

Development Management – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/0047/26

Recommendation: – APPROVE

Site: 8 Welland Close Worthing West Sussex BN13 3NR

Proposal: Demolition of existing garage and store and construction of single storey side extension

Date of Site Visit: 25/02/2026

Neighbours Checked: Y

Additional Neighbours Notified: Y – 7 and 8 Dart Close (missed off initial neighbour letters), full consultation period of 21 days applied.

Site and Surroundings

The site is located to the south side of Welland Close, within a residential area of Worthing. The property comprises a detached two-storey house with brick elevations and a pitched roof. There is a flat roof projecting porch to the front and a detached garage to the west side of the building, set forward to align with the porch. The property is set back from the road behind an open front garden and hard surface providing parking for two vehicles. There is a good size garden to the rear that has a terrace to accommodate the drop in ground levels to the south.

The property is not within a conservation area, is not a listed building and there are no protected trees on site.

Proposal

Planning permission is sought for demolition of the garage and construction of a single storey side extension to the west side.

The proposed extension would measure approximately 3.85m wide x 9.6m deep aligning with the existing porch and garage to the front and the rear wall of the existing house at the back. The proposed extension would have a flat roof of approximately 2.8m high which would extend across the front to replace the roof of the existing porch, which is currently about 2.5m high.

A new door would be formed to the front elevation between the existing house and the garage door, forming a hallway providing access to the garage/store, utility and enlarged kitchen. The garage door to the front would be slightly widened and the garage converted to a store and utility. The extension would also accommodate an enlarged kitchen with French doors and sidelights to the rear.

Relevant Planning History:

None relevant

Consultations

WSCC Highways - The proposals seek to create a single storey side extension at 8 Welland Close, Welland Close is a residential d class cul-de-sac in Worthing, subject to a 30mph speed restriction. The Local Highway Authority (LHA) has reviewed data supplied to WSCC by Sussex Police over a period of the last five years. There have been no recorded injury accidents at the existing access with the public highway, onto Welland Close. There is no evidence to suggest that the access is operating unsafely, or that the proposed change of use would exacerbate an existing safety concern.

The existing garage in its current format is substandard in size compared with WSCC parking standards which outline that a garage of 3m x 6m is sufficient to serve an average sized vehicle. Therefore, this existing garage space does not count toward the overall parking provision. Currently there is frontage parking at the property for 2 vehicles, and this same provision is proposed to be retained to serve the dwelling and garage conversion.

The proposed additional floor space does not provide an additional bedroom for the property. Therefore, the parking provision for the dwelling is not anticipated to be affected by the proposals. Parking sufficient to serve a minimum of two parking spaces is available on frontage hard standing. There is also the possibility for on street parking to accommodate for any overspill generated by the proposal. The plans demonstrate that storage is available within a portion of the garage conversion of for cycle storage.

The Local Highway Authority does not consider that the proposal would have an unacceptable impact on highway safety or result in 'severe' cumulative impacts on the operation of the highway network, therefore is not contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework (paragraph 116), and that there are no transport grounds to resist the proposal.

WSP - Following a review of the submitted information, we have no objection on surface water grounds. Due to the site, size, location, and type of development we would recommend the approval of the application with the following informative attached:

Informative 1: The applicant must follow the drainage hierarchy of preference. Due to the size and location of the development, an infiltration test should be carried out in accordance with the Part H2, paragraph 1.34 to 1.37 of the Building Regulations (https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/5a80cf9ded915d74e33fc8ae/BR_PD_F_AD_H_2015.pdf). This rate should then be put into the calculation in Part H3, paragraph 3.28. Following this the applicant can use the free tools at <https://www.uksuds.com/> to size the soakaway for the 1 in 100 (1%) plus CC event.

If infiltration fails, the same links should be used to size attenuation storage to ensure surface water runoff does not increase from the existing discharge rate.

To obtain the relevant rainfall data the applicant can visit <https://fehweb.ceh.ac.uk/> to download the point data for their site and input the csv file into the tools above.

Neighbour Representations

One objection received from the neighbour to the rear (comments relating to sensitive personal information have been removed from this document):

We live in the property directly behind (7 Dart Close) and I would like to politely raise our concerns as to why we wish to oppose.

