Expiry Date - 01/10/2026
Extension of Time - 29/10/2026

Development Management – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/0920/26 **Recommendation: – APPROVE**

Site: **97 Heene Road Worthing West Sussex BN11 4PG**

Proposal: **Two storey rear extension. Removal of chimneys. Rooms in roof with rear hip to gable roof extension, South side dormer, side rooflights. Single storey extension to north side with ASHP to front (east), and associated conversion of existing garage building into gym/office space**

Date of Site Visit: 09.09.2026

Neighbours Checked: Y

Additional Neighbours Notified: N

Site and Surroundings

The application relates to an early-mid C20 detached 2-storey house located on the west side of Heene Road within the Heene Conservation Area. The dwelling is constructed in brick under a plain tiled, pitched and hipped roof with 'bonnets', and Mock Tudor decorative timber boarding to the upper part of the front elevation. The dwelling forms one of a mirrored pair with the neighbouring property to the South (No.95). To the North, the application site adjoins a large corner plot occupied by a generously proportioned, late Victorian/Edwardian villa subdivided into several dwelling units (No.99/Elmcroft 1-6).

No.97 has been enlarged by a conservatory at the rear. A narrow driveway on the north side of the dwelling leads to a detached, pitched-roof garage building set back into the rear garden. The frontage is enclosed by a flint and brick-dressed wall with tall hedge/shrub planting behind.

There are no TPO trees on the site. The property is not listed or locally listed.

Proposal

Permission is sought for various extensions and alterations comprising: -

- Removal of the existing conservatory and erection of a 2-storey rear extension (2.95m deep by 3.9m wide) infilling the rear southwest corner of the dwelling;
- Roof extension involving extending the existing main roof ridge 7.1m rearward (west) over the proposed 2-storey rear extension and replacing the roof over the existing 2-storey rear-projecting component to create a rear gable plus pitched roof dormer on the South side elevation; roof lights to North, South and front (East) elevations;
- Single-storey side/rear extension on North side with a glazed link attaching to the existing detached garage building with the latter converted into habitable accommodation;

- ASHP (Hitachi R290 Monobloc) sited at ground-level adjacent to north site boundary forward of dwelling.

Relevant Planning History:

02/00928/FULL - Change of use of part of property from chiropodist practice to residential so that the whole property is used as a single dwelling house. (Retrospective).
STATUS: Approved 18th October 2002.

Consultations

Southern Water: Request a condition seeking details of surface water/foul water disposal to be agreed owing absence of mapping information.

Any new connections to the public sewerage system will require a New Sewer Connection application (also known as a Section 106) to be submitted and approved by Southern Water.

It is possible that a sewer now deemed to be public could be crossing the development site. Therefore, should any sewer be found during construction works, an investigation of the sewer will be required to ascertain its ownership before any further works commence on site.

Officer Comment: Requested planning condition is not considered proportionate in the context of this site which is not identified to be at risk of surface water flooding now or in the future. Informative to be added instead.

The Worthing Society: The drawings are shown with insufficient context, so we have found it difficult to assess properly and gauge the effect on the conservation area. However, we submit that the side dormers to the roof detrimentally impact the profile and massing of the house and respectfully suggest consideration be given to how this element of the design will affect the setting of this part of the conservation area, The Society has no objection to other parts of the proposals.

Adur and Worthing Councils

Tree Officer

Initial Comment
I do not feel it is TPO worthy. If the tree were assessed through criteria like TEMPO, it would not meet the minimum threshold for a Tree Preservation Order. Its small size, limited public visibility, and modest contribution to the wider area does not present sufficient amenity value to justify protection. As such, I would not recommend serving a TPO. That said from an arboricultural perspective, building directly up to the boundary where trees on neighbouring property are located is potentially inappropriate because it:

- Forces unavoidable RPA encroachment;

- Requires crown reduction to the boundary (although this could be carried out by the applicant exercising their common law right to prune overhanging branches);
- Removes the buffer zone recommended by BS 5837;
- Limits the ability to implement protective measures;
- Increases the risk of long-term decline and future conflict.

These concerns do not necessarily prevent development, but they do show that the proposed siting is not arboriculturally optimal and carries predictable impacts that should be acknowledged. If the proposed development is approved a robust AMS would need to be produced to detail how the trees will be safeguarded.

Final Comment
I am satisfied that the report provided considers the trees within influencing distance of the proposed development, the use of screw pile and beam foundations is satisfactory. A standard condition to ensure the development is carried out in accordance with the measures set out in Section 5 of the submitted Arboricultural Report will be acceptable.

Environmental Protection, Environmental Health & Licensing: No objection in principle, recommends a condition relating to hours of construction works.

