Development Management – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/0740/26 Recommendation: Approve

Site: **32 Lime Tree Avenue Worthing West Sussex BN14 0DL**

Proposal: **Ground floor rear extension; roof enlargement with raised ridge, rear dormer above ground floor extension and front rooflights; and front porch.**

Date of Site Visits: 25.08.26 & 21.10.26 – 06.11.26

Neighbours Checked: Y

Additional Neighbours Notified: Y 27.10.2026

Site and Surroundings

The site contains a detached, hipped roof bungalow on slightly sloping ground on the east side of Lime Tree Avenue. The main ridge runs north-south and there is a front-projection with a taller hipped roof. A detached, flat roof garage is to the south at the rear corner of the bungalow. To the north is a passageway along the side boundary, which narrows from 2m to 1m towards the rear, where the side-wall of the bungalow and its roof-slope, project beyond the main wall. Side boundaries are largely 1.8m timber fencing. Shrubs are behind the side boundary with no 34, at a mixture of heights.

The front garden is largely lawn/planted, with a driveway between the garage and the street.

Number 32 and its neighbour are bungalows, with some outward design similarities, but a taller ridge at no 30. To the north no 34 is a house with side passageway and single storey side element containing a south-facing roof light and rear glazed doors, onto a seating area close to the boundary. Two smaller first floor side windows are on the side wall approximately 3m from the boundary with no.32. Further north, no 34 has a projected conservatory to the rear.

The wider street has a mixture of bungalows, chalets and some houses. Plots are fairly spacious, with gaps between detached buildings. There is a notable cluster of bungalows opposite, largely with hipped roofs. Beyond these is a more mixed series of roof forms, including chalet-bungalows with gables or cropped hips. This is more prevalent in the part of Lime Tree Avenue north of the Cissbury Avenue junction; here are several half-hip chalet-bungalows among nos 55-67.

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

Proposal

The application proposes enlargement of the roof by +1.2m in height, (giving approx. 5.9m overall) and rearward extension including a rear box dormer, to create a first floor containing two additional bedrooms and bathroom. This would bring the total number of bedrooms to four.

A single storey rear extension of approx. 3.85m depth would be contained partly below the rearward extension of the pitched roof and dormer. The rearmost 1m depth of this single storey would be flat roofed at approx. 2.6m height. This would contain a kitchen/diner.

The proposals have been amended in order to reduce the increased height of the proposed roof from the original proposal of 6.95m. The rearward extension has been reduced by 1 metre overall, with the depth of the box dormer reduced by 0.85m and the rearward projection of the roof-slope by 2.3m, the latter being partly achieved by substituting a flat roof for the rearmost 1m depth of the rear extension instead of the continuous slope originally proposed.

The extensions would be in matching materials. Three roof light windows are proposed to the front roof-slope.

Notification of amended plans was undertaken on 27th October, including additional neighbours opposite.

Relevant Planning History: None

Consultations

Southern Water: No objections

Representations

34 Lime Tree Avenue

Amended Plans (6th November)

Further to my objection to the original plans - I also object to the revised plans. There seems very little difference in size and would still greatly impact our light, living area and would be aesthetically awful.

Original Plans

The rear extension would cause loss of light; Overlooking from a side window onto garden and patio; Overshadowing of property. Inappropriate design

Relevant Planning Policies:

Worthing Local Plan policies (WBC 2023): SP1, DM5
National Planning Policy Framework (MHCLG 2026)
National Planning Practice Guidance
SPG 'Extending or Altering Your Home' (WBC)

Planning Assessment:

Local Plan policies raise no in principle objection to extensions. Under Policy DM5, high-quality design is required, which respects and enhances the prevailing character of the area, with attention to architectural form. Policy DP3 of the NPPF indicates that Development proposals should respond to their context. DM5 also requires that development should not have an unacceptable impact on adjacent occupiers, including daylight/sunlight, outlook, privacy and noise. These are considered below.

The Council's Supplementary Guidance 'Extending or Altering Your Home' advises that the extension should use a roof form which is similar to that of the existing building for instance in style and pitch. Dormers, particularly on the frontage, should never be allowed to dominate the roof by being overly large or higher than the existing roof ridge.

