

Development Management – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/0321/26

Recommendation: – REFUSE

Site: 24 Cissbury Gardens Worthing West Sussex BN14 0DX

Proposal: Ground floor rear and side extension; front garage extension; rooms in roof consisting of hip to gable ends and rear dormer extending onto rear extension and front roof lights.

Date of Site Visit: 25.03.2026

Neighbours Checked: Y

Additional Neighbours Notified: N

Site and Surroundings

The application relates to a detached, hipped roof bungalow situated on elevated ground on the east side of Cissbury Gardens within an outer residential suburb of the town. The layout of the bungalow includes a front-projecting component the previously hipped roof of which has recently been altered into a gable. The bungalow, which has an attached garage on its south side, is set back behind a gently sloping, soft-planted front garden enclosed by a low retaining wall fronting the back edge of the highway. There is a good-sized garden to the rear.

The application property comprises one of several detached, hipped roof bungalows on this side of the road. They are not identical in their detailed design but share similar characteristics including hipped roof forms, front-projecting components and attached garages to the side.

The property is not listed or locally listed. It is not within a conservation area and there are no TPO trees on the site.

Proposal

Permission is sought to demolish the attached garage and remodel the existing bungalow involving extensions to the south side and rear, including the alteration and enlargement of the existing roof to provide rooms in the roof.

On the ground-floor the proposed rear extension would extend 5.3m deep across the full width of the rear elevation, wrapping around the rear southeast corner of the bungalow to extend 2.75m wide on the south side, also extending 2.6m further forward (west) of the existing garage. The resulting L-shaped extension would be a maximum 11.45m wide by a maximum 15.3m deep.

The existing roof would be enlarged by extending the hip on the north side to form a gable and by extending the ridge southward over the proposed ground-floor extension on the south side, in a matching gable form. A large dormer-style flat-roofed first-floor rear extension (10.5m wide x 2.45m high) would extend 6m rearward (east) from the

enlarged rear roof slope, extending over the top of the proposed ground-floor extension by 2.4m. It would be set in from the edges of the main gabled roof by 0.4m on either side.

The proposed single-storey elements would have flat roofs 2.52m high.

The resulting accommodation would consist of an entrance hall, large open-plan lounge and kitchen/diner, 3no bedrooms, bathroom and integral garage on the ground-floor, with stairs up to a landing and 2no further bedrooms and bathroom on the first floor.

The external walls of the extensions (including proposed side gables) would be finished in render. The enlarged, gabled roof would be tiled with the dormer-style roof extension finished in cedar cladding.

An array of solar PVs would be fitted on the flat roof of the dormer-style rear roof extension and on the south side roof slope of the existing gabled, front projection.

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

Paragraph 139 of the NPP states that development that is not well designed should be refused especially where it fails to reflect local design policies taking into account local design guidance and supplementary planning documents.

Worthing Local Plan policy DM5 states that all new development including extensions should be of high architectural and design quality and respect and enhance the character of the site and the prevailing character of the area taking into consideration (amongst other things) proportion, form, design, context, massing, siting, layout, size, scale, materials and detailed design features. It states that development should enhance the local environment by way of its appearance and character, with particular attention paid to architectural form, height, materials, density, scale, orientation and

street scene. All new development should make a positive contribution to the sense of place, local character and distinctiveness of an area.

The Council's SPG 'Extending or Altering Your Home' provides guidance on the general principles to be adopted in designing an extension with the 2no most important things identified as ensuring the design of the extension achieves an appropriate relationship with the design of the existing house and taking into account the impact on the street scene. It states the size and shape of any extension should normally be designed to ensure the original house remains the larger and more dominant feature; its design should be consistent with the style and shape of the existing property. It goes on to explain that roof extensions and dormers are often highly visible and alien features which greatly alter the appearance of a dwelling. It states that dormers should never be allowed to dominate the roof by being overly large.

The size, scale and massing of the proposed extensions would substantially alter the style and shape of the existing detached bungalow significantly changing its appearance and resulting in a notably more horizontal proportion.

