Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/0676/23 Recommendation: Approve

Site: 7 Patricia Avenue, Worthing

Proposal: **Amendments to previously approved application AWDM/1504/22. Rooms in roof consisting of side dormer and side roof lights and two storey rear extension/ part single storey extension with internal alterations.**

Last visited: 07.06.2023

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

The application site relates to a detached two storey dwelling located on the west side of Patricia Avenue, opposite the entrance to Patricia Close which is on the east side of the street. The house has a garage attached on its south side with a utility room to the rear part, and a single storey rear projection that includes a roof terrace at first floor level.

There are other dwellings to the south at No's 1-5 Patricia Avenue and to the north at No. 9 Patricia Avenue that match No.7 in their general form, including hipped roofs, and general design, although these have been extended to the rear to varying degrees. Further to the north and on the east side of Patricia Avenue opposite the site there are mainly hipped roofed bungalows but with some variety in their design.

Permission was granted in 2022 for a part single storey/part 2 storey extension at the rear with a barn-hip roof, a dormer extension to the north side roofslope, and rooflight windows (AWDM/1504/22 refers). This permission followed refusal of an earlier scheme for a part single storey/part two storey extension across the width of the rear elevation with an extended ridge to form a 2 storey gable at the rear, a first floor extension to the south side, and a roof extension to the north side (AWDM/0314/22 refers).

The current application seeks amendments to the size of the approved extension to the rear which would increase its depth to 3.5 metres in depth when measured from the existing rear garage/utility room wall. At its north-west corner, the previous application proposed no increase in depth from the existing single storey rear projection, but extending with two storeys and across its width. The amended plans proposed an additional 1.1 metres in depth from this part and across the width of the main rear wall. As before, the roofline would be extended over but with a full hip now proposed to the rear roofslope.

A porch addition has been indicated on the drawings but has been amended to reduce its height to 2.9 metres and with matching materials which would fall within permitted development allowances and so is not included in the application.

As originally submitted the current application also proposed changes to the external finishes to include part render and part fibre cement cladding boards but this element has since been deleted from the proposals and now reverts to a combination of matching brick and render, rendered rear walls, and tiled roofs and tile hanging to match the existing building as per the previous approval.

Relevant Planning History:

AWDM/1504/22 Rooms in roof consisting of side dormer and side roof lights and gabled two storey rear extension/ part single storey extension with internal alterations. (Resubmission of AWDM/0314/22). Approved 14.12.2022

AWDM/0314/22 First floor side extension, rooms in roof consisting of side dormer and side roof lights and gabled two storey rear extension/ part single storey extension with internal alterations. Refused on 19.07.2022 for the following reasons:

01. Having regard to the design and character of surrounding dwellings, the proposed development would appear as an incongruous and excessively dominant addition to the building detrimental to the visual amenities of the site and surrounding streetscene. As such the proposed development would be contrary to saved policy H16 of the Worthing Local Plan, policy 16 of the Worthing Core Strategy, the Councils' SPG 'Extending or Altering Your Home', policy DM5 of the Submission Draft Worthing Local Plan, and the relevant paragraphs of the National Planning Policy Framework.

02. Having regard to the relationship with neighbouring dwellings, the proposed development would represent an unneighbourly and overbearing form of development, detrimental to the amenities of neighbouring occupiers, notably in terms of an increased sense of enclosure and loss of privacy. As such the proposal is considered to be contrary to saved policy H18 of the Worthing Local Plan, policy 16 of the Worthing Core Strategy, policy DM5 of the Submission Draft Worthing Local Plan and the relevant paragraphs of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Consultations:
None received

Representations:
Two representations have been received from the occupiers of neighbouring properties at No.5 and No.8 Patricia Avenue, objecting to the application on the following grounds as summarised:

- Materials – use of cladding and render would be contrary to previous condition, out of character
- Visual impact of proposed porch, out of keeping
- Loss of light- additional loss of light from increased footprint of the proposed extensions – would affect bathroom, utility room and snug area of neighbour's kitchen at No.5.

- Loss of privacy
- Lack of parking

Relevant Planning Policies
Worthing Local Plan 2020-2036: SP1, DM5, DM20
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 previously approved scheme allowed a 2.2 metre deep two storey rear extension with a continuation of the main ridgeline and forming a half hip at the rear. Although the current proposals would increase the overall depth to the rear, this has been combined with a full hip design that would appear reasonably sympathetic to the existing building form and help to minimise the sense of scale resulting from the extension. As before, views of this element would be possible between buildings but the ridgeline itself would be extended to a lesser degree than previously approved and the overall scale would not appear excessively dominant having regard to its revised form and the glimpse view possible.

