

Development Management – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/1440/25

Recommendation: – Refuse

Site: First Floor Flat 55 King Edward Avenue Worthing West Sussex

Proposal: Loft conversion including rear dormer and front roof lights

Date of Site Visit: 24.03.2026

Neighbours Checked: Y

Additional Neighbours Notified: N

Site and Surroundings

The application site relates to a first floor flat within a semi detached property located on the north side of King Edward Avenue, on the corner at its junction with The Quashetts. There are other similar matching pairs of semi detached houses to the west and opposite the site.

Proposal

Permission is sought for roof extensions and alterations comprising of a dormer extension to the main roofslope within continues over the rear outrigger to form an L-shaped design over the two rear roofslopes. Two rooflights are also proposed to the front roofslope, as indicated on the floor plan and roof plan although not indicated on the south elevation drawing.

The rear roof extension would extend across much of the width of the main roofslope and would measure approximately 6.5 metres in width, and 2.4 metres in height. It would be set below the main ridge level, although there are discrepancies in the drawings and so this is indicated to be between 0.5-0.7 metres below ridge level. The dormer would measure 2.9 metres in depth to the main roofslope and extending forward over the outrigger roofslope, with discrepancies in the drawings indicating this to be between 4-4.6 metres in depth approximately. The dormer extension would be finished in tile hanging.

Relevant Planning History:

None relevant

Consultations

None received

Representations

None received

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

Chapter 12 of the NPPF sets out the policies to achieve well-designed places. In paragraph 131, it advises that 'The creation of high quality, beautiful and sustainable buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve. Good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, creates better places in which to live and work and helps make development acceptable to communities.'

The NPPF emphasises securing high quality design that (amongst other things): is visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping; is sympathetic to local character and history; maintains a strong sense of place using the arrangement of streets, building types and materials to create attractive, welcoming and distinctive places to live; and, with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users (paragraph 135), and that permission should be refused for development that is not well designed, especially where it fails to reflect local design policies or government guidance on design, taking into account any local design guidance and supplementary planning documents such as design guides and codes (paragraph 139).

Policy DM5 of the Worthing Local Plan requires that:

All new development (including extensions, residential annexes, alterations, ancillary development, change of use and intensification) should:

- i) be of a high architectural and design quality and respect and enhance the character of the site and the prevailing character of the area. This will include consideration of proportion, form, design, context, massing, siting, layout, density, height, size, scale, materials, detailed design features and landscaping;
- ii) enhance the local environment by way of its appearance and character, with particular attention being paid to the architectural form, height, materials, density, scale, orientation, landscaping, tree canopy, impact on street scene and layout of the development;
- iii) make a positive contribution to the sense of place, local character and distinctiveness of an area;
- iv) respect, preserve and where appropriate enhance, heritage assets and settings;

- v) be well built, accessible, fit for purpose, and adaptable to changing lifestyle, demography and climate;
- vi) include a layout and design which: take account of potential users of the site; create safe conditions for access, egress and active travel (walking and cycling) between all locations; provide good links to integrated public transport; and have acceptable parking arrangements (in terms of amount and layout);
- vii) make a positive contribution to creating a safe and secure environment by integrating measures for security and designing out opportunities for crime;
- viii) not have an unacceptable impact on the occupiers of adjacent properties, particularly of residential dwellings, including unacceptable loss of privacy, daylight/sunlight, outlook, an unacceptable increase in noise giving rise in significant adverse impacts, or vehicular movements resulting in severe cumulative impacts on the road network, or loss of important open space of public value (unless it satisfies any of the exceptions set out under Policy DM7 – Open Space, Recreation and Leisure);
- ix) respect the existing natural features of the site, including landform, trees and biodiversity and contribute positively to biodiversity net gain. Where appropriate, this will include the protection and integration of existing trees and green infrastructure into new developments;
- x) ensure that lighting incorporated into developments provides the minimum for public safety, is energy efficient and avoids light pollution.

The Council's SPG 'Extending or Altering Your Home' provides general advice and sets out a number of design principles. It states that:

When designing an extension and deciding on an appropriate siting, the two most important things to ensure are; that the design of your extension achieves an appropriate relationship with the design of the existing house and; that it also takes into account any impact on the street scene.

It goes on to say that: *The size and shape of any extension should normally be designed to ensure the original house remains the larger and more dominant feature.*

In relation to roof extensions and dormers it states that:

Roof extensions and dormers are often highly visible and alien features which greatly alter the appearance of a dwelling. Therefore, there is a normal presumption against dormer windows that are visible from the street. However, exceptions to this can be made if the dormer is located at the rear of the property to make it less visible, or if several other dwellings on the street already have dormer windows, which are not substantially out of character.

