

Development Management – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/1602/25

Recommendation: – Approve

Site: 26 The Heights Worthing West Sussex BN14 0AJ

Proposal: Erection of a first floor above the existing bungalow to form a two-storey house with associated alterations

Date of Site Visit: 10.02.2026

Neighbours Checked: Y

Additional Neighbours Notified: N

Site and Surroundings

The site relates to a detached L-shaped bungalow located on the west side of The Heights within a cul-de-sac of detached bungalows and two storey houses with some variation in their design, arranged around a circular area of open space with grass and trees. The bungalow has a garage attached to its south side and a raised patio area at the rear. This is a sloping site where ground levels fall to the west. There are protected trees to the rear of the site in the neighbouring land to the west and south boundaries, where Tree Protection Order No. 27 of 2001 applies.

Proposal

Permission is sought for the remodelling of the bungalow to include a first floor extension with a hipped roof which would raise the main ridge level by approximately 1.4 metres in height, and stepping down in height to the front projecting element with first floor windows to the front and rear positioned to break through the eaves level. The ground floor footprint would remain as existing with the existing brickwork retained at ground floor level, but with some changes to fenestration also indicated at ground floor level.

The drawings also indicate that the chimney would be replaced with a meal flue located towards the rear of the south side elevation and these works could be carried out as Permitted Development.

Planning History:

None relevant

Consultations

None relevant

Representations

Two representations have been received from the occupier of No.10 Valley Gardens objecting to the proposed development on the grounds of unacceptable impact on privacy and residential amenity, design, and overdevelopment, with the following comments in the first representation:

The proposed first-floor addition includes windows that would directly overlook our private garden and would also allow clear views into windows on both the ground and first floors of our house. The first floor of our house at the rear of the property are bedrooms and bathroom. This would result in a significant loss of privacy for our household and would materially harm our ability to enjoy our home and garden without being overlooked.

At present, the existing bungalow is single storey and does not cause this level of overlooking. The addition of a first floor represents a substantial change in scale and height that would introduce new and intrusive views into our property, which cannot be adequately mitigated. The proposal is therefore contrary to established planning principles and local planning policies that seek to protect neighbouring residents from loss of privacy, overlooking, and harm to residential amenity. For the reasons outlined above, I respectfully request that you refuse this application.

The applicant has responded to the neighbour comments with reference to the one and a half storey scale of the proposals, the position of windows and use of rooms, separation distances, trees and screening, and differences in ground levels limiting views.

The second representation from the same occupier at No.10 comments as follows:

The property in question is already elevated and this additional floor will be higher than our property therefore looking over us and I dispute there are adequate trees and shrubbery to hide our property from this extension. The extension will be so high this 'screening' mentioned will make no difference.

There are two windows that will look over and into the rear of our property - what these rooms are used for is irrelevant - not sure how the applicant can possibly say it will be 'almost impossible' to look into the rear of our property. This extension will clearly be an invasion of our privacy and is not far enough away to make a material difference to us. The comment regarding one of the windows looking through the gap between the houses maybe the case but assumes anyone looking out is looking in a straight line so again irrelevant.

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

Within this cul-de-sac, dwellings are relatively low density and set well back from the street frontage giving a spacious character to the streetscene. The existing bungalow has a projecting front elevation to give an L-shaped form which contributes to the effect of a staggered building line set around the curve of the road frontage like other neighbouring dwellings, although the arrangement of properties around the open space/roundabout are not strictly regimented in their layout. There is also some variety in the design of dwellings in the vicinity of the site with a mix of two storey, chalet-style bungalows and single storey bungalows. The neighbouring dwelling to the south is two storey (at a lower ground level), and the existing bungalow is set back from the bungalow to the north (at a higher ground level).

The proposals would add an additional storey to the whole footprint of the main bungalow including to the existing front projection. No changes are proposed to the single storey garage. The application has followed a pre-application enquiry, and in response the proposals have been reduced in their height from a full two storey scale which also included a projecting front gable. The application now proposes a hipped roof design and stepping down in scale to the front projection, with the first floor windows designed to break through the eaves, and this would be limited to a height of approximately 4 metres when measured at the frontage. These changes have reduced dominance compared with the original scheme and would appear reasonably sympathetic in scale and design given that there is some variety in the surrounding streetscene and that the staggered footprint would remain.

