Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/0614/25 Recommendation: Approve

Site: 5 Devonport Place, Worthing

Proposal: Single storey rear extension

Date of site visit: 15.07.2025

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

The site relates to a modern two-storey house located on the west side of Devonport Place. It is semi-detached, attached to No.4 on its south side, and also linked by its garage to that of No.6 to the north. Devonport Place comprises of other similar and matching dwellings arranged around a cul-de-sac with open-plan gardens to their frontages.

Permission is sought for the construction of a single storey rear extension. It would measure 5.28 metres in width and 3 metres in depth from the main rear wall. The plans indicate that part of the existing garage would be divided and link internally to the proposed extension, and with the extension side wall extending approximately 1.5m beyond the rear corner of the garage. The extension would have a flat roof up to 2.85 metres in height. Matching brickwork is proposed for the external walls.

Relevant Planning History:
WB/93/0767/FULL Erection of 8 x three bedroomed and 6 x two bedroomed houses together with estate road and ancillary works. Approved 21.12.1993. Condition 16 removed certain PD rights at the dwelling/highway frontages.

Consultations:

The **Highway Authority** raises no objections and has made the following comments:

This application seeks the erection of a single-storey rear extension, providing enlarged living space on the ground floor. The site is located on Devonport Place, an unclassified road subject to a speed restriction of 30 mph.

The proposals will result in the reduction of depth to the existing garage, meaning it be too small for use for vehicular parking. However, I would note that the existing garage also does not meet the minimum dimensions for single-bay garages as outlined in Manual for Streets (MfS). As such, the garage may be too small to accommodate modern sized cars as existing. It is not unreasonable for the LHA to assume the garage could be being used for other purposes, such as storage. As such,

no concerns would be raised over loss of existing parking provision. One off-street car parking space is to be retained fronting the garage.

In summary, the LHA does not consider that this 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.

The Council's **Environmental Health** Officer has recommended a precautionary contamination condition to be applied.

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

The scale of the extension would appear reasonable and although a standard flat roof design is proposed, the proposed extension would be at the rear of the dwelling where it would not be readily visible in the streetscene or cause any significant harm to visual amenity. The use of matching brickwork would help blend with the recipient building. Design and impact on visual amenity are considered acceptable.

Residential Amenity

The main impact arising from the proposals would be to the occupiers of the neighbouring dwellings at No.6 to the north and No.4 to the south of the site. Neighbouring dwellings to the rear would be sufficiently separated to avoid any significant impact given the scale of the proposals.

To the north side, the extension would be set away from the boundary with No.6 by approximately 2.7 metres and the neighbour's own garage is adjacent to the boundary at this point with a rear conservatory set beyond that, positioned approximately 3 metres from the boundary. Having regard to the relationship between the two dwellings and the scale and positioning of the proposed extension, it is considered that there would be no significant impact to the amenities of the occupiers of No.6.

To the south side, the dwelling at No. 4 adjoins the application dwelling and has a rear window to the living /dining room close to the common boundary, and patio doors beyond that which also serve this room, but these have been enclosed by the neighbour's own rear conservatory. Although the proposed extension would be close to the boundary and further enclose the neighbouring rear window, given its limited depth and the permitted development fallback position which would allow a similar relationship here it is considered that a refusal on neighbour amenity grounds would not be justified in this instance.

A condition is recommended to ensure no side windows are installed in the interests of protecting privacy.

Flooding

The site is identified as being at risk of surface water flooding in the SFRA 2024. The applicant has indicated that floor levels would be no lower than existing floor levels and flood proofing/ resistance and resilience measures have been incorporated.

Recommendation

APPROVE subject to Conditions:-

1. Drawing Numbers
2. Standard time limit
3. Contamination precaution
4. Matching materials
5. No further side windows (north and south)

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? N

Case Officer: Rebekah Hincke Date: 28.07.2025

Authorised by: Louise Prew Date: 28/07/2025