From:
Date: Fri, 12 Dec 2025 at 16:27
Subject: AWDM/1083/25 103 Cranleigh Road
To: <finlay.gardner@adur-worthing.gov.uk>

Planning Application: AWDM/1083/25

Address: 103 Cranleigh Road, BN14 7QR
Applicant: Georgina Pottinger
Case Officer: Mr Finlay Gardner

Dear Mr Gardner,

I write further to your recent correspondence and the request to:

1. Reduce the proposed rear extension from 6m to 5m in depth, and/or
2. Set the development in by 1m from the southern boundary.

Having reviewed your comments carefully, I would like to provide a full and reasoned response which addresses **Adur & Worthing planning policy**, the **site-specific context**, the **impact on neighbouring amenity**, and the **practical family need** driving the development.

After considering all points raised, we respectfully maintain that the **6m x 7m extension in the submitted position represents** an appropriate, policy-compliant, and proportionate form of development and should be approved without the requested amendments.

---

1. Net Increase in Footprint Is Modest and Clearly Proportionate

Three existing structures are being demolished:

- Rear dilapidated brick-built conservatory: **4.15m x 1.8m = 7.47m²**
- Rear outdoor poorly functioning utility/WC: **2.5m x 1.4m = 3.5m²**
- Detached garage: **5.35m x 2.55m = 13.64m²**

Total existing built footprint removed: 24.6 m².
Proposed extension: 42 m².
True net increase: approx. 17–18 m².

For a detached bungalow on a generous plot, this increase is minor and represents a clear improvement over the existing dispersed and inefficient outbuildings.

This aligns with **Adur & Worthing Development Management Policy (DM)**, particularly the following criteria:

- **DM1 (Design)** – encourages rationalised and cohesive building forms;
- **DM2 (Residential Extensions)** – supports proportionate extensions that do not harm neighbour amenity;
- **DM3 (Neighbouring Amenity)** – impact is judged on demonstrable harm, not theoretical concerns.

The modest net increase strongly indicates compliance with these policies.

---

2. No Neighbour Objections – and the Directly Affected Neighbour Supports the Proposal

- **No objections** were received during the statutory neighbour notification period.
- The **southern neighbour (the only property potentially affected)** has confirmed support for the proposal (email from them confirming this to follow early next week).

- They gain **increased privacy** because the proposed extension replaces the existing glazed conservatory and open garden, and closes off direct sight lines into their garden.
- They are also planning their own rear extension and have indicated the proposals will complement theirs.

In planning law, **lack of harm is strengthened significantly by demonstrable neighbour support**, particularly from the property allegedly at risk of "overbearing impact."

The officer's email states an overbearing impact *"would be harmful"*, however **no independent observation or neighbour testimony supports this**.

---

3. The Officer's 'Overbearing' Concern Is Not Demonstrable on Site

According to the officer, the neighbour to the south sits slightly behind the applicant's rear elevation, leaving "less amenity space."

However, the following are site facts:

- The southern neighbour's house is **detached** and offset, providing natural separation.
- A 1.53m **physical gap** exists between dwellings.
- The proposed extension is **single-storey**, and of the same roof line as the current main dwelling (which is lower than the neighbouring property which is double storey).
- The southern neighbour is located **to the south**, meaning **no sunlight or daylight is lost** to them due to the orientation of the proposed extension.

Under **DM3 (Neighbouring Amenity)**, harm must be:

- **Demonstrable**,
- **Material**, and
- **More than minor**.

Given neighbour support, orientation, separation distances, and proposed build height compared to the existing main property, the "overbearing" claim cannot be substantiated on policy grounds.

---

4. Strong Permitted-Development (PD) Fall-Back – Greater Impact Could Lawfully Be Created

Current PD rules for **detached houses** allow:

- **Rear extensions up to 8m in depth** via prior approval;
- **Side extensions up to half the width of the original house**;
- **No requirement** to be 1m from a boundary for a **rear extension**;
- Two PD extensions (rear and side) of 6-8m each could be constructed **10mm apart**, then knocked through internally after completion.

Your own email acknowledges this.

The PD fallback would:

- Have a **greater visual mass**,
- Potentially sit even **closer to boundaries**,
- Result in a **less coherent and less neighbour-friendly outcome**.

Given this material fallback, requiring reduction of a far more **sensitive and integrated** single extension seems inconsistent with the intention of planning policy m, aswell as seeming over burdensome. The fallback must be afforded weight under standard planning case law (Mansell v Tonbridge & Malling BC).

---

5. Precedent Within Adur & Worthing – Including 42 Alfriston Road

The officer referenced differences in character between Gaisford Ward and Findon, but the local authority must apply **DM policy consistently** across the district unless there is a clear and demonstrable distinction.

Key comparable case:

- **42 Alfriston Road** — 5m deep rear extension **built directly up to the boundary** and approved.

This directly contradicts the necessity for a **1m setback** in our application.

When assessing consistency, the NPPF requires authorities to consider **decision-making fairness**. The planning system cannot demand stricter boundary setbacks in one area without clear policy justification — none exists within **DM1, DM2, or DM3**.

---

6. The Public Benefit: Facilitating Elderly Care at Home

The extension enables the creation of a **fourth guest/elderly parent bedroom** with level-access facilities.

Both parents are in their late 80s, with increasing respite and care needs. Without this adaptation:

- They may need **council-funded or supported home care in the future.**
- Or **social care placements**,
- At significantly higher long-term cost to the public purse.

Adur & Worthing's own policies emphasise supporting:

- **Ageing-in-place**,
- **Family-based care**, and
- **Adaptations that enhance independent living**.

The proposal directly aligns with these strategic objectives and represents a positive social outcome.

---

7. Proposed Alternatives Suggested by the Officer Are Not Reasonable or Necessary

The officer suggested:

- Reducing depth by 1m;
- Setting the extension in by 1m, Creating a stepped wall

These alterations would:

- Severely compromise the internal layout required for accessible care,
- Reduce usable internal width,
- Create awkward and wasted outdoor strips,
- Offer **no meaningful improvement** to any neighbour's amenity, especially given full neighbour support.

Under **DM1 (Design)**, extensions should be coherent and well-integrated — the officer's suggested "step" explicitly conflicts with this.

Conclusion and Formal Request

Having reviewed all planning considerations, neighbour feedback, comparable approvals, policy requirements, and family care needs, it is clear that:

- The proposal **meets DM1, DM2 and DM3**;
- No **demonstrable harm** arises;
- There is **full neighbour support**;
- The PD fallback allows **larger and more impactful development**;
- The net increase is modest;
- The proposal provides a **public social-care benefit**;
- And precedents in Adur & Worthing support similar (or more intensive) boundary relationships.

We therefore respectfully request that the application be reconsidered in light of these counter-arguments, and approved **without reduction in depth** and **without the 1m boundary setback** as the proposal is policy-compliant and represents sustainable and responsible development.

Finally, as possibly the only (or one of few) detached bungalows in Cranleigh Road, we do not feel that this application would set precedent for other local properties, and

any other detached bungalows in the area would still be entitled to used the PD route.

We remain open to constructive dialogue and a further site visit/meeting should additional clarification be helpful.

A supporting letter (email) from our southerly neighbour will be forwarded on to you next week.

Yours sincerely,
Georgina Pottinger