Expiry Date - 31/08/2026
Extension of Time – 29/09/2026

Development Management – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/0809/26 Recommendation: – REFUSE

Site: 57 Hollingbury Gardens Worthing West Sussex BN14 0EB

Proposal: Ground floor front infill extension; raising of roof ridge with gable ends and rooflights to create first floor accommodation within roof space

Date of Site Visit: Photos viewed from previous case officer

Neighbours Checked: Y

Additional Neighbours Notified: N

Site and Surroundings

The site relates to a bungalow on the west side of Hollingbury Gardens. A porch on its north side has been recently removed. There is a garage attached to its south side where it connects to the garage at the neighbouring bungalow to the south at No. 55. This a sloping site, sloping downwards from east to west.

Proposal

The application has been submitted as a resubmission of AWDM/0049/26 which was refused in March 2026.

The current application seeks permission for the construction of an extension to the ground floor which would square off the north-east front corner. The roof of the bungalow would be raised and extended over the new ground floor footprint and with first floor accommodation created which would provide two ensuite bedrooms and a study. The roof would have a central flat top with gables to the front and rear. Matching materials are proposed

Relevant Planning History:

AWDM/0049/26 - Ground floor front infill extension; raising of roof ridge with gable ends and rooflights to create first floor accommodation within roof space
STATUS: Application Refused 12th March 2026.

AWDM/0442/26 - Single storey front extension and removal of bay window.
STATUS: Application Permitted 12th August 2026.

Consultations

None undertaken

Neighbour Representations (summary)

59 Hollingbury Gardens

Loss of light
Loss of privacy
An elevated platform/decking across the width of the property has also been constructed and this will lead to a loss of privacy to the south facing elevation of our property at the rear living room.
Loss of a view
Loss of trees
The application should be refused as previously

54 Hollingbury Gardens

The original refusal on the grounds of height, scale, siting and design surely would still be applicable to this resubmission.

The only change is not extending the roof above the current height, this resubmission still increases and adds accommodation to the height as a whole roof

Original objection stands for this resubmission too, it does not keep any originality, completely transforming to a property that will not blend with nearby properties. The roof alterations will swamp the neighbour to the north, with loss of light and overbearing impact.

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
Policy DP3 indicates that Development proposals should respond to their context (the history, character and features of their site and its setting) and that development proposal should be refused if, without clear justification, they conflict with any explicit design standards set out in the development plan

Policy DM5 requires all new development including extensions to (amongst other things) be of high architectural design quality and respect and enhance the character of the site and the prevailing character of the area in terms of proportion, form, design, context, massing, siting layout, density, height, size, scale, materials, detailed design and landscaping; enhance the local environment by way of its appearance and character with particular attention being paid to the architectural form, height, materials, density, scale and impact on street scene of the development; make a positive contribution to the sense of place, local character and distinctiveness of an area; and not have an unacceptable impact on the occupiers of adjacent properties including unacceptable loss of privacy, daylight/sunlight, and outlook.

The Council's SPG 'Extending or Altering Your Home' sets out the guiding principles in designing an extension as ensuring a design that achieves an appropriate relationship to the design of the existing house that also takes into account the impact on the street scene; and the effect of the proposals on the amenities of neighbouring residential properties. It states that the size and shape of any extension should normally be designed to ensure the original house remains the larger and more dominant feature. Also, that roof extensions and dormers are often highly visible and alien features which greatly alter the appearance of a dwelling. It also states that "In order to ensure that your extension relates well to your house, its design should be consistent with your existing property's style and shape. If your extension will be visible from the street, it is important to ensure that the roof form of the extension is similar to that of the existing house".

There is a general uniformity to the character of the streetscene in the vicinity of the site with single storey bungalows. Whilst there is some variation with chalet style bungalows on the opposite side of the street, neighbouring dwellings on this side of Hollingbury Gardens are relevantly modest in their form and height. Some have projecting front elements as per the application site with a hipped roof. There are examples of gable ends to the side elevation such as at No.59 and 61 to the north, which also have front projecting elements with a front gable. No.59 has extended to its frontage with an infill extension to its south east corner and forms a second gabled front projection at a lower level (AWDM/0758/23 refers). There are other examples of front extensions with false pitched roofs at No.51, 53, 55 and 63, although these do not extend to the full depth of the main front projecting element.

The current proposal still seeks to remodel the house by extending at the ground floor to the frontage which would have the effect of squaring off the footprint at this corner of the building. This would not be set back from the main front elevation as is common in most other front extensions as above. The proposed development seeks to extend up to the full width removing this element of subservience and set back losing the characterful front projection with hipped roof, this ground floor element has recently been granted planning permission under AWDM/0442/26.

The proposal also still seeks to increase the roof across the front and rear of the hip ends of the bungalow and create a flat top and providing additional bedrooms at first floor level.

Even through the height of the roof would not increase the proposal would continue to subsume the existing gable feature building and remove the hipped roof which is

characteristic of the area. The appearance would be of a larger almost two storey building with gable ends in contrast to the more modest chalet style bungalow form of other extended properties in the street. The design of the roof with the flat top furthermore creates a bulky squat form with a front window in the gable clashing against the flat top roof.

No. 55 and 57 are positioned forward in their plots in relation to neighbouring dwellings which would exacerbate the dominant effect of the two storey front gable proposed at No.57, and the full extent of the extended roof would be apparent and appear as an unsympathetic form of development.

Residential Amenity

The ground floor extension to the front of the property is not considered on its own to result in any significant impact on the neighbouring property to the north. There are other examples in the street scene where single storey extensions fill in the gap similarly and in this instance there would be a reasonable separation distance to the neighbours side facing bedroom window at No.59 and there are no other main side windows in this alignment. However, given the scale of the extension proposed to provide a two-storey element, the size and proximity could nevertheless have an overbearing and unneighbourly relationship to No.59 causing an increased sense of enclosure and loss of light.

To the south side, each bungalow has an intervening garage at the common boundary. No.55 has a side bedroom window facing the application site but is positioned approximately 5 metres from its main side wall. Given the relationship with No.55, the site orientation, and that the extended roof ridge would slope away from this property, there would be no significant impact in terms of light or enclosure.

In relation to the comments concerning the loss of trees is regrettable however it is noted that there are no protected trees on the site.

Recommendation:

REFUSE for the reason:-

The proposed development would, by reason of its height, scale, siting and design, be inconsistent with the form and shape of the existing dwelling which would adversely affect the character of the existing dwelling and visual amenity of the surrounding streetscene and would result in a loss of amenity to neighbouring occupiers to north. As such the proposal is considered contrary to policy DM5 of the Worthing Local Plan, the Council's SPG 'Extending or Altering Your Home' and the relevant paragraphs of the NPPF.

Informative
The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by identifying matters of concern with the proposal and determining the application within a timely manner, clearly setting out the reason(s) for refusal, allowing the Applicant the opportunity to consider the harm caused and whether or not it can be remedied by a revision to the proposal. The Local Planning Authority has a pre-

application advice service in respect of any future application for a revised development.

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

Case Officer: Jackie Fox Date:23.09.26

Authorised by: Louise Prew Date: 29/09/2026