Expiry Date - 11/08/2026
Extension of Time – 06/10/2026

# Development Management – Delegated Officer Report

**Application Number: AWDM/0735/26 Recommendation: – APPROVE**

**Site: 106 Meadow Road Worthing West Sussex BN11 2SE**

**Proposal: Single storey rear extension**

**Date of Site Visit:** 07/08/2026

**Neighbours Checked:** Y

**Additional Neighbours Notified:** N

**Site and Surroundings**
The application site is a bungalow located on the western side of Meadow Road. 106 is a semi-detached property with access to its garden to the northern side. To the rear of the site there are currently two conservatories which run off the rear of the house whilst stepping in from the northern boundary.

The site is not within a conservation area nor is the property listed. There are no TPO's on the site.

**Proposal**
The application relates to the introduction of a single storey rear extension measuring 4.2m in depth and set in from the side elevations of the host property with a total width of 6.42m. The extension is to have a flat roof at 2.9m in height. On the southern elevation there is proposed to be one window which will be obscure glazed. The rear elevation has two doors and two windows.

An existing window will be removed on the rear elevation and replaced with a door to provide access to the rear garden.

**Relevant Planning History:**
AWDM/0297/26 - Householder application for permitted development for prior approval for single storey extension to rear of property measuring 5m from rear wall of the original dwelling, maximum height 2.75m and height of eaves of the extension 2.75m
**STATUS:** Application Refused 17th April 2026.

**Consultations**
**Southern Water**
Following the weekly list sent on 23rd June 2026, Southern Water has determined that the flow rate for the above site will remain consistent, so capacity is not an issue and no Southern Water assets will be affected. Therefore, Southern Water has no objections to this proposal.

Please note, surface water should not be disposed of into a public foul sewer and must comply with the Hierarchy of H3 of the Building Regulations. For more details, refer to the Drainage and Waste Disposal: Approved Document H on the GOV.UK website.

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.

Due to legislative changes effective from 1st October 2011 regarding the ownership of sewers, 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 works commence on site. If this happens, please call our Customer Service Desk on 0330 303 0119.

**Neighbour Representations**

| | |
|---|---|
| No. of Contributors | 2 |
| No. of Representations | 0 |
| No. In Support | 0 |
| No. of Objections | 2 |

**Mrs Sharon Gorringe 108 Meadow Road Worthing West Sussex BN11 2SE**

*This can not be allowed to happen. Could you send an officer of the council to the property to inspect the ridiculous proposal for this small bungalow. This is a case of serious overdevelopment and states in your terms this should not go ahead. These properties are not made for such huge projects and will ruin the aesthetic of the street not to mention the neighbouring gardens. We have some issues already with ground water and drainage and this will make it so much worse, wildlife will be excluded and nothing will grow in my garden. My grandchildren love the garden but how can they play with this hideous unnecessary attachment to the bungalow with engulfs the neighbours right to enjoy their gardens and grow what they wish for a sustainable lifestyle and freedom for wildlife. This is an absolute objection to this overdevelopment plan which is wildly in appropriate.*

**Miss Laura Holmes 104 Meadow Road Worthing West Sussex BN11 2SE**

*This is an object to the proposed plans of electing an enormous monstrosity in Sicily a small space. Firstly, the addition of extra concrete will greatly impact on the already struggling groundwater and drainage issues. Secondly, in addition to the this it also takes away from the rear possible grassland that is greatly needed to absorb the ground water.*

*Thirdly this concrete abomination is terrible for the local wildlife as they visit only my garden and 108 gardens as surrounding neighbours have also opted for concrete creating many drainage issues and a loss of the wildlife.*

*Fourthly this huge unnecessary addition will drown my garden and 108 gardens in darkness no longer allowing natural growth of grass and various plant, vegetation, vegetable and spice beds.*

*I am flabbergasted that this proposal has made it to neighbourhood consultation. To have an almost 10ft high and 4.5-meter width of brick to look at in this otherwise small borough is unthinkable. This is an absolute example of overdevelopment. Please check your own local guidelines and policies, perhaps send an agent to the property to view how little of the garden would remain should this go ahead and the effect it will have on the neighbouring properties. Not a single home in this postcode or indeed around the close has an extension larger than 3 meters and it may only be 2 of them*

*not do they have loft conversions. These small bungalows with small gardens are not designed for this type of mammoth unnecessary extension. This can be done anywhere with any property that has a similar street renovation style but not here. Please send someone to see the local area to h understand what an awful impact this will have.*

**Relevant Planning Policies:**
Worthing Local Plan policies (WBC 2023): SP1, DM5
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.

***Visual Amenity***
Due to the location of the proposed development, it will be largely screened from the public realm. The potential for the views from within the public realm is mitigated from the stepping in from the northern side elevation of the house. While the eaves are higher than that of the existing house, the extension is screened from the wider public realm.

While it is recognised that these houses have short gardens, a sufficient amount of amenity space and greenery is retained on site.

As such it is not considered to impact the visual amenity of the site and in accordance with Policy DM5 of the Worthing Local Plan.

***Residential Amenity***
The properties most affected by the proposal would be Nos. 104 to the north and 108 to the south. The rear property has a south-facing garden and is separated from the proposed extension by approximately 6m of garden, which is considered sufficient to mitigate any significant overshadowing or overbearing impact.

No. 104 is a semi-detached property, part of the adjacent pair, located to the north of the site. This property is separated from the applicant site by the dwellings' side access and has its own rear extension of approximately 2m. The householder prior approval was refused due to impacts on this neighbour. The Council's SPG provides the following guidance on extensions:

*As most dwellings have the main windows to principal rooms facing towards the front and back of the property, extensions close to a neighbour's boundary can significantly reduce the amount of daylight and sunlight reaching the principal rooms of adjoining houses. Whilst each application is considered on its own merits, this problem can often be overcome in the case of single store extensions by ensuring that they do not project more than 3m (10 ft) from the rear wall of the original dwelling house. However, there are some important exceptions to this rule, where this depth may need to be reduced, of can be increased.*

To overcome previous reasons for refusal the extension has been reduced in depth by 80cm and set in from the shared boundary by an additional 30cm. While the depth is greater than 3 metres the set in from the boundary and neighbours own extension mitigate the proposed impact and ensure that the habitable room windows of the neighbouring property and their garden wouldn't be adversely overshadowed or enclosed

The neighbouring property to the south, the other of this semi-detached pair, whilst being attached to the application site, is not considered adversely affected. The previous application was not refused due to impacts on this neighbour. The extension here is set off the shared boundary by 170cm reducing any sense of enclosure. With the extension to the north of the neighbour there will not be any overshadowing due to the sun's path.

Overall, the proposal would not result in an unacceptable impact on neighbouring outlook, daylight, sunlight or residential amenity. Its scale and design are considered acceptable in the context of the site and surrounding area, and the impacts identified do not warrant refusal. Therefore, it is considered that on balance the proposal would be in accordance with Policy DM5 of the Worthing Local Plan.

***Other Matters***
The concerns raised regarding drainage are noted. However, it is recognised that more than half of the garden remains and due to the scale of the extension this is considered acceptable.

**Recommendation:**

**APPROVE** subject to condition(s):-

1. Drawing Numbers
2. Standard time limit
3. Matching materials
4. No openings to side elevations of extension
5. Side window to remain obscure glazed

**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? Y**

Case Officer: Finlay Gardner Date: 29/09/2026

Authorised by: Louise Prew Date: 06/10/2026