

Development Management – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/0049/26

Recommendation: – Refuse

Site: 57 Hollingbury Gardens Worthing West Sussex BN14 0EB

Proposal: Ground floor front infill extension; raising of roof ridge with gable ends and rooflights to create first floor accommodation within roof space

Date of Site Visit: 10.03.2026

Neighbours Checked: Y

Additional Neighbours Notified: N

Site and Surroundings

The site relates to a bungalow on the west side of Hollingbury Gardens. There is a small porch added to its north side and there is a garage attached to its south side where it connects to the garage at the neighbouring bungalow to the south at No. 55. This is a sloping site, sloping downwards from east to west.

Proposal

Permission is sought for the construction of an extension to the ground floor which would square off the north-east corner of the building and with the entrance door relocated to the front elevation. The roof of the bungalow would be raised and extended over the new ground floor footprint and with first floor accommodation created which would provide two ensuite bedrooms and a study. The roof would have a central ridge with gables to the front and rear and includes an extended roof with gable to the single storey rear projection. Matching materials are proposed.

Relevant Planning History:

None relevant

Consultations

None relevant

Representations

Two representations have been received from the occupiers of neighbouring dwellings.

No. 54 Hollingbury Gardens:

I am disappointed by the proposed alterations to No 57. It feels no regard has been given to neighbouring properties as not one of the properties in the vicinity fronts to the roadside like this proposal. It feels very much an unsympathetic remodel. The infill to create a 'family room' seems an unnecessary addition but just to create the roof

space to obtain better profit. When No54 infilled to the front no 'extra' roof was required as the infilled area was already under the existing roof.

The raising of the ridge appears to be minor in relation to the highest current point of the ridge, bearing in mind that ridge is currently small in size, but in actuality will be major to the lower level ridges that will all be increased to the new height. It seems an excessive route to obtain maximum roof space to obtain maximum profit. The side elevations will appear on the street scene as a major roof in comparison to the neighbouring properties. Will this swamp the two neighbouring properties?

The new upstairs front window being so close to the road also means our side of house will lose privacy (we are the only property with no garage). Our side door and side garden from the utility is constantly in use. This new upper window will also see into my bedroom (I sleep on the ground floor) and the living room of Number 52. This would have less of an effect if it was in a dormer further back in the slope of a roof and a dormer wouldn't be objectionable as it would feel further away and nestle nicely with the surrounding properties.

Not one of the chalets nearby has a frontage like the proposed, but all have sloping away main roofs from the main road with a dormer and cut back hips/half hips. To alter this property to the proposed development just doesn't feel like it would 'fit in' with the direct neighbouring properties, one of which is linked via the garage, or indeed the bungalows nearby.

I hate objecting, I truly do, especially when my own property was remodelled but the bulk of our remodelling was to the rear which is not impactful to the road scene. I think No 57 could be altered more sympathetically and not affect the street scene as much as it will.

56 Cissbury Gardens:

Albeit in principle i have no objection to the development itself i want to raise the concern as to the cutting back of trees and Hedging to this property which will take away our privacy as well as the environmental impact to birds and wildlife.

The same developer did exactly that at the adjoining proerty at number 59 Hollingbury Gardens back in 2023 (AWDm/0758/23) thus taking away the privacy to the rear of our property then

Should the trees ? hedging be cut back here then this will take away the privacy completely given the ridge height being raised and a rear window being installed in the loft conversion

My concern here is that preliminary works to this area are already underway thus my concern at this point before you pass planning

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

Policy DM5 requires all new development including extensions to (amongst other things) be of high architectural design quality and respect and enhance the character of the site and the prevailing character of the area in terms of proportion, form, design, context, massing, siting layout, density, height, size, scale, materials, detailed design and landscaping; enhance the local environment by way of its appearance and character with particular attention being paid to the architectural form, height, materials, density, scale and impact on street scene of the development; make a positive contribution to the sense of place, local character and distinctiveness of an area; and not have an unacceptable impact on the occupiers of adjacent properties including unacceptable loss of privacy, daylight/sunlight, and outlook.

