



Planning Appeal Statement

TOWN & COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990 SECTION 78(1) HOUSEHOLDER PLANNING APPEAL

**SITE
10 SUSSEX ROAD
WORTHING
WEST SUSSEX BN11 1DS**

**PROPOSAL:
DEMOLITION OF EXISTING SIDE EXTENSION
AND ERECTION OF REPLACEMENT SINGLE-STOREY
SIDE EXTENSION AND STREET BOUNDARY WALL**

APPELLANT:

Location & Description of Appeal Site

See the Design & Access Statement submitted with original application for full details of the location and description of the site. A copy of this Design & Access Statement forms **Appendix A** of this Statement.

The Proposal

A full description of the proposed replacement side extension and boundary wall are contained within the Design & Access Statement submitted with the original application.

The Decision

Planning consent for the development was refused by decision letter dated the 12th February 2026. The single reason for refusal given read as follows:

‘The proposed extension by reason of its siting, height, form, massing and relationship to the boundary would appear incongruous with the street scene detrimental to the appearance of the existing building, the street scene and local character contrary to Policy DM5 of the Worthing Local Plan 2023 and the Council’s SPG Extending or Altering Your Home and the Policies of the NPPF.’

A copy of Policy DM5 is appended in the Design & Access Statement presented with the original application. A copy of Worthing Borough Council’s SPG ‘Extending or Altering Your Home’ forms **Appendix B** to this statement.

The SPG contains general advice with regards to house extensions. It requires that the size and shape of the extension be subsidiary to the host dwelling. The design should be consistent with the existing property’s style and shape and have a roof form similar to that of the existing house. Further, it should respect the amenities of neighbouring properties and the character of the surrounding area.

Case for the Appellant

A detailed and compelling case for the development is set out within the Design & Access Statement which formed part of the original application documentation.

This Statement will therefore limit itself to addressing the contents of Worthing Borough Council’s Delegated Officer Report, a copy of which comprises **Appendix C** of this Statement.

Comment on The Delegated Officer Report

The proposed side extension is of a modest scale and proportion and would not form an unduly obtrusive feature in the street scene to Stanley Road, albeit that it would project forward of the building line to houses in this street.

Use of a flat roof was a deliberate choice as it successfully limits the massing and bulk of the extension, such that it would not be visually prominent in the street scene. Its projection in front of the Stanley Road building line is of limited consequence. The extension would not be read as a significant feature in the street scene to Stanley Road on would only project modestly above the boundary fence/wall.

The boundary fence already runs hard along the pavement edge and itself and therefore already breaches the building line in Stanley Road.

The flat roof has been carefully softened with a moulded fascia, an architectural feature which compliments the Victorian character of the host dwelling.

It is therefore well designed and would not constitute an ugly, disjointed or jarring feature. It is noted that the SPG cautions against the use of flat roof extensions, but they cannot be ruled out on every case, as a matter of course. Rather, they need to be treated on a case-by-case basis. Here use of a flat roof is the optimal design solution.

Putting a pitched roof on the extension would increase its massing and bulk and therefore make it a more prominent feature in the street scene. Drawings of such an extension were prepared pre-application, but they were not as successful as the appropriately designed flat roof extension here proposed.

The Delegated Report believes that the existing side extension was constructed somewhere between 2020 and 2024. Google Earth aerial photographs from 2015 (presented in the original Design & Access Statement) clearly show half of this extension in situ at this point.

The existing extension therefore is considered to at least in part be lawful and a material factor in the consideration of this appeal.

This proposal offers the opportunity of removing this poorly designed, somewhat ramshackle extension with a good quality piece of architecture whose form and materials would complement the host dwelling.

The Delegated Report confirms that there are no third-party objections to the proposal and that the boundary wall element is considered acceptable in principle.

It is further confirmed in the Delegated Report that the extension would not harm the residential amenity of any immediately neighbouring property and that the rear fence would not unduly impact on No.2 Stanley Road, particularly given that there is already high fencing in situ and there is a tree located within the boundary to that property.

No overlooking is considered to arise, and it is noted that the site is not a listed building, nor does it lie within a Conservation Area or an Area of Special Townscape Quality.

For the reasons set out in the Design & Access Statement and in this Appeal Statement, the Inspector is requested to uphold the appeal and grant planning permission for the single storey side extension proposed.