

Development Management – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/0584/26

Recommendation – APPROVE

Site: 12 Rectory Road Worthing West Sussex BN14 7PA

Proposal: Loft conversion with raised ridge, front roof lights and rear dormer, increased chimney height

Date of site visit: 10.06.2026

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Site and Surroundings

The application relates to a detached, gabled-ended bungalow dating from the late 1970s occupying an irregular-shaped plot fronting the east side of Rectory Road, and to the rear (north) of 2, 8-10 Haynes Road. The bungalow is set back from the road behind a wedge-shaped frontage enclosed at the front by a brick-dressed flint wall with conifer hedging growing above. Vehicle accesses at either end serve an in/out driveway. A sycamore tree in the front garden close to the southern vehicle access is subject to a TPO (No.10 of 2003). A driveway on the south side of the bungalow leads to a detached garage building in the southeast corner of the site.

Adjoining to the north is St Lawrence GP Surgery, consisting of a large complex of connected 2-storey and single-storey building components, the premises having been considerably expanded and evolved over many years from the original pair of houses (77-79 St Lawrence Avenue) to largely infill the southern half of the site. Parking areas front Rectory Road, and St Lawrence Avenue to the north.

The property is not listed, locally listed or within a conservation area.

Proposal

The proposal, which has been amended following negotiation, is to provide rooms in the forms formed by nominally raising the entire main north-south roof ridge and constructing a rear dormer, together with front roof lights. The proposed dormer would have a mostly flat roof with a tiled 'skirt' (or crown roof) extending rearward (east) at the same height as the new main ridge. It would be 13m wide, set in 2m from both the north and south side gable walls, and up 0.9m from the rear eaves. The face and side 'cheeks' would be tiled to match the main roof. 4no 2-pane windows (serving bedrooms and a bathroom) would face east overlooking the rear garden. 3no sets of doubled (vertical) front roof lights would serve the stairs and landing.

The chimney stack on the north side would be raised in height to 1.35m above the new roof ridge.

Relevant Planning History: None

Consultations: None undertaken.

Representations: None received.

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 existing bungalow is a standalone infill dwelling permitted in 1977 on vacant land. Direct views of it from Rectory Road are curtailed by its low roof profile and screening provided by tall vegetation on the site frontage. This is further supplemented a tall tree and undergrowth in the front southwest corner of the neighbouring surgery premises (subject to the same TPO as above). Nevertheless, angled views of the southernmost part of the bungalow are visible from further south in Rectory Road, above the lower hedge and boundary treatment enclosing the west side of 2 Haynes Road. The north side gable of the bungalow is visible in angled views from the north, across the parking area fronting the surgery.

It is proposed to replace the roof, raising the ridge height by 0.25m by increasing the angle of pitch to achieve the required headroom within the proposed first-floor accommodation. The increase in height and angle of pitch will not be overtly apparent given the individual, standalone design of the bungalow. The rear dormer is very wide and will be highly visible from neighbouring properties. However, public views of it will be limited owing to the generous 2m gap between its side 'cheeks' and the north and south gables. The dormer will be most visible in views from the north across the surgery car park. However, it will not dominate the roof viewed from this direction, or appear as an overly assertive or intrusive feature in the street scene. The use of matching materials and finishes will help it to recede into the background.

Residential Amenity

The most affected properties are the dwellings to the south, sited at 90° to the rear of the application property, fronting Haynes Road. The rear garden of No.12 is stepped, with the deeper half to the north some 18m deep; and the shallower half to the south approximately 8.8m deep. The 4no windows in the proposed rear dormer would therefore overlook the rear part of the gardens belonging to Nos 10 and 12 Haynes Road at 8.8m and 18m respectively. However, some degree of overlooking and inter-visibility between neighbouring gardens and properties is inevitable in this type of suburban context. Following amendment, the proposed dormer window openings are not overly large, and having regard to the separation distances involved, it is considered the effects of overlooking from the windows would not be harmfully intrusive as to result in a significant loss of amenity for the occupiers of these properties.

There will be a separation distance of 14m between the taller south side gable wall of No.12 and the main rear elevation of 8 Haynes Road to the south, and 16m to the side of the proposed dormer 'cheek'. However, the taller ridge height will only be 5.25m overall, and although clearly visible from the rear windows of this detached house, the proposed roof enlargements will not be overbearing in effect, or result in any loss of light or privacy for the occupier(s) of this property.

There will be no harmful impacts on the neighbouring surgery premises.

Recommendation

APPROVE subject to Conditions:-

1. Drawing Numbers
2. Standard time limit
3. Matching materials
4. No openings to south side gable, dormer cheek.

Informative

Pro Active Amendment

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

Case Officer: Jo Morin Date: 01.07.2026

Authorised by: Louise Prew Date: 02/07/2026