Extensions close to a neighbour's boundary should not significantly reduce the amount of daylight and sunlight reaching the neighbour's principal rooms of adjoining houses. Potential for overbearing should also be considered. Each application is considered on its own merits but for example, single storey extensions which do not project more than 3m from the rear wall of the original dwelling house are likely to overcome this. Location of the extension, for instance to the south of the neighbour, should be considered. Differences in levels may also be relevant. The relationship with neighbouring properties should also be considered with respect potential impact on privacy.

Visual Amenity

The building lies between two taller buildings, no 34 a house is significantly taller and no 30, a bungalow, only slightly taller. As mentioned earlier, there is a mixture of buildings and therefore heights in the street. However, the application as submitted was considered inappropriately tall, creating and over-dominant and sheer roof form, and uncomfortable asymmetry which unsettled the simplicity of the fully-hipped building

Raising the roof is not considered harmful in itself harmful in the street-scene of this particular location, between taller buildings. The amended ridge is now less likely to create a stark difference in height with the neighbouring bungalow. The hip ends, whilst a new design element for this building, are reasonably similar in pitch and have been used elsewhere in the street; they can also be undertaken in some cases under permitted development rights.Their pitch is similar to the existing hipped roof projection to the front to the building, which is to be retained. Given the space on each side of the building, particularly to the south, it is unlikely to appear cramped. To the rear the box dormer would be inset below the new ridge and by approx. 2m from either end,

which minimises visibility from the street. Neighbouring impact is considered below. Importantly matching materials are also to be used. There is sufficient driveway and garage space to cater for three cars without loss of the vegetated front garden.

Residential Amenity

Although the enlarged roof would be visible from neighbours opposite, the intervening distances and moderate mass of the proposal and its rooflights are not considered harmful.

In consideration of neighbours on either side, number 34 is the closer. The proposal would be located to the south. Here, the side rooflight and rear glazed doors of no.34 provide light to the living space which faces toward the garden. The rooflight is likely to be affected by the additional mass to the south/south-east and the upper side windows at no 34 are also further westward, where effects are likely to be minor.

To the rear, the glazed doors are not affected by a 45-degree daylight angle (BRE) taken from their centre, even considering that they are probably located approximately 40 cm further westward than indicated on the submitted block plan.

In terms of visual impact, which is also a concern in the neighbour's objections, the closest part of the extension would be approximately 2m south of the boundary, comprising the pitch roof of between 4.3m descending to 2.6m in height over a distance of approximately 2.3m rearward of the neighbouring corner of no 34. The 2.6m flat roof section would continue for approx. 1.25m beyond this. The dormer window is approximately 4m from the boundary.

Whilst this overall rear element would be visible from the rear and garden of no 34, including its seating area, above the fence, (and through the internal rooflight and side windows), the impact of this amended, reduced proposal is not considered to be immediately overbearing upon the neighbouring outlook, the roofline of the amended proposal is descending where it would be visible behind the rear of no.34 then becomes a flat roof and the dormer is recessed from the proposed side.

Nor is it likely to create a tunnelling effect given the size of the rear garden at no 34. However, it is important that control is used to ensure that no additional windows can be formed in the side elevation, particularly above ground floor level which could give rise to unreasonable lines of sight and overlooking. A planning condition can be applied. The upper windows of the proposed dormer would face into the rear garden of no 32 and any oblique overlooking from these is not considered unreasonable in the context of this suburban area.

In consideration of no 30 to the south, the southern gap at no.32 is such that the proposed roof enlargement would be some 3.8mm from the boundary, with the box dormer some further 2m away. Much of the volume of the proposed extension relative the rear of no 30, would be the flat single-story roof and lower section of the roof-slope, with fairly minor visual impact. Whilst the upper windows in the box dormer facing into the rear garden of no 32 is acceptable, control is also needed over the side elevation to avoid the risk of additional side windows with a line of sight to this neighbour,

likewise, to ensure that the rear flat roof section is not used as a balcony. This can also be covered by planning conditions.

Community Infrastructure Level (CIL)

The proposals would not result in a net increase in gross floor area more than 100 sqm and would not therefore be eligible for CIL

Recommendation:

Approve

Subject to conditions

1) Amended Plans
2) Time (3yrs)
3) Materials to match
4) PD restriction - no windows to either side elevation
5) No use of flat roof as a balcony

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 is willing to meet with the Applicant to discuss the best course of action and is also willing to provide pre-application advice in respect of any future application for a revised development.

Informative:
Party Wall Act - works near boundary

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

Case Officer: Stephen Cantwell Date: 17th November 2026

Authorised by: Gary Peck Date: 18 November 2026