

Development Management – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/1358/25

Recommendation: Approve

Site: The Castle Day Nursery Angola Road Worthing West Sussex

Proposal: Erection of single storey rear extension to replace existing outbuilding, alterations to side lean-to to form solid walls and tiled roof, install side entrance gate, and landscaping works

Date of Site Visit: 10.02.2026

Neighbours Checked: Y

Additional Neighbours Notified: Revised description and plans notified 18.03.2026

Site and Surroundings

The site relates to a detached two storey building located on the west side of Angola Road, close to the junction with Dominion Road to the north. At the time of visiting the premises were vacant and undergoing renovations, but has been in use as a day nursery. The site is not a listed building and is not within a conservation area. The building has been extended to its rear with a large single storey addition which runs along much of the length of the northern boundary, and there is a glazed lean-to addition to the north side elevation at its frontage. There are mature trees to the rear (west) boundary of the site and a Silver Birch tree to the site frontage. No Tree Preservation Orders are in place in relation to these trees.

Proposal

Permission is sought for the construction of a single storey extension to the existing day nursery to form an additional classroom area. The extension would connect to the rear (west) of the existing single storey addition and would span across much of the width of the site. An outbuilding has already been removed from this area. The extension would measure approximately 11.9 metres in width and 7.3 metres in depth and would have a flat roof up to 3.1 metres in height. The extension would be finished in standing-seam grey cladding to its outward facing elevations and with vertical timber cladding to the east elevation which faces into the rear garden.

Alterations are also proposed to the side lean-to structure at the frontage, to form solid walls and a tiled roof with rooflight windows. A tiled lean-to roof would replace the existing lean-to glazed roof up to 3.5 metres in height approximately and with red/clay tiles to the roof and tile hanging to its north side wall above the existing boundary wall. Infill brickwork to the front elevation would surround a replacement window and door. A new entrance gate is also indicated on the south side of the building to provide access to the rear garden area.

Planning History:

01/00996/FULL - Alterations and extensions to form three two bedroom flats and 5 one bedroom flats; demolition of garages and re-arrangement of parking areas to form landscaped amenity areas.

STATUS: Conditional Consent 26th November 2001.

94/05016/FULL - SINGLE STOREY EXTENSION TO PROVIDE ADDITIONAL FACILITIES FOR CHILDREN, EXTENSION TO COVERED WAY AND INCREASE IN NUMBER OF CHILDREN FROM 50 TO 54

STATUS: Conditional Consent 10th November 1994.

95/05013/FULL - SINGLE STOREY EXTENSION TO PROVIDE ADDITIONAL FACILITIES FOR CHILDREN AND EXTENSION TO COVERED WAY (REVISION TO APPLICATION

WB/94/0698)

STATUS: Conditional Consent 7th March 1995.

Consultations

The **Highway Authority** has made the following comments

WSCC in its role as Local Highway Authority (LHA) has been consulted on highway matters by the Local Planning Authority (LPA) for the erection of a single-storey rear extension to replace existing outbuilding, side gate and minor landscaping works for Castle Day Nursery.

Following a review of the submitted plans and documents, the LHA request more information from the applicant, subject to the following comments:

The proposals include a net additional 63.1 sqm of floorspace for the nursery, and alterations to provide amended classroom layouts. No information has been provided in regards to whether the proposals include an increase in children or staff the nursery will accommodate. Can the applicant confirm whether there will be a change in child/staff numbers and if so, provide figures pertaining to the existing/proposed trip rates the site generates.

Please raise this with the applicant and reconsult. Upon receiving this information, the LHA can assess the application further.

In response the applicant's agent has provided the following clarification:

The primary intent of this application is to enhance operational efficiency (e.g., improving storage and optimising space), which the current layout does not adequately support. As such, the proposals do not intend to increase user or staff numbers at this stage.

That being said, the proposed extension does offer potential for future expansion. Any such expansion would only be pursued if it becomes necessary (e.g., upon reaching maximum capacity) and deemed suitable, subject to all required assessments and planning considerations.

The **Highway Authority** has provided a further response to this as follows:

Thank you for sending this through. As the proposals do not represent a material increase in anticipated vehicle movements, the LHA would not consider the proposals contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework (paragraph 116) - consequently there are no transport grounds to resist the proposal. Any proposals to increase nursery user capacity in the future would be subject to separate consultation.

