

Development Management – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/0342/26 **Recommendation:** – APPROVE

Site: 19 Hayling Gardens Worthing West Sussex BN13 3AJ

Proposal: Single storey rear extension

Date of Site Visit: 14/04/2026.

Neighbours Checked: Y

Additional Neighbours Notified: Y

Site and Surroundings

The site, 19 Hayling Gardens, is situated within an established residential area in Worthing. The site comprises a detached bungalow with a pitched roof. The immediate locality is characterised by a combination of detached bungalows and two-storey dwellings within a cul-de-sac, with the vast majority of properties benefitting from driveways leading to garages. The application property also follows this pattern.

The application site contains a large private rear garden enclosed by fencing and vegetation. The site is verdant in character and slopes downwards in a southerly direction.

The property is not a listed building and is not located within a conservation area. There is a Tree Preservation Orders (TPO No.23 of 2004) relating to 2 trees on the site, a silver birch and a cypress. Neither appeared to be present at the time of the site visit.

Proposal

Planning permission is sought for a proposed single storey rear extension.

Following amendment, the proposed single-storey rear extension will extend to a maximum depth of 6.4m to the rear of the existing garage and 4.5m to the rear of the main bungalow. It will be 12.53m wide, set in 1m from the western edge of the garage and 1m from the east side wall of the bungalow. It will feature a flat roof with a height of approximately 2.96m.

The extension will be constructed in matching brick, and a flat roof finished with a felt/GRP finish.

No side openings are proposed in the extension, although a new bedroom window will be inserted in the east side wall of the existing bungalow. White uPVC double-glazed windows and doors will be installed on the rear (south) elevation. A rooflight is proposed on the roof of the proposed extension.

The existing garage is to be converted into a bedroom, with the existing garage door on the front (north) elevation being replaced with uPVC windows.

Relevant Planning History:

No relevant planning history.

Consultations

Tree And Landscape Officer

"Thank you for your email, I agree that the Silver Birch tree appears to have been removed within the last year to 18 months, so a replacement should be provided. Also the previously replaced Cypress tree also appears to have been removed therefore I think it is reasonable to request two new trees.

The replacements should be container grown 12 -14cm girth in a minimum 50ltr container or equivalent. The size, species and position of the replacement tree planting to be prior agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority, carried out within two years from the date of the given consent and in accordance with details of the consent. One of the trees should be another Silver Birch as it is a TPO replacement, the other is the owner's choice, but will need prior approval.

Another condition should be:

If within five years following replanting, any of the replacement trees die or become seriously diseased, another tree of the same size and species shall be planted in a similar position during the next planting season following the removal of the replacement tree, unless the Local Planning Authority gives written approval to any variation.

Reason: In the interest of visual amenity.

Many thanks"

Neighbour Representations

Neighbour Comments- 18 Hayling Gardens

"I object to this application on the following bases:

The windows on the proposed east elevation would be intrusive creating a loss of privacy due to the extremely close proximity to my property. I also believe that as I exit my front door, I would see straight into the proposed bedroom, hardly desirable from either my, or my neighbour's, point of view.

The extension will create a tunnel effect on the entrance to my property, creating a gloomy and depressive feel with a significant loss of light causing a loss of amenity.

The extension would appear to be over development and overbearing on the boundary resulting in intrusive loss of privacy and amenity to my property. It is difficult to understand how the extension can be built without removal of some boundary shrubbery as attested in the application. I would request that the Planning Officer also visits my property when undertaking the site visit to understand the impact of the development on my property.”

Planning Officer Response: The above comments relate to the originally submitted scheme. Following discussions with the applicant, amendments were made to the proposal to address the concerns raised. Following receipt of the amended plans, the occupier of No. 18 confirmed that they no longer object to the development. As such, the concerns raised are considered to have been satisfactorily addressed through the revised design.

