

Development Management – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/0449/26

Recommendation: – APPROVE

Site: 69 Sunningdale Road Worthing West Sussex BN13 2NQ

Proposal: Rear infill extension

Date of Site Visit: 06/05/2026.

Neighbours Checked: Y

Additional Neighbours Notified: N

Site and Surroundings

The site, 69 Sunningdale Road, is situated within an established residential area in Worthing. The site comprises a semi-detached bungalow with a pitched roof. It has been enlarged by a single-storey rear extension and modest conservatory. A driveway running down the right-hand side of the property leads to a detached garage set back into the rear garden. The immediate locality is characterised predominantly by semi-detached bungalows set within individual plots, typically with private rear gardens and single-storey rear extensions, with the application site following this pattern.

The property is not a listed building and is not located within a conservation area. There are no Tree Preservation Orders affecting the site.

Proposal

Planning permission is sought for a proposed single-storey rear infill extension.

The proposed rear infill extension will extend to a maximum depth of approximately 2.65m and 5.16m wide. It will feature a flat roof with a height of approximately 2.8m.

According to the submitted form, the extension will be constructed in matching materials. The existing extension is of face-brick construction, but the proposed infill extension will contain rendered walls to match the existing property. The existing conservatory is to be removed.

No side openings are proposed. New bifold doors are proposed on the rear elevation.

Relevant Planning History:

No relevant planning history.

Consultations

None undertaken.

Neighbour Representations

67 Sunningdale Road

"I am totally against the rear extension proposed at 69 Sunningdale Road, Worthing.

My wife suffers from Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease (COPD) and is confined to living in the bedroom adjacent to next door's Dining area. She can only walk a few feet before she is breathless. She sleeps on and off during the day and is known to suffer anxiety and panic attacks when becoming severely breathless. The air conditioning that I have installed in the adjacent conservatory helps her breathe when she is particularly stressed. I can't imagine how her health will deteriorate with the noise generated by several months of construction.

One point to mention about the actual plan is that I don't believe that it conforms to the 45-degree "Right to Light" rule. A 3-metre-high extension would need to be 310 mm away from my fence not 200 mm. The window in my bedroom is east facing and so the natural light that it receives would be impacted by the extension being too close. The 110 mm increase in separation would also allow any maintenance of the wall of the extension and reduce the likelihood that my fence would be damaged at any time."

Planning Officer Response: The personal circumstances of the neighbouring occupiers are noted and treated with sympathy. However, the planning assessment must be made on the land use planning merits of the proposal. Temporary disturbance arising from construction activity is not uncommon in residential development and would not in itself warrant refusal of a householder extension that is otherwise considered acceptable in planning terms. Any construction works would also be subject to separate environmental health and statutory controls in relation to noise and hours of working.

In respect of residential amenity impacts, the proposed rear extension has been assessed having regard to the Council's adopted design guidance, including the 45-degree guideline. The council is satisfied that the proposal would not result in an unacceptable loss of light, outlook, or overbearing impact to neighbouring occupiers. While there may be some limited change experienced by the adjoining property, this would not be so significant as to justify refusal of the application.

Matters relating to "right to light", maintenance access, and any potential damage to boundary treatments are civil matters between neighbouring landowners and are not material planning considerations in the determination of this application.

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 rear infill extension would be subsidiary in form and scale to the existing building and, according to the submitted form, would be finished in matching materials to match the existing building. Due to this, the extension relates well to the existing building and will not appear out of place. The flat roof is acceptable given the minor scale of the extension and relates well to the existing single-storey rear extension, with the proposed single-storey extension being an infill of this extension.

The proposed rear infill extension is to the rear of the building and only glimpsed views of it will be visible from the road. The addition of the extension will not appear visually out of keeping and will not detract from the character of the area.

Residential Amenity

The neighbouring property most affected by the proposed development is immediately adjacent (west) at 67 Sunningdale Road.

67 Sunningdale Road

67 Sunningdale Road is attached to the west of the application site. The properties are separated by fencing.

The application site contains an existing single-storey rear extension. The proposed extension is to infill the gap between the existing extension and the site boundary, replacing the existing conservatory. The infill extension will be approximately 0.67m deeper than the existing conservatory and approximately 0.3m closer to the common boundary. No.67 contains an existing conservatory that is at a similar depth to the proposed extension.

When compared to the impact of the application site's existing conservatory, the proposed extension will have an additional impact on the receipt of light to and outlook from the windows on the conservatory of no.67, but due to its relatively modest height and depth, less than the 3m depth set out in the above SPG, it is considered the impact will not be so severe to warrant refusal.

No openings on the proposed extension will directly face no.67. There would be no overlooking or loss of privacy to neighbours.

Recommendation:

APPROVE subject to condition(s):-

1. Drawing Numbers

2. Standard time limit
3. Matching materials
4. No 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: Tom Westerman Date: 26/05/2026.

Authorised by: Jo Morin Date: 26.05.2026