Development Management – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/0718/25 **Recommendation: Refuse**

Site: **6 Thurlow Road Worthing West Sussex BN11 2JB**

Proposal: **Roof extensions including hip to gable end over front projection; rear hip to gable with balcony, side dormer, side rooflight and change of roof materials; rendering of elevations; and alterations to fenestration**

Last visited: 07.10.2025

Neighbours Checked: Y

Additional Neighbours Notified: Y No. 36 and 38 Homefield Drive notified 30.07.2025

Site and Surroundings

The application site relates to a detached bungalow located on the south side of Thurlow Road. The bungalow has a hipped roof form with a projecting gable element to its front elevation. There is a detached garage to its east side with a driveway and vehicular access onto Thurlow Road. This is a predominantly residential area comprising of a mix of dwelling types and designs. The application bungalow infills between the rear gardens of two storey semi-detached houses fronting Homefield Road to the west and a row of terrace dwellings in Cranworth Road to the east which are positioned at 90 degrees to the application site.

Proposal

Permission is sought for the construction of a hip to gable roof extension to both the front (north) and rear (south) elevations, a dormer extension to the west roofslope and a rooflight window to the east roofslope. The rear gable wall would be recessed and would include a balcony set below the roof overhang and enclosed by a glazed balustrade. The front gable wall would extend over the ground floor front projection and to its east side and forward of the main front wall, forming an open undercroft area supported by a column at its northeast corner. The proposals include re-roofing with a grey metal roof with standing seam detail. A white painted render finish is proposed for the gable walls, and the existing brickwork would be painted white. New dark grey aluminium frame windows, bi-folding patio doors and side (west) door are also indicated.

Relevant Planning History:
None relevant

Consultations
None

Neighbour Representations
None received

Relevant Planning Policies:

Worthing Local Plan policies (WBC 2023): SP1, DM5, DM20
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 Councils SPG Extending or Altering Your Home states that the size and shape of any extension should normally be designed to ensure the original house remains the larger and more dominant feature. It advises that the design should be consistent with the existing property's style and shape and where visible from the street it is important to ensure that the roof form is similar to that of the existing house. It states that where possible, false pitch roofs should be avoided. It goes on to advise 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. It advises that the facing materials of any extension should ideally match those used for the existing house. If identical materials are not available, the nearest possible alternative should be used and that when selecting materials, you should ensure that they match the originals in size, shape and texture. Re-use of existing roof tiles is encouraged.

The proposed gable extension to the front elevation in particular would be a highly visible feature. In the vicinity of the site gable ends generally feature as a decorative element where they are seen on nearby frontages, such as to bay windows or as a secondary element of the building. However, there is some variety in the type and designs of dwellings in the vicinity of the site with no specific uniformity in their form and with a fairly prominent gable wall present at No. 8 Thurlow Road to the east, albeit at the end of the row of terraces. Whilst the proposed roof extensions would alter the appearance and roof form of the building, in the context of this site and having regard to this being a stand-alone bungalow and with no strict uniformity in the streetscene, the introduction of a gable form to the front and rear roofslopes would not in itself cause any significant harm to visual amenity subject to satisfactory detailing. However, the design of the front gable would have a relatively dominant appearance due in part to the overhanging element forward of the main front wall but exacerbated by the design and size of the proposed gable window and the overall composition of windows in relation to the ground floor. This would have a jarring effect visually and would result in an unduly dominant and incongruous form of development. The applicant has not been willing to amend the design of the proposals to address this issue. In terms of the rear gable, given its position at the rear of the building where it would not be readily visible and it would be recessed, despite the addition of balcony glazing this element would not cause any significant harm to visual amenity. The proposed dormer window would also appear reasonably well proportioned in relation to the roof form and there are other, larger, dormers visible in the wider streetscene and so in this context its size and positioning would be acceptable.

In terms of the proposed materials, painted rendered walls would not appear unreasonable, in combination with the painted brickwork indicated, and with other examples seen in the vicinity of the site. However, the use of grey colour coated metal sheet roofing with standing seam would represent a stark contrast to the existing traditional tiles used on the application dwelling and at odds with the traditional tiles and palette and texture of materials seen elsewhere in the streetscene. The extensive use of metal sheet roofing proposed across the entirety of the relatively shallow pitched single storey roof would result in a visually discordant form of development that would be out of keeping with the character of the recipient building and surrounding streetscene. The applicant has not been willing to amend the proposals to matching or similar tiles to be in keeping with the surrounding type and palette of materials used elsewhere in the streetscene.

The elevation drawings show some of the windows being replaced with a smaller window and infilled with a panel, but the details do not explain what the appearance or finish of this would be. It is not clear whether this a louvre detail, cladding panel or another detail. Had the application been considered acceptable in all other respects, further information would have been sought.