A horizontal cladding board finished was originally proposed for the first floor extension whereas dwellings in the vicinity are generally finished in traditional brick and tiles or render. Although it is noted that the neighbouring bungalow to the north has similar cladding, the proposals at No.26 would be more prominent. The applicant has responded to this concern by amending to a rendered finish which would include decorative black timber boards. The mock-Tudor style boarding is not widely seen but it is acknowledged that there are two other examples in the immediate streetscene and this would not cause any significant harm to visual amenity. Alterations to the fenestration would appear reasonable.

The works would be sufficiently remote from the protected trees in the neighbouring land to avoid any significant impact.

Residential Amenity

Dwellings in Valley Gardens to the rear are set at a lower ground level stepping down as site levels fall to the west. In relation to No.10 Valley Gardens, this is a two storey dwelling sited at the lower ground level to the immediate rear of the application site, and with a steep rear garden where its ground floor level is cut into the site levels. The existing bungalow at No.26 is visible from the first floor windows of No.10, as are the other neighbouring two storey dwellings to the south of No.26, and this relationship is

similar to that of other dwellings in Valley Gardens. From ground floor level views of the neighbouring two storey roofs can be seen from No.10 and with some glimpse views of first floor windows. There is some screening provided by the surrounding trees and shrubs when in leaf.

The comments raised in the representations from the occupier of No.10 are noted and whilst the addition of a first floor with a raised roof would be visible, particularly from the neighbours first floor windows and with new windows introduced at this level, there is a separation distance of more than 30 metres at No.10 and other neighbouring dwellings to the rear elevations in Valley Gardens, and the steep slope at No.10 also helps to reduce any impact to the ground floor. Having regard to this relationship and with other neighbouring two storey dwellings, and in view of the scale and design of the proposals it is considered that this relationship would not cause any significant overbearing impact or significant loss of privacy and can be accepted. It is also recognised that the property could build a roof extension under permitted development rights which would could introduce rear facing windows at roof level.

To the north of the site is another L-shaped bungalow at No. 25 The Heights that has been extended into its roof with a dormer extension on its south roofslope facing the site. The neighbouring bungalow is positioned forward of No.26 in its alignment, with its existing side (north) wall extending some 10 metres beyond the main rear wall of No.25 and in close proximity to the boundary. No.25 is sited at a higher ground level to the application site. It has a garage building to its south side which includes glazed doors to its rear elevation and no side windows. Beyond that a conservatory has been added to the rear, spanning across the width of the bungalow but is set away from the southern boundary and has its main outlook towards the rear.

The proposed extension would extend along the length of the existing bungalow and would be in close proximity to the boundary with No.25. Since the pre-application proposals, the overall scale has been reduced from a full two storey scale, to include a lower eaves and overall height reduced, and a gable has been deleted from the front elevation with a hipped roof now proposed. Whilst the proposals would nevertheless add further bulk in close proximity to the boundary with No.25, given the relationship between the two buildings including the change in level where floor levels and the adjacent patio level at No.25 are set higher than those at the site and the intervening garage, and having regard to the height and hipped roof design proposed, on balance it is considered that there would not be any significant harm to the occupiers of No.26 to warrant refusal of the application on residential amenity grounds in terms of light or outlook. First floor windows in the north elevation are limited to high level rooflight windows to serve the bathroom and ensuite would not pose any significant threat to residential amenity.

To the south of the site is a detached two storey house with a hipped roof at No.27, set back from No.26 in its alignment. It has a garage to its frontage on the north side of the house with kitchen behind with outlook to the rear. The house has been extended to the rear with a single storey extension set away from the boundary with No.26 and there is a raised patio area close to the boundary.

Having regard to the relationship between No.27 and the site, where there would be reasonable separation remaining, no apparent windows to habitable rooms on the

north side wall closest to the site, and with one side window set away from the boundary within the neighbours rear extension, it is considered that the proposals would not pose any significant threat to residential amenity in terms of light, outlook or privacy.

Recommendation:

APPROVE subject to condition(s):-

1. Drawing Numbers
2. Standard time limit
3. Materials as indicated
4. No further openings to side elevations of extension

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? Y

Case Officer: Rebekah Hincke Date: 09.07.2026

Authorised by: Louise Prew Date: 09/07/2026