Environmental Protection, Environmental Health & Licensing: recommends conditions controlling construction hours, and contamination precaution.

The Council's **Senior Tree and Landscape Officer** has commented as follows:

I consider that as the foundations will cause minimum intrusion into the root area, without creating significant compaction, the proposal is acceptable, in regard to the retained trees.

The Council's **Drainage Consultant** has commented as follows:

Thank you for your consultation on the above site. We have reviewed the application as the drainage consultant acting on behalf of the Council and wish to make the following comments.

The applicant is applying for the (Revised Description) erection of single storey rear extension to replace existing outbuilding, alterations to side lean-to to form solid walls and tiled roof, install side entrance gate, and landscaping works. The application is to Worthing Borough Council.

Following a review of the submitted information, we have no objection on surface water grounds. Due to the site, size, location, and type of development we would recommend the approval of the application with the following informative attached:

Informative 1: The applicant must follow the drainage hierarchy of preference. Due to the size and location of the development, an infiltration test should be carried out in accordance with the Part H2, paragraph 1.34 to 1.37 of the Building Regulations (https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/5a80cf9ded915d74e33fc8ae/BR_PD_F_AD_H_2015.pdf). This rate should then be put into the calculation in Part H3, paragraph 3.28. Following this the applicant can use the free tools at <https://www.uksuds.com/> to size the soakaway for the 1 in 100 (1%) plus CC event.

If infiltration fails, the same links should be used to size attenuation storage to ensure surface water runoff does not increase from the existing discharge rate.

To obtain the relevant rainfall data the applicant can visit <https://fehweb.ceh.ac.uk/> to download the point data for their site and input the csv file into the tools above.

Representations

None received

Relevant Planning Policies:

Worthing Local Plan policies (WBC 2023):
SP1 (Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development)
SS1 (Spatial Strategy)
DM5 (Quality of the Built Environment)
DM8 (Planning for Sustainable Communities/Community Facilities)
DM15 (Sustainable Transport and Active Travel)
DM16 (Sustainable Design)
DM20 (Flood Risk and Sustainable Drainage)
DM22 (Pollution)

National Planning Policy Framework (MHCLG 2024)
National Planning Practice Guidance

Planning Assessment:

Paragraph 11 identifies at the heart of the NPPF a presumption in favour of sustainable development. For decision making this means approving development proposals that accord with an up-to-date development plan without delay or where there are no relevant development plan policies, or the policies which are most important for determining the application are out-of-date, granting permission unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the policies of the NPPF taken as a whole.

The proposals would support the continued use as a day nursery and would not represent any significant intensification of use that would pose any significant threat to residential amenity or raise any parking or highways issues. The number of child places were limited to 50 on the original permission WB/168/73 and then extended to 54 places by planning permission WB/94/0698 which approved the previous extension, and with hours of operation controlled by condition to 8 am to 6pm. This would not alter as a result of the proposals and will be conditioned.

To the north side there is a pedestrian access separating the site from No.8-9 and 8A Dominion Buildings to the north which is a shop with a flat above. This leads to a parking area at the rear of the parade of shops and flats and an area adjacent to the site boundary which is used for bin storage. There is a metal-clad building within the neighbouring builder's yard to the north west which has access into this area with a roller shutter door. Given the relationship with neighbouring buildings and having regard to the scale and design of the proposals, there would be no significant harm to the amenities of neighbouring occupiers to the north of the site. Although the lean-to structure would be immediately adjacent to the pedestrian access to the north side, this follows the form and overall relationship of the existing structure that the alterations would replace and the revised drawings indicate that these works would be within the site boundary. There are no affected windows in the south elevation of No. 8-9 and 8A to the north.

To the south side of the site, is St Stephens Church and northern part of this building appears to contain the church hall. This is separated from the site by its enclosed side garden area and this also contains an outbuilding to the rear (west) boundary adjacent to the common boundary with the site. Close boarded fencing encloses the site on this side. Although the proposed rear extension would be sited closely to the boundary

with the neighbouring site, the structure would be set in by approximately 0.65m at its eastern end and 0.3m at its south western corner, with the closest section screened by the neighbours own rear outbuilding which contains no windows facing towards the site. Windows within the church hall building are sufficiently separated from the proposed extension to avoid any significant impact and side windows in the proposed extension can be obscure glazed in the interests of avoiding overlooking. Given the relationship with the neighbouring buildings and garden area it is considered that there would be no significant harm to amenity from the proposals including that arising from the installation of a new gate on this south side.