Relevant Planning Policies:

Worthing Local Plan policies (WBC 2023): SP1, DM5, DM19
National 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 bungalow is sited further forward in its plot than the immediately neighbouring properties to the east. Following amendments to the original design, the proposed extension would be subordinate in scale and appearance to the existing dwelling. It would be constructed in brickwork to match the existing property and would have a flat roof with a maximum height of no more than 3m. The set-back of the side walls of the extension from the main frontage building will help to minimise its visual impact from the street viewed through the gaps between the existing buildings. As a result, the extension would not appear overlarge in relation to the existing bungalow or incongruous within the site.

The proposed flat roof design is considered acceptable given the extension's position to the rear of the dwelling and its role in limiting the overall height and massing of the development.

Residential Amenity

The neighbouring properties most affected by the proposed development are those immediately adjacent at 18 Hayling Gardens (to the east) and 20 Hayling Gardens (to the west).

18 Hayling Gardens

18 Hayling Gardens lies immediately to the east of the application site and comprises a chalet style bungalow with accommodation in its roofspace. The properties are separated by boundary fencing and vegetation. The principal entrance to no.18 is located on its west side elevation, which also contains a first-floor window overlooking part of the rear garden of the application site.

The proposed extension would contain no side-facing windows or doors and would be set approximately 1m in from the eastern side elevation of the host dwelling. Following amendments to the original scheme, this increased separation distance reduces the relationship between the extension and the neighbouring property. Given the absence of side-facing openings and the retained separation distance, the proposal would not result in overlooking or an unacceptable loss of privacy for the occupants of no.18.

Despite the proposed extension not having any windows on its side, the existing bungalow is to have two new windows installed on its east elevation, one for the bedroom and one for the ensuite. To ensure the privacy of the bedroom window the boundary fence on the east side is to be extended northward as far as the front elevation of the property. The ensuite window is to be obscure-glazed.

The extension would have a flat roof with a maximum height of less than 3m above the highest adjacent ground level. Furthermore, the land levels fall away towards the south, reducing the visual prominence of the development. Given its modest height and single-storey form, the extension would not appear unduly dominant or overbearing and would not result in an unacceptable loss of light to openings serving no.18. The amended design, including the 1m setback from the shared boundary, also reduces any perception of a tunnelling effect at the entrance to the neighbouring property.

As a result of the above, there would be no overlooking or loss of privacy to neighbours, and there would be no unacceptable loss of light.

20 Hayling Gardens

20 Hayling Gardens lies immediately to the west of the application site and comprises a detached bungalow. The dwelling is positioned slightly forward of the application property and benefits from an existing conservatory to the rear.

The relationship between the two properties is moderated by the presence of an existing garage at no.20, together with boundary fencing and established trees which provide a degree of screening between the sites.

The proposed extension would be single-storey in scale and would contain no side-facing windows or doors on its western elevation. In addition, the extension would be set approximately 1m in from the western side elevation of the host dwelling, thereby increasing the separation from the shared boundary. The conservatory serving no.20 would remain at a sufficient distance from the proposed development and would not be adversely affected by the extension.

Given the separation between the properties, the absence of side-facing openings, and the modest height of the extension, the proposal would not result in overlooking, loss of privacy, or an unacceptable loss of light upon the occupiers of No. 20 Hayling Gardens.

Trees

Policy DM19 states that, in all new development, there should be no net loss of trees and that, where practical and appropriate, trees removed should be replaced at a ratio greater than 1:1 to maintain canopy cover and contribute to biodiversity net gain. In this case, a protected Silver Birch tree and a previously required replacement Cypress tree appear to have been removed. Accordingly, conditions are attached requiring the planting of two replacement trees (with a replacement provision should either tree fail within five years of planting) in order to ensure compliance with Policy DM19 and safeguard the visual amenity of the area.

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. Planting of two replacement trees
6. Replacement of new trees if needed

Informative

The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by identifying matters of concern within the application (as originally submitted) and negotiating, with the Applicant, acceptable amendments to the proposal to address those concerns. As a result, the Local Planning Authority has been able to grant planning permission for an acceptable proposal, 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 – as amended

Case Officer: Tom Westerman Date: 30/06/2026

Authorised by: Jo Morin Date: 30.06.2026