Expiry Date - 18/06/2025

Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/0518/25 **Recommendation – APPROVE**

Site: **175 Singleton Crescent Worthing West Sussex BN12 5DJ**

Proposal: **Single storey rear extension**

Date of site visit: 16.06.2025

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Site and Surroundings

The application property comprises a semi-detached bungalow fronting the south side of Singleton Crescent within an outer residential suburb of the town. There is a drive to the west side with a detached garage set back into the garden and a car port in front.

Attached to the east side, No.173 has been enlarged by a single-storey rear extension (AWDM/1168/21).

Adjoining to the west, No.177 occupies a corner plot at the entrance to the estate. It comprises a detached bungalow oriented at 90 degrees to the application property. It faces west with a wrap-around garden to the front and north/south sides but with only a shallow strip of garden to the rear (east).

The property is not listed, locally listed or within a conservation area. There are no TPO trees on the site.

The site is within EA Flood Zone 1. Parts of the site curtilage lie within an area identified in the Council's SFRA (2024) to be at medium risk of surface water flooding (1 in 1000 year), but not that part where the proposed extension would be located.

Proposal

Permission is sought for a single-storey rear extension. It would extend virtually the full width of the bungalow some 6.6m wide, having a maximum depth of 3.95m. Constructed in brick, it would have a flat roof 2.8m high with 2no centrally positioned roof lanterns

Relevant Planning History: None

Consultations: None

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 proposed single-storey extension would be subsidiary in scale to the host dwelling. The use of matching materials for the elevations would complement its appearance.

The proposed extension is located at the rear of the bungalow, set in from the side wall and would not be visible in public views.

Residential Amenity

The proposed extension is separated from No.177 by the existing garage building (to be retained) and the width of the driveway in front. A small window in the west side wall of the extension would face toward the enclosed side wall of the car port sited on the common boundary and would not give rise to overlooking.

The proposed rear extension has been designed to match the depth of that existing at No.173. The latter is constructed in brick with a flat roof with a roof lantern. High level windows on the west side facing the application property are fixed shut and obscure-glazed. The scale and siting of the proposed extension would have some impact on the receipt of light to the latter. However, as the main source of light to the neighbour's extension is from window openings to the rear (south) elevation overlooking its own garden the impact would not be severe.

Flood Risk

Neither the existing bungalow nor the proposed extension are identified to be within an area at future risk of flooding. Floor levels within the extension would be at the same level as for the existing bungalow. The requirement for a FRA is not considered proportionate to the low risk of flooding in this case.

Recommendation

Expiry Date - 18/06/2025

APPROVE subject to Conditions:-

1. Drawing Numbers
2. Standard time limit
3. Matching materials

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:	Jo Morin	Date: 16.06.2025
Authorised by:	Louise Prew	Date: 16/06/2025