CMK Planning
11 Jew Street
Brighton
BN1 1UT

29th September 2025

Dear Planning,

SITE: No.32 St. Michaels Road, Worthing, BN11 4RY
Proposal: Alterations and extensions
PREVIOUS PLANNING REF: **AWDM/1348/22 and** AWDM/1302/21
PREVIOUS APPEAL REFERENCE: APP/M3835/D/21/3286341

I write regarding the above.

An application was previously approved (AWDM/1348/22). Prior to this, there was a refused scheme AWDM/1302/21, dismissed at appeal (APP/M3835/D/21/3286341 - February 2022).

The previous application proposed a supported contemporary design approach that corresponds to the siting, scale, form and materials of the supported existing extension.



Above: Previously approved elevation (© Buildview).



Above: Currently proposed elevation (© Puzzle).

Requirement for replacement extension

This part of the existing side extension is approaching the end of its economic life and is visually and architecturally awkward in form. A replacement is therefore both necessary and desirable.

The proposed scheme adopts a more restrained and simplistic design approach, broadly reflecting the principles of permitted development. While it is acknowledged that the width of the extension exceeds 50% of the width of the original dwelling, the existing extension already does so, and the proposal would not project any further in this respect. Owing to the position of the neighbouring property, the extension would be built directly up to the boundary wall.

Scale, form and design

In terms of scale, the proposed height is approximately 2.89m, comfortably below the 4m threshold set by permitted development rights. The extension is also set back 1.19m from the front elevation of the dwelling (and almost 2m from the forward-most bay), thereby retaining visual subservience to the host building.

External materials will match or be sympathetic to those of the existing dwelling, ensuring a consistent appearance. The overall design approach is deliberately simple and understated, avoiding any heavy-handed pastiche of the host property, which would be unsuccessful in this context. Instead, the proposal provides a light, clean, glazed framework aesthetic that offers a clear but respectful juxtaposition with the original building.

The proposed extension would integrate discreetly into its setting. Owing to its recessed position (flanked on both sides) it would read as a secondary element within the plot, thereby ensuring the original dwelling continues to provide the main visual focus in the street.

Due to its limited scale and form, and given that it simply replaces an existing part of the extension, the proposal would not adversely affect residential amenity. No new elements are introduced that could result in overlooking, overshadowing, or any other harm to neighbouring living conditions.

The site lies outside, but close to, the conservation area. Given the proposal's modest scale and form, together with its recessed position from the road and its location between two larger two-and-three-quarter storey dwellings, it would have no effect on the setting or character of the conservation area.

Ultimately the proposal can be found to be wholly compliant with DM5 (Quality of the built environment) and DM24 (The historic environment).

As the proposal accords fully with the Local Development Plan and the provisions of the NPPF, we respectfully request that planning permission be granted without delay.

Kind regards,

Colm McKee MRTPI
Director, CMK Planning