



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 July 2026

by **Martin Andrews MA(Planning) BSc(Econ) DipTP & DipTP(Dist) MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30 July 2026

Appeal Ref: 6010786

24 Cissbury Gardens, Offington, Worthing BN14 0DX

- 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 Todd Lednor against the decision of Worthing Borough Council.
 - The application Ref. is AWDM/0321/26.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a two-storey side extension with extended dormers to the front and rear.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed extensions on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the street scene of Cissbury Gardens.

Reasons

3. The Delegated Officer Report accurately describes the context of the appeal dwelling, namely a road mainly of bungalows with a common denominator of a well-spaced layout and a frequency of hipped roofs and garages to the side. A substantial number of the dwellings have had single storey rear additions and roof extensions in the form of a change from a side hip to a gable.
4. However, the alterations and additions proposed in the appeal application would include roof extensions of a size that would significantly and harmfully change the character and appearance of the dwelling. In most, if not all, views in the street scene and in aspects from neighbouring gardens, the bulk and massing of the extended roof would draw the eye and be perceived as harmfully reducing the space between the buildings above eaves height. The significance of the reference to an 11.5m roof width is challenged on behalf of the appellant, but it nonetheless it remains both factual and indicative of the extent of the alterations proposed in the application.
5. As the Officer's Report explains, the Council's published guidance on domestic extensions ('Extending and Altering Your Home Supplementary Planning Guidance' – 'the SPG') requires the size and shape of any extension to normally be designed to ensure the original dwelling remains the larger and more dominant feature and to be consistent with the style and shape of the existing property.

6. Exceptionally, I have experienced extensions that do radically but successfully change the character and appearance of the host dwelling in contravention of this guidance. However, in this suburban location, the pleasing rhythm of the street scene relies on a degree of consistency of dwelling type, scale and type. Certainly, there is also some variety, and the grounds of appeal illustrate this with reference to examples shown in the aerial view of Cissbury Gardens and surrounding plots (Figures 5 to 7).
7. However, I have no details of the original size of these properties, their planning histories and their individual street scene context that would justify my determination of this appeal other than in accordance with my appraisal on my visit informed by the principles of the SPG. And the more immediate context in this instance is of properties that when seen from the road are similar in scale and design to the appeal bungalow, in particular the hipped roofs.
8. Overall, I therefore find that in its present form the appeal scheme would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the street scene of Cissbury Gardens. This would conflict with Policy DM5 of the Worthing Local Plan 2023 and with Government policy in Section 12: 'Achieving Well-Designed Places' of the National Planning Policy Framework, December 2024.
9. For the above reasons and having had regard to all other matters raised, the appeal fails.

Martin Andrews

INSPECTOR