking arrangements (in terms of amount and layout);

vii) make a positive contribution to creating a safe and secure environment by integrating measures for security and designing out opportunities for crime;

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);

ix) respect the existing natural features of the site, including landform, trees and biodiversity and contribute positively to biodiversity net gain. Where appropriate, this will include the protection and integration of existing trees and green infrastructure into new developments;

x) ensure that lighting incorporated into developments provides the minimum for public safety, is energy efficient and avoids light pollution.

The Council's SPG 'Extending or Altering Your Home' provides general advice and sets out a number of design principles. It states that:

When designing an extension and deciding on an appropriate siting, the two most important things to ensure are; 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.

It goes on to say that: *The size and shape of any extension should normally be designed to ensure the original house remains the larger and more dominant feature.*

In relation to roof extensions and dormers it states that:

Roof extensions and dormers are often highly visible and alien features which greatly alter the appearance of a dwelling. Therefore, there is a normal presumption against dormer windows that are visible from the street. However, exceptions to this can be

made if the dormer is located at the rear of the property to make it less visible, or if several other dwellings on the street already have dormer windows, which are not substantially out of character.

Dormers should never be allowed to dominate the roof by being overly large or higher than the existing roof ridge. Where possible they should be designed to follow the vertical lines of existing windows. Always, avoid wrapping dormers around more than one face of the roof, or cutting into the line of the hip.

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. In some cases a roof light may form a more suitable alternative to a dormer. Whilst the windows themselves should match those of the existing building, the roofs and sides of new dormers should be covered in materials which match or compliment the main roof.

The site is set within an attractive terrace designed with a series of symmetrical pairs of dwellings with matching bay windows, decorative banding and stucco detailing. Each pair is staggered in its positioning, following the alignments of the road. No.146 is sited forward in its alignment compared with No.148 to the west, which is a semi-detached dwelling set away from the application site, and there is a relatively wide space separating these two dwellings. In this context the main side wall of No.146 is relatively prominent and with glimpse views of the rear portion of the rear projection visible in the streetscene.

Dormer windows are not a characteristic feature of the area and whilst another wrap-around, albeit slightly smaller, roof extension is noted at the rear of No.138 at the eastern end of the terrace, there is no planning history for this development but is likely to pre-date current planning policy and it is not readily visible in the streetscene although would be seen from the rear railway line. Nevertheless this example of poor design should not set any precedent for those proposed at No.146.

The dormer extensions as originally proposed would be large and bulky and appear as dominant and top-heavy additions to the building, unsympathetic in their scale, form and design. The rear dormer as originally submitted at over 5 metres in width would be particularly wide, sited awkwardly in relation to the chimney and with minimal or no setback from the edges of the roof. The applicant has agreed to a reduced width which sets the dormer further in from the west side of the roof and now spaced from the chimney. Although this element would still be large, the full extent of this rear dormer would not be perceived in the streetscene.

This would be in combination with the side dormer wrap-around element to the rear projection which in itself would appear relatively wide and bulky in its design. The applicant has provided amended plans that reduce the width of this element from 6 metres as originally proposed, to 3.7 metres in the revised drawing. Whilst the overall design would still be bulky, some of this would not be seen from the street, and the applicant has provided a comparison drawing of permitted development fallback which shows the proposed dormer as revised would be 0.4m wider than the PD comparison but other factors that contribute to its bulky appearance such as its wrap-around

design and protrusion above the rear ridge height would be possible under permitted development allowances.

The proposals would represent a relatively small departure from the permitted development fallback position and the addition of two obscure glazed side windows would help to break up the some of the bulk visually. Given the fallback position for the dormer extensions, it is considered that a refusal on design and visual amenity grounds would not be justified in this instance. Subject to the use of matching materials the proposed dormer extensions are considered acceptable on balance.

Although rooflights are not a particular feature of the terrace, some others can be seen at No.138 and on the terraces opposite, and it is noted that similar rooflights could be installed as Permitted Development. In this context the proposed rooflights to the front roofslope are considered acceptable.

Although the single storey extension would be relatively deep and align with the main side wall of the house where its side elevation would be visible in the streetscene, its overall scale and design would appear reasonable as a single storey subservient structure at the rear and would be set in from the boundary. Matching render and roof tiles are proposed which would help blend with the recipient building.

Residential Amenity

The main impact as a result of the proposals would be to the occupiers of dwellings at No.144 to the east and No.148 to the west. Dwellings to the rear of the site in Pavilion Road are well separated from the site set beyond the railway line and given the scale of the proposals no significant harm would be caused. Likewise, dwellings on the opposite side of Tarring Road would be sufficiently remote from the proposed development to avoid any significant threat to residential amenity. The impact of the front rooflights would be similar to the effect of existing front windows and they would be at high level where they would not cause any significant harm in this instance.

To the east, the neighbouring dwelling at No.144 forms a symmetrical pair with No.146 with its rear projection generally matching that of the application site. The application details indicate that the roof extensions would extend to the boundary with No.144 but it is noted that the applicant has signed a Certificate A ownership certificate, and no overhang is indicated. The roof extensions would be sufficiently remote from neighbouring windows and in the context of the adjoining rear projection there would be no significant harm to residential amenity caused to the occupiers of No.144.

To the west, the side access to the rear twitten and the driveway of No.148 separates this dwelling from the application site with a distance of approximately 4.8 metres between the two opposite main side walls. There are no windows in the main east side wall of No.148 that faces the site but there are windows in the rear and in the side wall of the rear projection positioned further away to the west. Given the scale and positioning of the proposed single storey extension in relation to No.148, there would be no significant loss of light or outlook from this aspect of the proposed development. Windows are proposed in the side roofslope of the single storey extension but these would be at a high level and would not cause any significant loss of privacy. A condition is recommended to prevent any further windows in the side wall of the extension in the

interests of protecting privacy. Two new windows are indicated in the main side wall and would be opposite the flank wall to No.148. These would be at ground floor level to the existing wall where they can be installed under permitted development rights.

The revised roof extensions would still be relatively bulky, but the extent of the side dormer has been reduced considerably. In the context of the existing two storey building the proposals would not pose any significant threat in terms of loss of light or outlook to the neighbouring occupiers of No.148. Side windows can be obscure glazed in the interests of protecting privacy and a condition is recommended to secure this.

Recommendation

APPROVE subject to Conditions:-

1. Drawing Numbers
2. Standard time limit
3. Matching materials
4. Obscure glazing etc (west elevation – dormer extension)
5. No further windows etc (west elevation – gf 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? N

Case Officer: Rebekah Hincke Date:16.07.2024

Authorised by: Louise Prew Date: 16/07/2024