Expiry Date - 02/04/2025

Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/0127/25 Recommendation – APPROVE

Site: 8 King Street Worthing West Sussex BN14 7BW

Proposal: Single storey rear infill extension

Date of site visit: 04/04/2025

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Site and Surroundings

The application site relates to a two storey mid-terrace house located on the east side of King Street. It has a two storey rear outrigger to the south of the site. The terrace is characteristic of paired properties with small gaps between the outriggers to the rear. To the rear of the site is a large timber merchants.

Proposal

Permission is sought for the construction of a 4.95 metre deep single storey extension to the rear which would infill to the side of the existing two storey rear projection to its full length and up to the side (east) boundary. The extension would measure approximately 3.7 metres in height with a lean-to roof that has an amended eaves height of 2.5m which would include rooflight windows. Bi-folding doors would be inserted across the rear elevation. Matching materials are proposed.

Relevant Planning History:
None relevant

Consultations:
None

Representations:
One objection:
"We object to the proposed extension, as the scale of the proposals are contrary to local planning guidance, and they will negatively impact our residential amenity in the following ways:

1. *Based on measurements taken from the drawings, the application design extends across the boundary (the centreline of the original garden wall) by approximately 250mm. We have spoken to No.8 and while we are happy for their extension to replace the original garden wall, we insist the new extension footprint does not extend beyond the existing footprint of the shared garden wall. We do not consent to the extension extending further onto our property.*

2. *The parapet height for the proposed extension (as measured from the drawings) is approximately 3200-3250mm above ground level. The excessive height of this wall astride our south boundary, will lead to a significant loss of natural daylight into the habitable dining room within our terraced property, as well as the creation of an overbearing, 'tunnelling effect' between the properties. To reduce this impact, we have spoken with No.8 and asked whether they could have a mono-pitched roof, lowering the wall along the boundary to no higher than 2500mm above natural ground level. This approach is common were terraced outriggers sit in such proximity. Similar properties on King Street, where side extensions have been awarded permission, have mono-pitch roofs falling to eaves levels typically no higher than 2.5m over ground level at the boundary."*

"Re: the above application at 8 King Street. Having reviewed their latest proposals from 16 June 2025, we have no issues with their proposal, so we won't be posting any comments.

Thank you for consulting us on this matter"

Relevant Planning Policies

Worthing Local Plan policies (WBC 2023): SP1, DM5
National Planning Policy Framework (MHCLG 2024)
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 extension would be located at the rear of the dwelling where it would be well enclosed by neighbouring buildings and would not be visible in the streetscene. Subject to the use of matching materials, design and impact on visual amenity is considered acceptable.

Residential Amenity
The extension would be sufficiently remote from neighbouring dwellings to the south and to the rear (east) to avoid any significant impact. The main impact as a result of the proposals would be to the occupiers of the adjoining dwelling at No. 10 King Street to the north.

No.10 appears to largely mirror the form and layout of the application dwelling with a matching two storey rear projection, and has a ground floor window in its main rear (east) wall positioned within the recess between the two rear outriggers which appears to be a main window to a habitable room, and with two side windows in the south elevation facing towards the boundary which appear to serve the kitchen/dining room. A boundary wall and fence up to 2

metres in height separates the two dwellings at this point. There is also a window to the rear elevation of the outrigger. The existing recess between the side walls of the two rear projections is relatively narrow, with a distance of approximately 3 metres at present. The extension would be up to the boundary.

The neighbour's objection refers to a reduction in the eaves to 2.5m reducing the impact on their property. The amended proposal reduces the eaves height to approximately 2.5m which is considered reduce the overbearing impact to an acceptable level.

Having regard to the relationship with No.10 and the position of neighbouring windows, the size and proximity of the proposed extension has the potential to be unneighbourly and overbearing to the neighbouring occupiers. However, following the amendments to the proposal there is not considered to be an excessive level of overbearing or enclosing on the neighbouring property. As such whilst there will be a tunnelling effect created with the narrowing of the recess between the two dwellings this is not considered to be to a level that would be demonstrable to the application. The reduction would also reduce the loss of light to this property. The rooflight windows are indicated but would be at a high level where they would not cause any significant loss of privacy.

On balance the proposal will have an impact on the neighbouring property but through the reduction in scale on the boundary

Recommendation

APPROVE subject to Conditions:-

1. Drawing Numbers
2. Standard time limit
3. Matching materials
4. No side windows to northern elevation

Informative

The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by assessing the proposal against all material considerations, including planning policies and any representations that may have been received and subsequently determining to grant planning permission 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? N

Case Officer: Finlay Gardner Date: 14/07/2025

Authorised by: Louise Prew Date: 14/07/2025