The prevailing character of Cissbury Gardens is of detached bungalows. There are some detached, 2-storey houses and chalet houses interspersed along the length of the road, but these are in the minority. The bungalows are not identical in design, but a sense of consistency is derived from their typically well-spaced layout and shared characteristics, including predominantly hipped roofs with garages to the side, contributing to the spacious character of the road. Many of the bungalows have been enlarged by single storey rear extensions and roof extensions typically in the form of side hip to gables, and (mostly) modest front, rear or side dormers. In contrast, the proposed width of the enlarged roof would be some 11.5m, extending to within 1 metre of the site boundary on the south side. The overall scale, bulk and massing of the enlargements, enclosing the existing space between the buildings, would result in a more built-up appearance, that would be at odds with, and harmful to, the distinctive low-key, suburban character of existing development.

Furthermore, the excessive size and unsympathetic flat-roofed form of the rear roof extension would wholly dominate the rear of the bungalow, its ungainly and discordant presence accentuated in the street scene by the elevated siting of the bungalow, with the cedar-clad exterior further drawing the eye.

There is no objection per se to the forward projection of the proposed side extension. It would sit behind the existing front-projecting component. [The Proposed West Elevation drawing 000/06 incorrectly shows the latter still with a hipped roof.] The proposed flat roof of this element would appear somewhat utilitarian and would be considerably improved by the addition of a hipped and pitched roof. However, an amendment has not been sought owing to more fundamental concerns about the overall scale, form and massing of the proposed remodelling works.

Residential Amenity

The most affected properties are those on either side, Nos 22 (south) on slightly higher ground, and No.26 (north) on slightly lower ground, but both elevated in relation to the road.

No.22

No.22 is similar in its original design to No.24 but has been enlarged by a replacement attached garage on its south side with a false-pitched roof extending northward over the main front entrance to form a canopy porch; plus, a single-storey rear extension that extends behind the replacement garage.

There is an original narrow, lean-to component with glazed openings on the north side of the bungalow facing the application site. A window positioned in front (west) of the lean-to on the north side elevation is obscure-glazed and appears to serve a bathroom. A greenhouse is sited in the gap between the side of the bungalow and the site boundary, forward of the bathroom window.

The proposed ground-floor rear component would extend 5.3m beyond the existing main rear wall of No.22 (approximately 3.6m deeper than the existing garage) and the first-floor component by approximately 2.5m (within 1m of the site boundary). The boundary is marked by panel fencing of varying height with a loose weave trellis above the lower fencing. The overall height and bulk of the enlargements would have an enclosing effect on the lean-to and the nearest window in the rear elevation of No.22 and would result in some loss of daylight. However, the windows in question appear to serve a kitchen and utility room, non-habitable rooms. Consequently, it is considered the impact would not be so severe as to warrant refusal.

A new window serving a bedroom is proposed in the south side of the side extension roughly opposite the glazed lean-to at No.22. Although fencing on the common boundary would provide some screening, in the event of approval, obscure-glazing would be necessary to safeguard against the effects of mutual overlooking (albeit less than ideal for a habitable room).

No.26

No.26 is also similar in its original design to No.24, but is sited slightly further forward in its plot, closer to the edge of the highway. It has been enlarged by a single-storey, flat-roofed rear extension approximately 5m deep, which extends to the rear of the attached garage on the south side. Two windows in the south side of the extension facing No.24 are obscure-glazed. There is another window in the side of the garage.

The proposed ground-floor rear component would extend approximately 3m beyond the rear wall of the neighbour's extension with the proposed first-floor rear component roughly in line with it. However, there is a reasonable gap of approximately 2.5m between the main north side wall of No.24 and the site boundary and a further gap of approximately 1m between the boundary and the flank of the neighbour's extension. Given the non-habitable or secondary nature of the window openings in the side of No.26 it is considered the impact of the proposed enlargements on outlook and daylight/sunlight would not be unacceptable notwithstanding the orientation of No.26 to the North and its siting on slightly lower ground.

CIL

The proposals would result in a net increase in gross floor area more than 100sqm and would therefore be eligible for CIL.

Recommendation:

REFUSE for the reason: -

1. By reason of its large size, scale, massing, unsympathetic form and detailed design, the proposed development would be poorly related in visual terms to the host dwelling and would represent an unduly dominant and discordant form of development that would detract from the appearance of the existing dwelling and be harmfully out of keeping with prevailing local character and the street scene contrary to policy DM5 of the Worthing Local Plan, the Council's SPG 'Extending or Altering Your Home' and the NPPF.

Informative

Pro-active Refusal

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

Case Officer: Jo Morin Date: 10.04.2026

Authorised by: Louise Prew Date: 14/04/2026