Dormers should never be allowed to dominate the roof by being overly large or higher than the existing roof ridge. Where possible they should be designed to follow the vertical lines of existing windows. Always, avoid wrapping dormers around more than one face of the roof, or cutting into the line of the hip.

Hipped roof or gable ended dormers are often preferable to those with flat roofs, because they reduce the overall "bulk" of the extension. This also avoids the horizontal emphasis that is produced by large flat roofed dormers. In some cases a roof light may

form a more suitable alternative to a dormer. Whilst the windows themselves should match those of the existing building, the roofs and sides of new dormers should be covered in materials which match or compliment the main roof.

The site is in a highly visible location positioned at the corner of the street junction where wide views are possible from the surrounding streets to the north, east and south of the site. Dormer extensions are not a characteristic feature of the streetscene. Although there appear to be other examples of dormer extensions to the rear of other similar dwellings in King Edward Avenue, none are in a prominent position and are not readily visible in the streetscene. One example can be seen at No.65 King Edward Avenue which appears to have been constructed as Permitted Development (AWDM/1733/22 refers), but this is positioned at the rear and some 40 metres from the street frontage with intervening dwellings and their gardens between.

The dormer extension as proposed would be particularly large and bulky and would appear as a dominant and top-heavy addition to the building. It would be unsympathetic in scale, form and design. It is noted that there are discrepancies and inaccuracies in the drawings presenting difficulties to fully understand whether the drawings represent an accurate reflection of the proposals. Nevertheless on the basis of the information provided it is clear that the combination of the size of the rear dormer extension, across much of the width of the roof, with minimal set back and with its L-shaped form over the rear outrigger, would appear as an excessively bulky and incongruous addition to the building and wider streetscene where it would dominate the roof at the site.

In relation to the proposed front rooflight windows, these can be considered in the context of the surrounding streetscene where there are some other examples of rooflight windows which can be seen in the vicinity of the site. However the details of their appearance have not been included in the elevation drawings. Had the application been considered acceptable in other respects, a corrected drawing to indicate the proposed rooflight windows would have also been sought.

Residential Amenity

The main impact as a result of the proposals would be to the occupiers of the adjoining dwellings at No. 53 to the west, the ground floor flat at No.55, and dwellings to the rear in Westbourne Avenue. Dwellings on the opposite side of The Quashetts and King Edward Avenue would be sufficiently separated to avoid any significant impact as a result of the proposals. The impact of rooflight windows to the front elevation would be similar to that of existing front windows.

At the rear there is a separation distance of approximately 30 metres back to back and the bulk of the extensions would be well separated to avoid any significant impact to neighbouring occupiers to the rear. Although a second floor window and a Juliet balcony would be introduced, the impact would be similar to that of existing rear windows and would not pose any significant threat to the amenities of occupiers at the rear.

To the west, the neighbouring property at No.53 appears to be divided into two separate flats and forms a symmetrical pair with the application site. Its rear elevation,

including the rear projection, generally mirrors that of No.53. The proposed roof extension would be particularly large and bulky and although it would be felt in relation to the existing two storey building, the scale and form of the L-shaped design would be particularly unneighbourly and overbearing to the occupiers of No.53, with a loss of light and increased sense of enclosure. It is considered that this would also be the case for the occupiers of the ground floor flat at No.55 where the extended roof form over the rear projection would increase enclosure and would be overbearing.

Recommendation:

REFUSE for the reasons:-

1. The proposed development would, by reason of its scale, form, and design, represent a dominant, unsympathetic and overbearing form of development, detrimental to the visual amenities of the site and harmful to the character of the area. As such the proposed development would be contrary to policy DM5 of the Worthing Local Plan, the SPG 'Extending or Altering Your Home' and the relevant paragraphs of the National Planning Policy Framework.
2. Having regard to the scale and positioning of the proposed roof extension, the proposed development would be overbearing and unneighbourly, detrimental to the amenities of the neighbouring occupiers. As such the proposed development would be contrary to policy DM5 of the Worthing Local Plan and the relevant paragraphs of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Informative

The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by identifying matters of concern with the proposal and determining the application within a timely manner, clearly setting out the reason(s) for refusal, allowing the Applicant the opportunity to consider the harm caused and whether or not it can be remedied by a revision to the proposal. The Local Planning Authority has a pre-application advice service in respect of any future application for a revised development.

Is recommendation contrary to letter(s) of representation? N

Case Officer: Rebekah Hincke Date: 01.04.2026

Authorised by: Louise Prew Date: 07/04/2026