Neighbour Representations: None received.

Relevant Planning Policies:

Worthing Local Plan policies (WBC 2023): SP1, DM5, DM19, DM24
National Planning Policy Framework (MHCLG 2026)
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, and the effects on the character and appearance of the Heene Conservation Area.

Visual Amenity and Heritage

The Council has a statutory duty to have regard to the desirability of enhancing or preserving the character or appearance of its conservation areas.

The existing dwelling is well-proportioned and attractively detailed with a gabled roof projection jettied over a double-height front bay window, chimneys, mock Tudor decorative boarding, bonnet hip tiles and leaded windows. It makes a neutral contribution to the significance of the Heene Conservation Area, which derives its historic and architectural character largely from the grand Victorian and Edwardian villas which characterise the early evolution of this part of Worthing westwards from town centre.

Flint and brick dressed front boundary walls are an important townscape feature providing a sense of visual coherence despite the varied nature of development in this part of Heene Road, which includes a mix of domestic scale houses, older converted villas and purpose-built, low-rise flat buildings. Trees, hedges and mature landscaping within the front gardens of these properties contribute to the setting of the individual buildings and the attractive character of the area in general.

The depth of the proposed 2-storey rear extension would align with the existing rear-projecting component, infilling the recessed corner in place of the existing conservatory. The enlarged roof would extend over the new 2-storey extension and replace the hipped and pitched roof over the existing rear projecting component in the form of a full rear gable. The proposed 2-storey extension would not in itself be overtly visible from Heene Road owing to the relatively narrow gap separating Nos 95 and 97. The lengthened main roof ridge would be more visibly apparent but would not appear out of keeping with the overall scale and appearance of the existing dwelling.

As initially submitted, pitched-roof dormers were proposed on both the north and south side roof slopes. Following discussions with the Council's Conservation and Design Architect it was considered that the symmetrical placement of the proposed dormers on either side of the roof ridge was at odds with the architectural composition of the house which is not symmetrical. An amendment has been received omitting the proposed north side dormer. The remaining pitched-roof dormer proposed on the south side is modest in size (2.4m wide x 1.9m high x 2.4m deep) albeit rather 'squat' in its proportions but will not dominate the roof slope and is set 0.35m below the ridge. The existing original chimney stack sited forward (east) of it will be retained on the roof slope. The other 2no chimney stacks towards the rear on the south side will be removed to accommodate the roof extension.

The proposed rooflights will be vertically proportioned, flush-fitting roof lights from the Velux Heritage Conservation range (PC08) which are considered acceptable here.

The comments of the Worthing Society are noted, and it is recognised that the proposals will introduce a noticeable difference between the roof forms of Nos.95 and 97. However, there is considerable variety in the scale, form, massing and style of buildings in the immediate vicinity of these properties and their matching appearance is not a defining characteristic of the road, nor the Conservation Area. Consequently, the resulting visual imbalance would not result in unacceptable harm to the character or appearance of the Heene Conservation Area or the street scene.

The proposed single-storey side extension will infill the gap between the north side of the house and the north side boundary which is marked by a flint wall (lower towards the front with dilapidated fencing above, taller towards the rear). It will be set 2m back from the front of the house, and will have a steep, part tiled, part glazed, lean-to roof with a parapet wall (2.75m high) on the north side sitting just inside the flint boundary wall. The extension will be 14.7m long, attaching to the front of the existing garage building. The latter will be retained and insulated internally with glazed door openings inserted on the south side facing into the rear garden. Owing to its single-storey scale, set-back siting, traditional roof from and use of matching materials the extension will integrate well with the appearance of the host dwelling. A condition of planning

permission will require that the flint boundary wall is retained and any damage to it during the construction works made good.

The proposed ASHP, shown to be contained within 'louvred boxing', will be sited at ground level forward (East) of the gated courtyard on the North side and adjacent to the flint boundary wall. Although not overtly prominent it would nevertheless be visible in views from Heene Road from the site entrance/driveway. Some regard in this matter is given to policy HE6(4) of the NPPF which identifies that harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset should be weighed against the public benefits resulting from the proposal, which can include enabling energy efficiency and low carbon heating measures to be employed. In this case it is not considered the siting of the proposed ASHP within its boxing would cause unacceptable harm to visual amenity, or to the character or appearance of the Conservation Area.

There is a mature multi-stemmed bay tree (approximately 5m tall) growing close to the flint boundary wall within the garden of 99 Heene Road. Branches of the tree currently overhang the boundary extending up to the side of the existing house at No.97 and will need to be removed to accommodate the proposed side extension. The Council's Tree Officer is satisfied that this tree is not worthy of a TPO but considered that arboricultural good practice warranted an impact assessment be undertaken to ensure the compatibility of the proposed development with the retention of the tree.

