Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/0105/25 Recommendation – REFUSE

Site: 48 Lime Tree Avenue Worthing West Sussex BN14 0DP

Proposal: Removal of roof and erection of additional floor to form a two-storey house with rear balcony and single storey side extension

Date of site visit: 18.02.25

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Site and Surroundings

The property comprises a detached bungalow on the corner of Lime Tree Avenue and Cissbury Avenue. The property faces the corner and is set back. The vehicular access is situated off Lime Tree Avenue. There is relatively low wall to Lime Tree Avenue and approx. 1.8m high fencing to Cissbury Drive.

The bungalow has hipped and gable roofs and two forward projections features, one of which has a bay window to the front under a tiled roof. There is a flat roof extension to the side/rear. The property is a mixture of render and brick detailing.

The properties on the other three corners of this offset junction are all different with a bungalow, chalet bungalow and two storey house.

Proposal

The application proposes the removal of part of the rear wall of the existing kitchen and the erection of a single storey extension off the north corner of the property to form a porch/mud room, approx. 6.9m in depth and set off the northern boundary by approx. 0.3m. The extension would have access to the kitchen and have doors either end. The extension would have a pitched roof which would be replicated on the existing flat roof extension of the property.

The application also proposes removing the existing roofs and erection of additional storey with a new hipped roof, extensions above the forward projections with gables to the frontage with feature windows at first floor.

The existing flat roof of the existing extension is shown partly as a balcony from the proposed master bedroom with glazed windows to the north east elevation. Obscure glazed screening is shown on the balcony to the north west side.

The proposed extension would provide 3 additional bedrooms, one en-suite and a further bathroom at first floor.

The proposal involves a reconfiguration of the ground floor with some rearrangement of window positions and doors.

Consultations:

None

Representations:

Corner Cottage, 1A Cissbury Drive

We live at the back of 48 LimeTree Avenue and are very concerned that the proposed first floor balcony will overlook our front garden with the resulting loss of privacy

50 Lime Tree Avenue

As immediate neighbours to this property, we strongly object to this proposal and believe it will have a detrimental impact on our privacy and amenities. Furthermore, the proposal conflicts with the Worthing Local Plan 2023 and Worthing Borough Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPD) on housing extensions (Extending and Altering Your Home - Supplementary Planning Guidance). Number 48 is directly south of our property and so the effect on light will be greater (as detailed below). We also have solar panels on the southern elevation of our roof area and whilst this can probably not be taken into account I feel it is worth noting.

Worthing Local Plan 2023

The proposal conflicts with Policy DM5 in several respects.
- The two-storey dwelling on this highly visible corner plot would stand out awkwardly in an area where single-storey homes with attic conversions define the character. Its height and scale wouldn't fit with the surrounding properties, making it look out of place rather than respecting the established pattern of development.
- With the ridge height being raised by approximately 1.7m, the proposal would disrupt the street scene, as its bulk and prominence would break the uniform roofline of properties along Lime Street Ave and Cissbury Drive, and alter the area's open feel. Instead of blending in, it would dominate the surroundings, overshadow our property to the north, and negatively impact the local built environment.
- Rather than contributing to the area's character, the development would create an abrupt contrast that feels out of sync with its surroundings and will not reinforce the

established sense of place.
- The proposal will have an unacceptable impact on us as neighbours through the loss of privacy as a result of the proposed balcony, as well as the loss of daylight and sunlight due to the increased massing of the property and its position immediately adjoining our boundary.
This policy also required development proposals to take into account relevant SPDs. However, we believe that there are clear conflicts with the SPD on house extensions, as explained below.
Extending and Altering Your Home SPD

This guidance states that "The size and shape of any extension should normally be designed to ensure the original house remains the larger and more dominant feature. Therefore, the extension should not be higher than, or in front of, the main house."

The proposal will directly conflict with this guidance, and the original house will be unrecognisable if the extension and alterations are permitted.

On impacts to neighbours, the guidance sets out, "A carefully designed extension is important in order to reduce its potential impact on your neighbours. Such consideration should avoid any excessive loss of light and privacy and will reduce any overbearing effect of the extension."

Currently, the rear of the property is staggered and mostly set back from our boundary. However, the proposal will extend into this setback, resulting in an enlarged dwelling that directly adjoins our boundary with eaves rising to 3 meters, causing overshadowing. As this section of the building is located directly south of our conservatory, it is likely to block sunlight from reaching this part of our property.

No sunlight or daylight study has been conducted to assess the development's impact on natural light reaching the rear of our garden and conservatory. This information is essential for a proper evaluation of how the proposal will affect natural light availability to our property.

We are very concerned over the proposed first floor balcony as this will have direct views over our rear garden. The balcony is orientated so that it faces towards our garden, and the 2m high frosted glazing only serves to prevent views towards the side of our house and the road. Unlike internal rooms where windows that have the potential to overlook can be frosted, the balcony provides a clear line of sight over all of our rear garden.

Whilst we are not against all development and indeed our property and neighbouring properties have been extended into the roof space, the proposed development is excessive in scale, out of character with the surrounding area, and would have an unacceptable impact on our privacy and living conditions. Its height and massing would dominate the street scene, overshadow our property, and reduce natural light, while the first-floor balcony would create intrusive overlooking. The proposal conflicts with Policy

DM5 of the Worthing Local Plan 2023 and the Council's design guidance, which seeks to protect local character and residential amenities. Given these clear policy breaches, planning permission should be refused.