The applicant has pointed to another example of metal sheet roofing and a gable window nearby. The application should be considered on its own individual merits and those examples cited are not in the immediate streetscene. One example is at No.22 Lyndhurst Road (application AWDM/0130/21 refers) which is a new four storey residential building under construction where the mansard roof and detailing have a standing seam detail similar to the application proposals. However, the use of this

material differs to the application proposals in that it is a mansard roof where its use is more cohesive to the roof form and set back from the floors below, where it is similar to other mansard roofs in the immediate vicinity, and where it would have a similar colour palette to close neighbouring buildings. The second example is where a gable window has been inserted in a recently constructed dwelling at No.18 Homefield Road (application AWDM/1271/14 refers). It is set high in the gable, separated from first floor windows below and with similarities to the proportions of the gable treatment at the neighbouring dwelling and where it does not have a particularly dominant appearance. In both cases these examples are not in the immediate streetscene to which the application relates and in terms of their application on the recipient buildings and their design, the examples are not considered directly comparable to the application dwelling.

In this case it is considered that the detailed design and materials would relate poorly to the existing dwelling and would appear as an incongruous form of development out of keeping with the recipient building and the surrounding streetscene.

Residential Amenity

The main impact arising from the development would be to the occupiers of dwellings to the west at No. 36, 38 and 40 Homefield Road, and dwellings in the neighbouring terrace to the east at Cranworth Road whose rear gardens face towards the application site. Dwellings on the opposite side of the street to the north of the site would be sufficiently separated to avoid any significant impact arising from the proposals including from the introduction of a first floor window where distances between frontages would be similar to elsewhere in the street and would not pose any significant threat to privacy.

There is a close-knit relationship between the existing bungalow and the surrounding neighbouring dwellings to the east and west. The bungalow is sited most closely to its west boundary but despite this close relationship the bulk of the roof extensions would be reasonably well separated from No.38 and 40 Homefield Road to the immediate west and No.95 to 101 Cranworth Road and 8 Thurlow Road to the east where these dwellings and their rear gardens are sited at 90 degrees to the application dwelling at either side and there is a separation distance of between 12 to 16 metres approximately, although it is noted that No.40 has been extended further to the rear closing this spacing further. Nevertheless, there would be no significant impact arising from the bulk of the extensions to those occupiers or those further south including No.36 Homefield Drive whose rear garden extend along the rear boundary of the site. Although the proposed side windows could cause overlooking, obscure glazing could be installed in the interests of protecting privacy and this could be secured by condition if the application were to be approved.

However, given the close-knit relationship with neighbouring dwellings and gardens the introduction of a first floor balcony at the rear would cause overlooking to neighbouring occupiers to the south west and south east. It is recognised that a rear first floor window or Juliet-style balcony could be installed as permitted development but given the physical presence of users and that they would be apparent to neighbouring occupiers particularly at No's 93, 95 and 97 Cranworth Road where there is limited screening and to the rear and gardens of No. 38 and 36 Homefield Road

where there would be a reasonable expectation of privacy, having regard to its size and positioning it is considered that the proposed balcony would be unneighbourly. The applicant has not been willing to delete this element from the proposals. Whilst there are some existing views across gardens between dwellings in Cranworth Road and Homefield Road, the particularly shallow garden of the application site and close relationship between those dwellings and the application dwelling, the lack of first floor windows at the application site at present, and the physical presence of users of the proposed balcony are key considerations, and these factors would contribute to introducing an unneighbourly and overbearing form of development detrimental the amenities of neighbouring occupiers.

Other issues

The applicant has provided supporting information relating to the environmental credentials of the steel roof product proposed and has highlighted the following points:

1) The cleanest steel
GreenCoat® products are made from Nordic quality steels that are among the cleanest in the world with the tightest tolerances and best consistency
.
2) Leading technology using rapeseed oil
Most GreenCoat® products use a coating where rapeseed oil and other renewable raw materials are used. SSAB has long experience of Bio-based Technology (BT) in GreenCoat® products. All of our products are of course fully compliant with the REACH

3) Long lasting, superior surface for any weather
GreenCoat® products provide high colour retention and long lasting finishes that resist rust, white rust and UV radiation as well as scratches and the build-up of dirt, for reduced maintenance.

4) Rigorous outdoor testing
Over 40 years of extensive outdoor testing at sites located worldwide ensure that GreenCoat® products withstand the harshest weather conditions like wind, rain, snow, saltwater, ice, UV radiation, high humidity and storms.

Ensuring quality through real outdoor testing is a priority for SSAB and, therefore, we go far beyond what is required by the EU regulations.

5) Guaranteed performance
GreenCoat® products all come with extensive performance and finish guarantees.that the GreenCoat product is made form Nordic quality steels that are among the cleanest,

And of course, the roof can be recycled!

Whilst the reasons for selecting this material are noted, it is considered that this would not outweigh the harm that has been identified.

Recommendation:

REFUSE for the reason:-

1. The proposed development would, by reason of is design, detailing and materials, represent a visually discordant form of development detrimental to the visual amenities of the site and surrounding streetscene. As such the proposed development would be contrary to policy DM5 of the Worthing Local Plan, the Council's SPG Extending or Altering Your Home and the relevant paragraphs of the National Planning Policy Framework.

2. Having regard to the relationship with neighbouring dwellings, the introduction of a balcony would represent an unneighbourly and overbearing form of development causing a loss of privacy, detrimental to the amenities of neighbouring occupiers. As such the proposal 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 is willing to provide pre-application advice in respect of any future application for a revised development.

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

Case Officer: Rebekah Hincke Date: 04.12.2025

Authorised by: Louise Prew Date: 16/12/2025