



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 July 2026

by **Andrew Owen MA BA(Hons) MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30 July 2026

Appeal Ref: 6007576

48 Lime Tree Avenue, Offington, Worthing, West Sussex BN14 0DP

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr M Donaldson against the decision of Worthing Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is AWDM/1564/25.
 - The development proposed is ground floor extension and reconfiguration of the existing bungalow, including roof alterations and extensions, to create a one chalet-style dwelling with habitable accommodation within the roof.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for ground floor extension and reconfiguration of the existing bungalow, including roof alterations and extensions, to create a chalet-style dwelling with habitable accommodation within the roof at 48 Lime Tree Avenue, Offington, Worthing, West Sussex, BN14 0DP in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref AWDM/1564/25, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with drawing nos: A-S-301, A-S-302, A-E-101, A-E-102, A-E-103, A-P-201, A-P-202, A-P-203, A-P-204, and A-P-207.
 - 3) The external materials of the extensions hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing dwelling.
 - 4) No part of the rooflights in the north elevation of the roof extension hereby permitted shall be below 1.7 metres above the floor level of the room in which they are installed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area, and the effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of No 50 with regard to their privacy and outlook.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal site is located on the corner of Lime Tree Avenue and Cissbury Drive in a largely residential area and accommodates a detached bungalow. Indeed, the majority of the houses nearby are also detached bungalows and this consistency is

a strong characteristic of the area. Many of the bungalows have accommodation in the roofspace at first floor level. As a result there is a proliferation of roof lights and dormer windows in the area, including at the neighbouring houses at No 50, 1a Cissbury Drive and on the opposite corner of the junction at 6 Cissbury Avenue. Such features are therefore also characteristic of the area.

4. The proposal would involve the provision of three dormers; to the front and both side elevations, as well as the insertion of eight roof lights and an increase in the ridge height of the roof. There would also be an extension to the ground floor towards the rear of the dwelling, a part pitched/part crown roof above an existing flat-roofed extension, and part of the front elevation would be altered from having a pitched roof to a gable roof.
5. The dormers to either side would be small with hipped roofs. The front dormer would also have a hipped roof, but would be wider. These dormers would all be visible from the surrounding roads, and due to the local topography which rises from west to east, the dormers on the front and west side would be particularly prominent when seen from positions to the west. However, in the context of the number and variety of designs of the other dormers in the immediate vicinity, they would not appear incongruous. In particular, there are wide front dormers at Nos 58, 59 and 60 and a large flat roofed dormer at No 6 Cissbury Avenue, which is visible in the street scene despite being on the rear elevation of that house. Moreover, the dormers to either flank would comprise modest features in their respective roof slopes and so, even when considered with the rooflights on these sides, would not result in a cluttered appearance in the street scenes. Also, the increase in the ridge height of the dwelling would be minimal and so the resultant house would not be materially taller than the neighbouring house at No 50. The crown roof would not be perceptible from street level.
6. The combination of the dormers, the modest increase in the ridge height of the dwelling and the other alterations to the roof would add more bulk at this level. Nonetheless, it is not considered that these extensions, taken together, would overdominate or contrast with the ground floor part of the dwelling below, even when seen from the lower land to the west. Rather, they would result in an overall less divergent and more cohesive dwelling, with greater symmetry when seen from the front and the removal of an unattractive flat roof section to the rear.
7. Consequently, the development would not harm the character and appearance of the area. It therefore would accord with policy DM5 of the Worthing Local Plan (2023) which aims to ensure that development is of a high design quality and respects the character of the site and the prevailing area including in terms of its form, design, height, scale and its impact on the street scene.

Living conditions

8. The rear roof slope would contain three roof lights but no dormer windows. These would face towards the small rear garden at No 50. However, from the cross-section drawings provided, the rooflights would be at a high level so views out of them towards the neighbouring rear garden would be limited. Moreover, in the context of other roof level windows nearby, including rear dormers and side roof lights at No 52, any increased perception of overlooking at No 50 would be minimal.
9. The ground floor extension and the new roof over the existing flat roofed rear extension would result in more built development closer to the property at No 50.

However, the roof of the proposed single storey extension would slope away from the common boundary, in the same way that the roof of the house at No 50 does, and the new roof over the existing single storey extension would be angled away from No 50. The outlook from No 50 would undoubtedly change as a result of the proposal. But, due to the modest scale of the works, it is unlikely that the development would unacceptably restrict the outlook or would harmfully reduce the light received at this neighbouring property including in its rear conservatory.

10. As such, it is not considered that the development would result in an unacceptable effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of No 50. It would therefore in this regard also, comply with policy DM5, insofar as that seeks to ensure that development does not have an unacceptable impact on the occupiers of adjacent properties, including in terms of privacy, daylight/sunlight or outlook.

Other Matters

11. The development would extend no closer to the boundary with No 1a than the existing bungalow, so would not affect that resident's ability to maintain their house. Any excessive noise or disruption during the temporary construction period can be controlled by other legislation.

Conditions

12. I have imposed the standard condition relating to the commencement of development, and a condition specifying the approved plans, in the interests of certainty. I have also included a condition requiring the materials to be used in the extensions match those used in the main house, to reflect the appellant's submission, and so as to protect the character and appearance of the area.
13. The Council suggested two further conditions to protect the privacy of the residents of No 50. There is no reason for the suggested condition requiring the west side dormer and rooflights to be obscurely glazed or fixed, given that they would face across the driveway at the front of No 50. It would also not be necessary, or practical, for the north facing rooflights to be obscurely glazed and fixed. However it would be appropriate for the north facing rooflights to be designed so that they are at least 1.7m above the floor level in the bedrooms they serve so as to ensure they do not result in unacceptable overlooking to No 50. I have therefore altered the suggested condition to reflect that.
14. There is also no need for the suggested condition to ensure no further openings would be provided on the north-west side wall as this would be the side elevation of the ground floor extension that would directly face the boundary fence. So even if windows were inserted here, they would simply face the boundary fence at very close range and hence would not affect the privacy of the neighbouring occupiers.

Conclusion

15. The proposal would accord with the development plan taken as a whole and there are no other considerations that indicate a decision other than in accordance with the development plan. Therefore the appeal is allowed.

Andrew Owen

INSPECTOR