Expiry Date - 04/01/2024

Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/1556/23 **Recommendation – APPROVE**

Site: **29 Ely Road Worthing West Sussex BN13 1BD**

Proposal: **Two storey rear extension**

Date of site visit: 20/12/23

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Site and Surroundings

The site is located to the north-west side of Ely Road within a residential area of Worthing. The property comprises a detached, two storey house with brick and tile hung elevations and a tiled pitched roof. The property is positioned at an angle to the road where it curves round to the right. There is an open lawn and driveway to the front leading to the integral garage and a large garden to the rear. The property has previously been extended with a first floor extension to the north side.

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 a two storey extension to the rear. The ground floor of the extension would measure 3.5m deep x 5.95m wide x 2.3m high to eaves with a small monopitch roof adjoining the proposed first floor extension. The first floor extension would measure 2.75m deep x 5.95m wide, matching the eaves and ridge height of the existing building.

The accommodation would provide a new kitchen and enlarged dining room at ground floor with sliding doors to the south side, large picture window and smaller window to the rear and a door to the north side. At first floor the extension would provide a dressing room and ensuite to bedroom 2 with windows to the rear.

The extension would be finished in brick and tiles to match the existing building.

The application has been amended to reduce the depth of the first floor extension by 0.75m and to replace the proposed Juliet balcony to the rear with a window.

Relevant Planning History:

AWDM/1013/20 - Proposed first floor extension over existing garage to north side – Approved

10/0787/FULL - Proposed first floor extension over existing garage to form a bedroom – Refused

92/05217/FULL - Proposed ground and first floor extensions – Approved

92/05216/FULL - Ground floor extension to provide garage, kitchen extension and porch - Approved

Consultations:

None required

Representations:

One representation received:

I am concerned a double storey extension will significantly overlook my property and privacy will be compromised. It depends what the two storeys will comprise of, how large it will be when completed?

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 street scene is characterised by detached, semi-detached and small terraces of two storey houses of similar design and form, generally finished in bricks, tiles or render. The building line is not consistent and fluctuates in relation to the curve of the road. Some properties have a much deeper garden frontage than others. The application property differs to its immediate neighbours in that it is detached and has gables to the front and rear rather than to the sides. In addition the application property is positioned entirely forwards of the neighbouring building to the south and set back behind the neighbouring building to the north.

Due to the position of the building views of the rear extension would be clearly visible from the road to the south and obscured only by trees within

neighbouring gardens. Although the extension would be clearly visible in the street scene the design, form, roof pitch and materials would match those of the existing rear gable. The depth of the first floor has been reduced to ensure that the extension appears subsidiary to the existing building. Whilst the extension would partially close the gap to the rear, a distinct separation would remain between the rear of the proposed extension and the front of the adjacent building to the south. The deeper part of the extension would be at ground floor only and would not appear dominant in the street scene.

The proposed rear extension would not appear overly dominant or intrusive in the street scene and would not result in any significant harm to the character of the area or the visual amenities of the locality.

Residential Amenity

The most affected properties are those to the sides at No.27 and 31.

No.27 is located to the south of the application property and is set far back in its plot behind the rear elevation of No.29. There is a garage to the north side of the neighbour's house and a high fence to the boundary. There is a gap of about 6m between the side elevations of No.27 and 29. The proposed extension would extend out in line with the front elevation of No.27 at ground floor and 0.75m less at first floor. Due to the position of the houses in relation to each other, the gap to the side and the extension being to the north of No.27 the proposal would not result in an overbearing or oppressive structure or cause overshadowing to their property. The Juliet balcony originally proposed to the rear elevation has been removed and there would be no additional overlooking to the front windows of the neighbour's property. There are first floor windows to the side of No.27 however these are set back away from the extension and would not be adversely affected by the proposal. There are no openings proposed to the first floor south side of the extension and the doors to the south side at ground floor would look on to the existing fence. There would be no overlooking or loss of privacy as a result of this proposal.

No.31 is located to the north side and is positioned about 6.5m further forward in its plot than No.29 and about 2.6m in from the boundary. There is a garage to the side/rear of No.31 and driveway along the side of the house. The proposed extension would be set in 2.4m from the boundary with No.31 and at ground floor level would be screened by the neighbour's garage. Due to the set back position of No.29 in relation to No.31, the spacing between buildings (approx. 5m) and the closest rear first floor window to the application site serving a bathroom, the proposed extension would not project beyond a 45 degree line projected from the midpoint of the neighbours nearest habitable room window. The proposed extension would not result in overshadowing or diminish light to the neighbour's house or garden and would not appear overbearing or oppressive. No windows are proposed at first floor level to the side of the extension and no overlooking or loss of privacy would occur.

The properties to the rear on Princess Avenue are over 35m from the proposed rear extension and at an angle to the application property. The windows to the

rear are in the same position and height as the existing rear windows but would be 2.75m closer to the rear boundary. There would be no additional overlooking or loss of privacy to these neighbours as a result of an extension in this position.

There would be no significant harm to the residential amenities of adjacent occupiers as a result of this application.

Recommendation

APPROVE subject to Conditions:-

1. Drawing Numbers
2. Standard time limit
3. Matching materials
4. No additional first floor openings to side or rear elevations 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: 24/01/24

Authorised by: Jo Morin Date: 24.01.2024