Development Management – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: **AWDM/0390/25** **Recommendation: APPROVE**

Site: **17 Nutley Drive Worthing West Sussex BN12 4JP**

Proposal: **Removal of existing conservatory/addition and replacement with a single storey rear extension and a pergola. Raised parapet to existing single storey front component.**

Date of Site Visit: 15/04/25

Neighbours Checked: **Y**

Additional neighbour notification: **N**

Proposal, Site and Surroundings:

The application relates to a semi-detached 1930s style house with painted, smooth-rendered walls under a tiled, hipped roof fronting the south side of Nutley Drive. It has been extended across the full width of the rear elevation by an L-shaped conservatory.

The attached house to the east (No.15) has been enlarged by a rear conservatory that extends to a similar depth (approximately 2m) as the nearest part of the conservatory at No.17.

No.19 to the west has been enlarged by a modest single-storey rear extension/conservatory with a lean-to roof.

The property is not listed, locally listed or within a conservation area. There are no TPO trees on the site.

Permission is sought to remove the rear conservatory and erect a single-storey extension on the western half of the rear elevation of the dwelling. It will be 5.3m wide and 5.5m deep with a flat roof 3.2m high. It is proposed to infill the resulting 3.5m wide gap between the east side of the extension and the common boundary with No.15 with a ‘pergola’ structure. The proposed pergola is 4m deep. It would have a ‘slatted’ flat roof 2.6m high with ‘integrated blinds’ on the east side elevation and rear.

Permission is also sought to raise the parapet roof of the existing front-projection feature (formerly an integral garage) by 0.8m to 3.4m high.

Planning History: None relevant.

Consultations: None undertaken.

Representations:

An objection to the pergola has been received from the attached neighbour summarised as follows:

a) Height: The pergola structure will be very close to our party fence we believe that its total height will be over 276cm high.
b) Light: Currently both properties have additions with lean-to roofs. The facing end walls are of block construction to 1.8m, with the 'lean-to triangles' above these walls being glazed in both properties. This mutually allows light into both properties. We estimate that the proposed pergola would extend 68cm above our block wall and that this would have a deleterious effect on our right to light in this area of our property, which comprises part of our dining area. The illustration of the type of pergola proposed, supplied by the agent, shows that the sides of the structure are 'slatted' and it will be dark brown. We consider that both these design aspects could exacerbate the right to light issue.

The neighbour states they are open to suggestions to address these points.

Relevant Planning Policies:

Adopted Worthing Local Plan (2024): SP1, DM5
National Planning Policy Framework (MHCLG 2024)
Planning Practice Guidance (MHCLG)

Planning Assessment

The is no objection in principle to extensions and alterations to dwellings within the designated built-up area of the town. The key considerations are the effects of the proposed development on residential and visual amenity.

Visual Amenity

The application property is one of several similar properties in the road of a characteristic 1930s style with smooth, painted, rendered elevations and curved double-height bay windows with parapet roofs projecting above the eaves line. The original dwelling type included an integral garage incorporated within the modest front-projection, but a significant number of these have now been converted into habitable accommodation (including at the application property).

There is no objection to the proposed raised parapet roof on the existing front projection. It will be in-keeping with the style of the dwelling and help screen the existing bathroom pipework on the front elevation.

There will be glimpsed views of the proposed rear extension from the street through the gap between the houses, but it will appear as a subservient addition and

providing it is carried out using matching external finishes it will not detract from the appearance of the house or the character of the wider area.

Residential Amenity

The most affected properties are those on either side.

No.15
The conservatory at No.15 extends the full width of the rear elevation. It has a glazed lean-to roof and glazed doors at the rear (south) opening onto a rear deck/terrace. The lower part of the west side wall of the conservatory is of a solid construction with fixed 'fanlight' windows above and glazing within the 'wedge' shape of the lean-to roof. The glazing in question is a source of light not only to the conservatory but the inner core of the dwelling, comprising a dining area.

The lean-to roof at No.15 is taller than that existing at No.17, which has a very shallow lean-to roof construction. The overall height of the proposed pergola structure will be similar in height to the existing conservatory where it adjoins the rear wall of the house but will extend a further 2m rearwards into the garden (4m overall). The annotated elevation drawing shows it with a slatted roof and integrated blinds on the rear and east side adjoining the flank of the conservatory at No.15 (and the close-boarded boundary fence extending beyond it).

The pergola roof will be taller than the fixed 'fanlights' in the neighbouring conservatory at No.15 and extend part way up the wedge-shaped glazed area. A diagram of the integrated blind shows them to be largely opaque. The height and depth of the proposed pergola with integrated blinds will have an impact on the amount of light received through the glazing in the side of the conservatory at No.15, and to a small extent the nearest rear windows/doors. However, bearing in mind the main source of natural light to the conservatory and inner core is from the glazed roof and south-facing doors/windows, the overall impact will not be so harmful to the amenities of No.15 to warrant refusal.

The stated concerns pertaining to a 'right to light' are a matter of civil law and not a relevant planning consideration.

The height of the proposed rear extension is taller still at 3.2m but is well separated from the conservatory at No.15 and will have no adverse amenity impact.

No.19
The proposed rear extension will extend approximately 2.5m beyond the neighbour's extension/conservatory at No.19 with a gap of approximately 1m to the common boundary and 2m overall. The neighbour's extension includes a high-level frosted window in the side and another frosted window in the rear elevation of that part of the extension closest to the boundary. A window in the east side wall of the original dwelling at No.19 appears to serve a kitchen. The height and depth of the proposed rear extension will have some additional enclosing effect on the outlook from the kitchen window. However, its proposed external finish using light-coloured painted render to match will help to reflect the light and avoid an overly oppressive feel.

The window proposed in the west side elevation of the rear extension should be obscurely glazed to prevent the scope for unneighbourly overlooking.

The raised parapet at the front will have no adverse impacts on amenity.

Recommendation

01 Standard Time Limit
02 Approved Plans
03 Matching materials
04 Windows in west side of the rear extension to be obscure glazed

Informative:

Pro-active - No Amendment

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

Case Officer: Jo Morin Date: 09.06.2025

Authorised by: Louise Prew Date: 09/06/2025