The application has also been revised to revert to the use of matching facing materials for the side elevations which would help to blend with the existing and neighbouring dwellings, and as before roofing materials would match the existing building.

The single storey addition, although deeper than previously approved, would not be readily visible or cause any significant visual impact due to its position at the rear of the garage/utility room structure and inclusion of a flat roof.

The roof extension to the north side has not been amended and is as previously approved which, in combination with the revised roof form, remains acceptable in the context of other roof additions nearby and its design and positioning in the roofslope so that it would not appear excessively dominant.

The configuration and number of rooflights to the north and south side roofslopes has been amended, with two rooflights proposed to the north roofslope and three proposed to the south roofslope but would not appear excessive or cause any significant harm to visual amenity.

Residential Amenity

The main impact arising from the development would be to the occupiers of No. 5 and 9 Patricia Avenue to the south and north of the site respectively. Other dwellings on the east side of Patricia Avenue would be sufficiently remote to avoid any significant

impact threat to residential amenity arising. To the rear (west), there is a distance of more than 30 metres back to back with the rear of dwellings in Alinora Avenue which would offer sufficient separation to avoid any significant impact to the amenities of those occupiers to the west.

There appears to be no significant changes in the relationship between neighbouring dwellings to the north and south since the previous applications were considered. To the north side, as before, No. 9 has its own side garage closest to the boundary with No.7 and a patio area to the rear of this which appears to be used to accommodate bins at present. There is a side access to the south of this that provides access to the rear garden for occupants of No.7. In its main south side wall, No.9 has a first floor window serving a bedroom/office room that faces towards the application site. To its main rear wall, there are main windows to habitable rooms with patio doors at ground floor level providing access to the patio and garden and a rear bedroom window at first floor level closest to the proposed development. There is a separation distance of approximately 3.7 metres between the main side walls of the two dwellings. No.9 also has a conservatory extension set in from this by a further 4 metres with side windows facing the application site and also outlook to the rear.

The increase in depth of the proposed extension would further enclose No.9 to the north where the existing structures already extends beyond the neighbours' rear wall. It is noted that the survey drawing indicates the position of No.9 showing the extension to project a distance of approximately 4.3 metres beyond the rear of No.9 where in practice the rear wall of No.9 appears to more closely align with the existing main rear wall of No.7. In practice, the existing rear projection at the site extends beyond the main rear wall by approximately 2.4 metres and this would be increased to approximately 3.4 metres at this point (and across two storeys as before). Whilst the sense of enclosure would be increased as a result of the proposals, including to the neighbours patio area immediately adjacent, given the layout of No.9 with the intervening garage, and where main windows would be well separated from the proposed extension and would not suffer any significant loss of light, and the hipped roof design would help to limit the bulk and impact on the side window and in this respect would be similar to the previous permission, on balance this relationship is considered acceptable.

To the south side, the main rear wall of No.5 is sited more closely to the boundary with No.7 with only a side pedestrian accessway separating it from the existing garage structure at the site. As before, the south wall of the proposed single storey element closest to the neighbour would be set in from the boundary and with a flat roof and with the two storey element set further away, aligning with the existing main side wall of the dwelling. The comments made in the representation are noted included those concerns over the impact to the north facing rooms for No.5. However, with the exception of the rear room, windows in the north side elevation at No.5 appear to serve non-habitable rooms and the side window to the rear room is a secondary window with main outlook and light possible to the rear. Having regard to the relationship with No.5, it is considered that the impact as a result of the amended scheme, which would extend 3.5 metres in depth, would not pose any significant threat to residential amenity in terms of loss of light, outlook or privacy.

As before, a condition is recommended for windows in the north and south elevations to be obscure glazed and preventing further side windows in the interests of protecting privacy.

Flooding

The site lies within Flood Zones 2/3 where the Environment Agency's standing advice would apply to development classed as a Minor Extension. The additional accommodation would be partially at ground floor level and the accompanying FRA confirms that finished floor levels would be set no lower than existing.

Recommendation

APPROVE subject to Conditions:-

1. Drawing Numbers
2. Standard time limit
3. Matching materials
4. Obscure glazing etc (north and south side elevations)
5. No further windows (north and south elevations)

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: Rebekah Hincke Date: 13.07.2023

Authorised by: Jo Morin Date: 13.07.2023