1. Overbearing Impact due to Topography

Under the Local Plan Policy 15, the council must protect the amenity of existing residents. Due to living on a hill and our property being lower, the change in ground levels would make the proposed single storey extension much more visible to us. From our perspective this will create an overbearing impact from our upper rear windows.

2. Loss of Privacy

The windows/doors to the proposed extension will directly face specifically into our master bedroom. It will also be visible into our bathroom and second bedroom. This would hugely impact our most private habitable rooms, which is contrary to the council's 'Supplementary Planning Guidance on residential extensions.'

3. Impact on Vulnerable Residents

Under the Equality Act 2010 (Section 149) the council should regard my disability and my mother's role as my full-time carer. Maintaining a private, stable, and non-intrusive environment is essential for my health and safety. The increased overlooking from this extension would cause me significant distress and vulnerability, impacting my need to rest after and during a medical emergency as I use the back bedroom frequently.

I understand and fully respect that neighbours need to extend on their properties, but I would like to request for the Planning Officer to conduct a site visit from our property to fully understand the impact this would have. Or, we are more than happy to send photos if this is of any help.

Officer response: Further to these comments, photos were requested and received from the neighbour to support their objection and further comments provided as detailed below:

I have attached some photos to show how the planned extension windows/doors would feel overbearing and overwatched from both of our back bedrooms. Our bathroom window is also between these two bedrooms, although we have put extra privacy film over this window so I haven't taken a photo of this.

I have also shown a view from our downstairs window to show how close the houses are.

I hope this captures what I am trying to express. He used to have a tree on the left side which originally concealed his garage and store (also concealing the house behind.) However, it was cut down when he built his outbuilding last year which is directly behind our fence. So the removal of his tree has now left the back of his garage and store much more visually prominent which is where the extension door/window

would be if this were to go ahead.

I would like to apologise to Mr James Brook for my objection as I realise this could be very frustrating for him. But due to our situation of being vulnerable and my very poor health, I felt it important to express my concerns about the impact it would have on our overall privacy and general well-being.

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

The proposed extension would include the floorspace previously occupied by the garage and would join the garage space to the house and extend to the rear of the garage. The proposed extension would be in the same position to the front as the existing porch and garage, sitting forwards of the main house but with a recessed garage door and new pedestrian door. The rear elevation of the extension would not project beyond the rear of the existing building.

Most properties in the street scene have a forward projecting garage, porch or both and there are various examples of similar extensions to the front and side, including at the adjacent property No.9 and further to the west at No's.10, 11 and 16.

The proposed extension would be in keeping with similar development in the immediate locality and would not project any further forwards than the existing porch and garage. The proposal would mirror the existing side extension at No.9 where it adjoins the garage to the house and would not appear dominant or intrusive in the street scene.

The roof of the existing porch would be raised by approximately 30cm to the same height as the proposed extension; this would also be the same height as the adjacent garage extension to the neighbours property and would not appear out of character in the area.

The proposal would be subsidiary in scale and form to the existing building and would reflect the design and materials of the existing building and those of surrounding dwellings. There would be no significant adverse impact on the visual amenities of the locality as a result of this application.

Residential Amenity

The most affected neighbours are those to the west side at No.9 Welland Close.

This property has already extended to the side and rear of their garage which is adjacent to the boundary and is in the same position to the front and the same height as the proposed extension at No.8. The proposed extension would extend approximately 1.5m further to the rear than the neighbour's extension but would not extend beyond a line projected at 45 degrees from the midpoint of the neighbour's rear window and is not considered to diminish light to their property. A single storey extension in this position, to the side of the neighbour's house would not appear overbearing or oppressive or result in any significant overshadowing of their property. There are no openings proposed to the side of the extension and no overlooking or loss of privacy would occur.

There are no changes to the east side of the property and no impact on the neighbours to the east at No.7.

The neighbour to the rear (7 Dart Close) has objected to the development on the grounds of; overbearing development due to topography, loss of privacy and impact on vulnerable residents from noise of demolition and construction. The neighbour has also provided photos to support their objection which have been considered during assessment of the application.