Relevant Planning Policies

National Planning Policy Framework (HCLG 2024)
National Planning Practice Guidance
SPG ‘Extending or Altering Your Home’ (WBC)

Worthing Local Plan 2023 (WLP)

DM5 - QUALITY OF THE BUILT ENVIRONMENT
DM16 - SUSTAINABLE DESIGN

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 National Planning Policy Framework advises in Paragraph 131 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 and (c) sympathetic to local character and history, and in Paragraph 139 states: “Development that is not well designed should be refused especially where it fails to reflect local design guidance and supplementary planning documents such as design guides and codes”.

Policy DM5 of the WLP requires all new development to (amongst other things) be of a high architectural and design quality and respect and enhance the character of the site and the prevailing character of the area; 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, impact on street scene and the layout of the development; and make a positive contribution to the sense of place, local character and distinctiveness of an area

The Council’s Supplementary Planning Guidance ‘Extending or Altering your Home’ indicates the size and shape of any extension should normally be designed to ensure the original house remains the larger and more dominant feature, its design should be consistent with your existing property's style and shape and that roof extensions and dormers are often highly visible and alien features which greatly alter the appearance of a dwelling.

The existing bungalow is a modest detached bungalow which is in keeping with the scale and form of other bungalows to either side and in the near vicinity. The proposal would involve a new first floor and although the design is considered acceptable on its own to the front elevation, the properties position on the plot, the size of the plot and its relationship to surrounding development means that proposed configuration to form a the two storey dwelling would be squeezed into the plot inappropriate for the scale and character of the existing dwelling and plot relationships, and as such creating a bulky overdevelopment. The single storey elements would also be increased to the northern boundary and with the additional skirt roofing to the existing flat roof extension and the proposed extension would add to the inappropriate scale and bulk of development on this plot.

The character of this part of Lime Tree Avenue with Cissbury Drive is prominently of single storey bungalows. Although there are examples, that have gone up to first floor level these are generally within the existing roof space and lit either with roof lights or sympathetic dormer extensions in scale and character with the size of the dwelling.

To create an additional first floor to this extent on this bungalow would have a significant visual impact on both the architectural form and integrity of the building itself, and the street scene it sits within. The building sits on a corner and has been set back in the plot to enable the corner to remain open and the dwelling to sit comfortably with surrounding development. The proposed full first floor would be out of character and with its bulk and prominence above immediately surrounding development would not respect the established pattern of development. The proposed extensions to create a first floor would be unacceptable visually obtrusive from Lime Tree Avenue and Cissbury Drive.

As such the proposal would be out of scale and proportion with the existing dwelling, size and position of the plot impacting on the character of the existing dwelling and the street scene

The proposal would therefore be contrary to the NPPF and local plan policies.

Residential Amenity

The most affected properties are 50 Lime Tree Avenue and 1 A Cissbury Drive.

In terms of No 50 to the north-west, this property is a bungalow which has been extended into the roof with roof lights to the front and a flat roof dormer to the rear. The occupants of No 50 have raised objections to the proposal citing the scale and design of the extensions in the street scene and indicating concerns to loss of light, visual impact and overlooking.

The proposed single storey extension would be within approx. 0.3m of the boundary with a pitched roof. No 50 is set approx. 0.5m from the boundary with a blank flank elevation facing south and conservatory beyond. There is close boarded fencing to the

boundary. The single storey extension would be approx. 3m in height and with a pitched roof and south to south west of No 50. The proposed extension of this size and position would cause loss of light and visual impact to the conservatory of this property.

The first floor element is further from the boundary, but is still in close proximity to the boundary, with the additional height and massing, it is likely to cause detrimental loss of light and visual impact having an overbearing impact on No 50. The design of the proposal is such that the only first floor window in the north east elevation is to the proposed master bedroom which is at a further distance and oblique angle to the garden of No 50, it is not considered that this in itself would cause undue overlooking. A balcony is proposed beyond the bedroom. Although this would be at an oblique angle and partly screened its siting is such that it is likely to cause overlooking or perceived overlooking within close proximity with the boundary of No 50.

With regards to No 1A Cissbury Drive this property is situated to the north east. The occupants of No 1A have also raised objections to the proposal raising loss of privacy from the balcony to the front garden. No 1A has its side flank west elevation facing to the rear of No 48, there is a garage to the front closest to the boundary, although there is potential for some overlooking from the balcony on the front garage on 1A , there would be no direct overlooking of private space and with the garage closest to the boundary it is not considered that it would be detrimental as to refuse the application on this basis.

Recommendation

REFUSE for the reason:-

1. The proposed extensions and new first floor and roof by reason of the size, overall design, bulk and form would constitute a visually discordant overdevelopment of the existing dwelling on this modest corner plot, out of keeping with the design and appearance of the existing dwelling, and would be detrimental to immediate existing surrounding development and detrimental to the street scene. The proposal is therefore contrary to policy DM5 of the Worthing Local Plan 2023, Supplementary Planning Guidance "Extending or Altering Your Home" and the relevant policies of the National Planning Policy Framework

2. By reason of their scale, massing, orientation and proximity to the site boundaries the proposed extensions would be overbearing and give rise to a perception of or actual overlooking that would be intrusive for the occupiers of 50 Lime Tree Avenue detrimentally affecting their amenity. The proposal is therefore contrary to policy DM5 of the Worthing Local Plan, Supplementary Planning Guidance "Extending or Altering Your Home" and the relevant policies of the 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. The Local Planning Authority offers a pre-application service if the applicant would like to submit a revised proposal.

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

Case Officer: Jackie Fox Date: 26.02.25

Authorised by: Louise Prew Date: 19/03/2025