The submitted arboricultural report evaluates the risk of harm to the tree as 'low' on the basis:

- the tree is separated from the development footprint by the historic flint wall providing a physical barrier restricting lateral root extension;
- the elevated ground level of the garden of No.99 where the tree is growing, some 0.4m above the ground level of No.97 Heene Road; and
- the compacted tarmac surfacing of the side passage at No.97 with consolidated subbase and reduced soil aeration discouraging shallow roof activity.

Nevertheless, a low-impact foundation design is proposed for the extension utilising engineered screw piles with an above-ground suspended ground beam where tree roots are likely to be prevalent with the theoretical RPA of the extension footprint. It is proposed that all individual pile positions within the RPA will be pre-cleared by supervised hand-digging, ensuring an isolated roots are safeguarded or accommodated within severance. The south and eastern canopy of the tree will be pruned back laterally to the boundary to provide working clearance for the construction and prevent physical contract with the new structure. Temporary ground protection will safeguard unmade ground within the RPA during construction.

The Tree Officer is satisfied with the proposed safeguarding measures which can be secured by condition.

Residential Amenity

The most affected properties are those on either side in Heene Road, and to the northwest in Lansdowne Road.

To the south, No.95 has been enlarged at ground-floor by a large single-storey extension extending some 6m deep adjacent to the north side boundary with No.97. There is a separation distance of about 1.8m between the main side elevations of the original dwellings. The proposed 2-storey rear extension would have some enclosing effect on the outlook from the first-floor window in the recessed, rear (West) elevation of No.95, and result in some loss of daylight. However, the submitted drawing demonstrates that the 45-degree rule for daylight would be met for this window. [The separation distance between the houses is slightly exaggerated as shown but even so, the proposed 2-storey rear extension would meet the Test.] The existing 2-storey eaves height would be maintained, and the 'bulk' of the enlarged roof mass would slope away northwards from the common site boundary. Consequently, it is considered the effect on outlook from this window would not be unduly dominant or overbearing.

One rooflight is proposed on the South side, 2no on the North side (all serving the main bedroom) and 1no on the front slope serving an en-suite. A condition of planning permission will require any part of the roof lights in the side slopes below 1.7m high from the bedroom floor to be fixed shut.

The proposed rear roof gable includes a feature glazed window extending up into the roof apex, and a Juliet balcony. The main outlook would be rearward over the Applicant's own garden. A dogleg in the shape of the rear garden means that there would be a minimum distance of 12m between the proposed rear gable window and the site boundary with the rear garden of 'Irgmore', a detached Victorian dwelling in Lansdowne Road. The proposed window would overlook the rearmost part of the garden of 'Irgmore' occupied by a cabin/outbuilding but would not directly look the windows of the main dwelling. Consequently, it is considered the effect of overlooking would not be severe.

The parapet wall of the single-storey side extension will extend approximately 0.8m above the height of the existing cobble boundary wall/wall and fencing on the North side. However, there is a separation of distance of at least 6m between the boundary and the nearest part of No.99 containing windows. It is considered the effect would not be unduly oppressive or overbearing for the occupiers of No.99 despite the considerable length of this component.

New full height glazed windows/doors in the south side of the converted garage building, would be sited over 7m from the site boundary with No.95 and would not give rise to an unacceptable degree of overlooking.

A condition of planning permission will require that noise emissions from the ASHP do not exceed 37dB(A) at 1m from any neighbouring habitable room window or door in accordance with the noise threshold requirements for permitted development set out in MSC 020(a).

Controls are not usually exercised over the hours of construction works for householder development such as this. However, given the extent of the development works, the implementation of which is likely to take some months, it is considered controls would be justified in this case.

Recommendation:

APPROVE subject to condition(s):-

1. Drawing Numbers
2. Standard time limit
3. Matching materials
4. No openings to South side rear extension or North side of side extension
5. Existing flint wall on North site boundary to be retained and any damage during construction works to be made good prior to first occupation
6. Unless otherwise approved in writing the rooflights to comprise Velux Heritage Conservation rooflights Model PC08.
7. Development to be carried out in accordance with the foundation design, tree protection and mitigation measures set out in Section 5.14 of the submitted Arboricultural Impact Assessment.
8. Noise emissions from the ASHP shall not exceed 37dB(A) at 1m from any neighbouring habitable room window or door in accordance with the noise threshold set out in MSC 020(a).
9. Hours of construction work

Informative

Pro Active Amendment
SW Advice

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

Case Officer: Jo Morin Date: 27.10.2026

Authorised by: Peter Barnett Date: 27 October 2026