Overbearing development due to topography – There is a drop in ground levels to the south of the application property, however the single storey extension would not project any further to the rear than the existing two storey building, is single storey in height and positioned 8.9m from the boundary with No.7 and 21m from the first floor windows of the neighbours property. The photos provided by the neighbour show that the single storey extension would not be visible at all from the ground floor of their property. A single storey extension in this position at 21m from the upper floor windows of the neighbours property, that does not extend beyond the rear elevation of the existing two storey dwelling could not be considered to have an overbearing impact on the neighbour to the rear.

Loss of privacy – The proposed doors and windows to the rear elevation of the proposed single storey extension would be no closer to the neighbour's property than the existing openings. The openings would serve a kitchen which is a non-habitable room and would not be considered to result in any loss of privacy that would detrimentally affect the neighbours amenities. Even if the kitchen included a dining room, introducing a habitable element, openings at ground floor at a distance of 21m from the neighbours upper floor windows would not be considered to result in any significant loss of privacy. The same situation already exists from openings serving habitable rooms to the rear elevation of the existing house and the proposal would not exacerbate this. Loss of privacy from openings to a kitchen at 21m from the neighbours windows is not considered to be unacceptable.

Impact on vulnerable residents - In addition to the normal considerations of amenity set out in LP policy DM5, S149 of the Equality Act places a duty on public authorities in carrying out their functions to (amongst other things) advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not. Disability is a relevant protected characteristic. The public sector equality duty

(PSED) involves having due regard to the need to take steps minimise disadvantages suffered by persons who share a relevant protected characteristic, or to meet the needs of persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are different from the needs of persons who do not share it. Compliance may involve treating some persons more favourably than others. Thus, as the proposed development is acceptable, it is reasonable and appropriate in this case to impose restrictions on hours of construction work to minimise the harmful effects of noise, vibration and activity associated with construction work on the amenities of person(s) with a protected characteristic.

Whilst it is not the Council's normal practice to impose restrictions on hours of construction for domestic extensions as it is not considered proportionate to the potential risk of harm from noise and disturbance during construction works, in this case with regard to the specific duty to minimise disadvantages suffered by persons who share a relevant protected characteristic, a condition to restrict hours of demolition/construction is considered appropriate. This condition will minimise the impact resulting from noise from demolition and construction as much as is possible within the extent of the council's powers, without imposing unreasonable demands/restrictions on the applicant.

The proposal for a single storey extension in this location, that does not project beyond the rear elevation of the existing two storey house and is 21m from the upper floor rear windows of the neighbour's house, is not considered to have an unacceptable impact on residential amenity.

There would be no unacceptable detrimental impact on the residential amenities of adjacent occupiers as a result of this application.

Recommendation:

APPROVE subject to condition(s):-

1. Drawing Numbers
 2. Standard time limit
 3. Matching materials
 4. No openings to west side elevation of extension
 5. No work for the implementation of the development (including demolition and construction) hereby permitted shall be undertaken on the site on Sundays or on Public Holidays. On all other days such work shall only be undertaken between the hours of 8am and 6pm Monday to Friday and 9am to 1pm on Saturdays.
- Reason: To safeguard the amenities of the occupiers of neighbouring properties having regard to policy DM5 of the Worthing Local Plan.

Informative

1. 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.

2. The applicant must follow the drainage hierarchy of preference. Due to the size and location of the development, an infiltration test should be carried out in accordance with the Part H2, paragraph 1.34 to 1.37 of the Building Regulations (https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/5a80cf9ded915d74e33fc8ae/BR_PDF_AD_H_2015.pdf). This rate should then be put into the calculation in Part H3, paragraph 3.28. Following this the applicant can use the free tools at <https://www.uksuds.com/> to size the soakaway for the 1 in 100 (1%) plus CC event.

If infiltration fails, the same links should be used to size attenuation storage to ensure surface water runoff does not increase from the existing discharge rate. To obtain the relevant rainfall data the applicant can visit <https://fehweb.ceh.ac.uk/> to download the point data for their site and input the csv file into the tools above.

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

Case Officer: Amanda Haslett Date: 09/04/26

Authorised by: Jo Morin Date: 09.04.2026