Given the scale and position of the proposed extension and alterations, the main impact on residential amenity would be to the occupiers of the bungalow at No.41 Sackville Crescent to the west of the site whose rear garden back onto the site. No.39 is another bungalow sited further to the west and its rear garden is angled to a point where it meets No.41 and the site at its corner. No.39 is sufficiently separated to avoid any significant impact. To the rear garden of No.41 there is close-boarded fencing to the boundary with the site and trees to the west of this which overhang the site. The bungalow itself at no.41 is sufficiently separated to avoid any significant impact arising from the positioning or size of the extension proposed. The main impact would be to the garden area and this would introduce built form closer to the boundary than existing and has potential to generate noise and disturbance in close proximity, particularly where there are windows proposed. However, revised plans have been provided that indicate windows to the north, west and south boundaries would be fixed and obscure glazed, and having regard to the existing use of the outdoor areas for play space for the nursery, and the single storey scale of the extension proposed, it is considered that the proposals would not cause any significant harm to the amenities of the neighbouring occupier.

A condition is recommended to ensure windows to the south, west, and north side remain obscure glazed and non-opening in the interest of protecting amenity.

Although the proposals would result in a particularly large footprint for the building, given that it has already been extended along much of the site length on its north side, the additional extension would be at the rear where it would not be readily visible in the streetscene and in the context of the neighbouring rear access it would not cause any significant harm to visual amenity. The alterations to the side lean-to would be in keeping with the existing building and subject to the use of matching materials there would be no significant harm to visual amenity.

In relation to flooding, the site is at increased risk of tidal/fluvial flooding in the future. No objection has been raised by the drainage consultant in relation to surface water subject to the recommended informative concerning the drainage hierarchy to be followed. It is noted that the development is considered minor development in relation to flood risk and the vulnerability classification would not alter as a result of the proposals. A Flood Risk Assessment has been provided which considers floor levels, flood resistance and resilience measures. However, the ability for users to safely evacuate the site and whether adequate flood warnings would be available needs to be considered. Therefore the preparation of a flood warning and evacuation plan is recommended to ensure safe access and egress for the site in the event of a flood.

In relation to protection, conservation and enhancement of biodiversity, the extension would be positioned where there is an existing hardstanding and the application details confirm that it will impact less than 25 square metres of non-priority habitat and contains no priority habitats. In relation to the impact on the adjacent trees, the applicant has provided an arboricultural impact appraisal which concludes that the proposal does not require the removal of any trees and minimal pruning to overhanging branches. A pile foundation system is recommended as a precautionary approach to reduce any potential impact within the root protection areas and preliminary method statement has been provided which recommends further measures to protect the trees including agricultural supervision during works in relation to the pile foundations and ground beams. On the basis of the details provided the Council's tree officer considers that the foundations would cause minimum intrusion into the root area, and without creating significant compaction. A condition is recommended to ensure the works are carried out in accordance with the submitted arboricultural impact appraisal and method statement.

Recommendation:

APPROVE subject to condition(s):-

1. Drawing Numbers
2. Standard time limit
3. Construction hours
4. Contamination Precaution
5. Tree protection in accordance with Arboricultural Impact Assessment and Method Statement
6. Materials as indicated, and including brick work and tiles to match the existing building for the lean-to addition alterations
7. Flood Warning and Evacuation Plan
8. Obscure glazing etc. (north, west, and south elevations)
9. No further openings to side elevations of extension
10. The extended nursery premises hereby approved shall not operate outside of the hours of 8am to 6pm Monday to Friday and shall be closed on Saturdays, Sundays and Public Holidays
11. No more than 54 child/baby places shall be provided at the extended nursery premises hereby approved.

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.
- Drainage hierarchy

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

Case Officer: Rebekah Hincke Date: 06.07.2026

Authorised by: Louise Prew Date: 08/07/2026