The Council's SPG 'Extending or Altering Your Home' sets out the guiding principles in designing an extension as ensuring a design that achieves an appropriate relationship to the design of the existing house that also takes into account the impact on the street scene; and the effect of the proposals on the amenities of neighbouring residential properties. It states that the size and shape of any extension should normally be designed to ensure the original house remains the larger and more dominant feature. Also, that roof extensions and dormers are often highly visible and alien features which greatly alter the appearance of a dwelling. It also states that "In order to ensure that your extension relates well to your house, its design should be consistent with your existing property's style and shape. If your extension will be visible from the street, it is important to ensure that the roof form of the extension is similar to that of the existing house".

There is a general uniformity to the character of the streetscene in the vicinity of the site with single storey bungalows. Whilst there is some variation with chalet style bungalows on the opposite side of the street, neighbouring dwelling on this side of Hollingbury Gardens are relevantly modest in their form and height. Some have projecting front elements as per the application site with a hipped roof. There are examples of gable ends to the side elevation such as at No.59 and 61 to the north, which also have front projecting elements with a front gable. No.59 has extended to its frontage with an infill extension to its south east corner and forms a second gabled front projection at a lower level (AWDM/0758/23 refers). There are other examples of front extensions with false pitched roofs at No.51, 53, 55 and 63, although these do not extend to the full depth of the main front projecting element.

The proposal seeks to remodel the house by extending at the ground floor to the frontage which would have the effect of squaring off the footprint at this corner of the building. This would not be set back from the main front elevation as is common in most other front extensions as above. The proposed development seeks to extend up to the full width removing this element of subservience.

The proposal also seeks to increase the roof height raising the roof ridge and providing additional bedrooms at first floor level. The proposal would subsume the existing building. The appearance would be of a larger almost two storey building with gable window in contrast to the more modest chalet style bungalow form of other extended properties in the street. No. 55 and 57 are positioned forward in their plots in relation to neighbouring dwellings which would exacerbate the dominant effect of the two storey front gable proposed at No.57, and the full extent of the extended roof would be apparent and appear as an unsympathetic form of development.

Residential Amenity

The ground floor extension to the front of the property is not considered on its own to result in any significant impact on the neighbouring property to the north. There are other examples in the streetscene where single storey extensions fill in the gap similarly and in this instance there would be a reasonable separation distance to the neighbours side facing bedroom window at No.59 and there are no other main side windows in this alignment. However, given the scale of the extension proposed to provide a two-storey element, the size and proximity could nevertheless have an overbearing and unneighbourly relationship to No.59 causing an increased sense of enclosure and loss of light.

The proposed roof would also extend over the existing rear projection, but at a lower level to the main ridge proposed and would not project further than the existing roof form at the rear. At No.59 there is a side window to the rear living room that faces this element, but this is positioned some distance from the boundary. Given the relationship with No.59 there would be no significant impact as a result of this element of the proposal.

To the south side, each bungalow has an intervening garage at the common boundary. No.55 has a side bedroom window facing the application site but is positioned approximately 5 metres from its main side wall. Given the relationship with No.55, the site orientation, and that the extended roof ridge would slope away from this property, there would be no significant impact in terms of light or enclosure.

The comments raised in the representations in relation to the impact to dwellings on the opposite side of Hollingbury Gardens are noted. However, it is considered that a reasonable separation would exist to avoid any significant impact to neighbouring occupiers on this side of the street. In relation to the comments concerning trees and hedges at the rear, it is noted that there are no protected trees on site and the application form has not indicated that any trees or hedges would need to be removed. Nevertheless there is a separation distance of more than 50 metres to dwellings at the rear of the site which would be sufficient to avoid any significant loss of privacy from the proposed first floor window.

Recommendation:

REFUSE for the reason:-

The proposed development would, by reason of its height, scale, siting and design, be inconsistent with the form and shape of the existing dwelling which would adversely affect the character of the existing dwelling and visual amenity of the surrounding streetscene and would result in a loss of amenity to neighbouring occupiers to north. As such the proposal is considered contrary to policy DM5 of the Worthing Local Plan, the Council's SPG 'Extending or Altering Your Home' and the relevant paragraphs of the NPPF.

Informative

The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by identifying matters of concern with the proposal and determining the application within a timely manner, clearly setting out the reason(s) for refusal, allowing the Applicant the opportunity to consider the harm caused and whether or not it can be remedied by a revision to the proposal. The Local Planning Authority has a pre-application advice service in respect of any future application for a revised development.

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

Case Officer: Rebekah Hincke

Date: 11.03.2026

Authorised by: Louise Prew

Date: 12/03/2026