

Development Management – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/0432/26

Recommendation – APPROVE

Site: 7 Lansdowne Close Worthing West Sussex BN11 5HF

Proposal: First floor rear extension

Date of site visit: 06.05.2026

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Site and Surroundings

This householder application relates to an attractive detached early-mid C20 house at the far southwestern end of a cul-de-sac on the south side of Lansdowne Close. The house is rendered/painted brickwork with some clay tile hanging on the upper part of the front elevation, with a clay tiled hipped roof.

The surrounding area is residential in character. It is not within a conservation area and the property is not listed or locally listed. There are no TPO trees on the site.

There is a difference in ground levels from north to south with the rear garden at a lower level than the main house and its frontage.

Proposal

Planning permission was granted in 2023 (see below) for a part single, part 2-storey rear extension and a replacement detached garage in the front garden. That permission has been commenced and is under construction. At the time of the officer site visit the outer walls of the ground-floor component of the extension were in place, but no roof nor any part of the approved first-floor.

Permission is sought for a deeper first-floor extension than approved under AWDM/1554/23 to extend to the same depth as the recessed rear wall of the ground-floor component (i.e. retaining the narrow covered area/veranda detail as previously approved). It would be 2.3m deeper than the previously approved 2-storey component. Extending the full width of the existing house (approximately 9.35m), it would be 4.1m deep overall, with a tiled 'skirt' or crown roof. The latter would be 6.4m high (measured from adjacent rear garden). No windows are proposed in the side walls. The additional floor area would provide larger first-floor bedrooms with en-suite facilities. As before, the first-floor extension would be rendered with a feature panel on the south (rear) elevation consisting of vertical-cladding.

Relevant Planning History:

AWDM/1554/23 Existing garage to be removed and replaced with a double garage. Part single/part two storey rear extension. Alterations to existing fenestration. New boundary wall to East elevation: Permitted and part implemented (under construction).

Consultations: None

Representations:

An objection has been received from No.8 Lansdowne Close (adjoining to the East) as follows:

"We've looked at the documents on line and there's no detailed description of the proposals. If we've understood the plans correctly the application is solely to amend some of the plans submitted with Planning Application ADWM/1554/23 so that the mostly single storey rear extension permitted under those plans becomes a two storey extension."

When ADWM/1554/23 was submitted we said we were happy with the proposals for the front garden of number 7. In relation to the proposals at the back of the house, this is what we said then: "We do have one side window on our west elevation from which the new extension will be visible. It will have more impact than the current lower and smaller extension. However, we have noted that there will not be any windows added in the east elevation of our neighbour's house and the new extension is to be constructed without any windows on the east side. Also the extension will either not be visible from the windows in the back (south side) of our house or only very slightly visible. Therefore we are not making any objection to the proposed extension."

As far as we can work out the angles, the higher two storey rear extension in this new application will be more visible from our bedroom windows. However, the main reason for our objection is the loss of light to the window on the west side of our house. The new plans (Drawing P009 Revision P1 in particular) show a 45 degree angle from the centre of one of our bedroom windows, but there is no indication of our west side window on the plans, nor any angle shown in relation to that window. We have worked out the location of that window on P009 and a 45 degree angle drawn from the centre of that window will certainly hit the two storey extension. We think the higher extension will significantly reduce natural daylight to our stairs and front hall, whereas we didn't feel that would be the case with largely single storey extension in the original plans."

We would be happy for the Planning Officer dealing with the case to come to our house to check the angles and do a daylight / sunlight assessment."

Relevant Planning Policies

Worthing Local Plan policies (WBC 2023): SP1, DM5

National Planning Policy Framework (HCLG 2023)
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 first-floor rear extension is relatively large in size. Its 'tiled skirt' or crown roof is not in-keeping with the dual-pitched roof form of the host dwelling. The proposed extension assimilates less successfully with the scale and appearance of the host dwelling compared to the previously approved scheme AWDM/1554/23, which achieved a more subsidiary visual relationship owing to the smaller size of the first floor element.

That said, as the public highway does not extend directly in front of the application property (which has a deeper front garden as a result), only very limited public views of rear extension will be possible, at a tight angle through the gap between Nos 7 and 8. The eaves of the extension will line-through with the eaves of the host dwelling and some tiled pitched roof slope will be visible. The extension will not be overtly dominant in the street scene and will not result in unacceptable harm to the visual amenity of the area.

Residential Amenity

No.8 to the East consists of a detached house, similar in character but different in detailed design to No.7. The original dwelling extends deeper (southward) in its plot than No.7 and has been enlarged by single-storey side and rear extensions. Whereas the previously approved first-floor extension did not extend beyond the first-floor rear elevation of No.8, the latest proposal will extend approximately 2m south of it. There will be a separation gap of approximately 3.5m between the flank wall of the proposed first-floor extension and the 2-storey side wall of the original house at No.8. The deeper first floor component will be clearly visible from the south facing first-floor windows of No.8 but will not be unduly dominant or overbearing, or result in a significant loss of daylight/sunlight.

The flank window at No.8 referred to in the neighbour representation is closer to the front of the house and serves the stairs and landing in addition to a smaller adjacent window on the front (north) elevation. The deeper first-floor extension will have some additional enclosing effect on outlook from the window and some limited additional effect on the receipt of daylight/sunlight. However, as the window does not serve habitable accommodation it is considered the effect would not be significantly harmful.

The nearest properties in Southview Drive (Nos 26 and 28) adjoining the west side of the application property have rear gardens approximately 12 metres in depth and the proposed first-floor extension will be some further 2 metres off the shared boundary. It is considered sufficient separation distance will remain between the west side of the extension and the rear of these houses to avoid any adverse effect on their amenity.

A condition preventing the installation of side windows in the extension is recommended.

Recommendation

APPROVE subject to Conditions:-

1. Drawing Numbers
2. Standard time limit
3. Materials as shown on approved elevation.
4. No openings to side elevations of extension

Informative

Pro Active No Amendment

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

Case Officer: Jo Morin Date: 05.06.2026

Authorised by: Peter Barnett Date: 8 June 2026