

Application Summary

Address:	57 Hollingbury Gardens Worthing West Sussex BN14 0EB
Proposal:	Ground floor front infill extension; raising of roof ridge with gable ends and rooflights to create first floor accommodation within roof space (re-submission of refused application AWDM/0049/26).
Case Officer:	Rebekah Hincke

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Name:	Mr David Buxton
Email:	
Address:	59 Hollingbury Gardens Worthing West Sussex

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Member of the Public
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	- Design - Loss of General Amenity - Other - Privacy Light and Noise - Trees and Landscaping
Comments:	Section 2 - An elevated platform/decking across the width of the property has also been constructed and this will lead to a loss of privacy to the south facing elevation of our property at the rear living room.

Additionally from our rear south facing window mentioned in points 1 & 2, looking eastwards we have a view of bungalows opposite and the hillside adjacent to Cissbury Ring. We would suffer a loss of the majority of this view and instead have a brick wall less than 3 metres from our facade and a roof obstructing the outlook.

We believe it is relevant to note that when the property we reside in was redeveloped just before we purchased no. 59 and a similar infill was made to this property in 2024 on the south side (AWDM/0758/23), it did not cause a loss of light, privacy or obstruct the view to the neighbouring property at no.57.

The new owner has cut down large trees including one directly in the area where the proposed infill extension is planned to be built. In the planning application submitted it was stated that no trees will be trimmed or cut down in relation to the building works proposed. Large trees have also either been removed or radically trimmed at the rear of no. 57

This re-submitted application was refused by the LPA because previously in March 2026 because it was considered contrary to policy DM5 of the Worthing Local Plan, the Council's SPG 'Extending or Altering Your Home' and the relevant paragraphs of the NPPF. Given that the re-submitted application appears to be almost identical this alone should justify the re-submission being refused again. However, the difference for this re-submission is that we have made clear grounds for the application to be refused which we had made in the original application.

The LPA in rejecting the application advised 'the Applicant he had the opportunity to consider the harm caused and whether or not it can be remedied by a revision to the proposal'. It does not appear that any real revision has been made that mitigates any of the objections made by the original two parties and now by ourselves. For this reason we ask that the application be refused.

We agree with the LPA in their original refusal that under Policy DM5 there will be an 'unacceptable impact on the occupiers of adjacent properties including unacceptable loss of privacy, daylight/sunlight, and outlook' as we have described above.

As a general effect of this proposed development we believe that for the reasons outlined by the LPA in its original refusal, this application will have a detrimental impact on 'the general uniformity to the character of the streetscene in the vicinity of the site with single storey bungalows' as stated in the Council's SPG 'Extending or Altering Your Home' sets out the guiding principles' and concludes by saying that the proposal is generally not in keeping with neighbouring properties in the area as it 'seeks to extend up to the full width

removing this element of subservience'. In addition the refused application pointed to 'the dominant effect of the two storey front gable proposed at No.57, and the full extent of the extended roof would be apparent and appear as an unsympathetic form of development'.

We also ask why an appeal was not submitted to the original application that was refused, rather than the LPA allowing a re-submission.

For the reasons set out in the original application and in the case made above, we ask that this re-application be refused given the 'scale of the extension proposed to provide a two-storey element, the size and proximity will have an overbearing and unneighbourly relationship to No.59 causing an increased sense of enclosure and loss of light'.

Kind regards