Development Management – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/1132/25 **Recommendation: – Approve**

Site: **6 Seamill Park Crescent Worthing West Sussex BN11 2PN**

Proposal: **Single storey rear extension with decking and balustrades, front porch, hip to barn end roof extensions with front and rear dormers**

Date of Site Visit: 18.11.2025

Neighbours Checked: Y

Additional Neighbours Notified: Y Revised plans re-notified

Site and Surroundings

The site relates to a detached bungalow located on the south east side of Seamill Park Crescent, to the north of its junction with Seamill Park Avenue. Tree Preservation Order No.3 of 2003 and No. 1 of 2003 relate to various trees on the adjacent land to the rear of the site. This is a predominantly residential area and there is a mix of bungalows and two storey houses in the immediate vicinity. At the rear of the site, beyond the neighbouring rear garden is Brooklands Park and Lake.

Proposal

Permission is sought for alterations and extensions to the roof to form a barn hip to each side and with dormer windows to the front and rear roofslopes. At the time of visiting these works had commenced. Two 1.9 metre wide pitched roof dormer extensions are proposed to the front elevation and a flat roofed rear dormer extension which would measure approximately 8.5 metres in width. A new porch is proposed to the front elevation which would have a pitched roof and glazing to its frontage.

A single storey extension is proposed to the full width of rear elevation which would measure 4 metres in depth and would have a flat roof approximately 3.6 metres in height. A raised decking area with stepped access to the rear garden is also proposed at the rear.

Matching materials are proposed.

Relevant Planning History:

None relevant

Consultations

The Council's **Drainage Consultant** commented on the application as originally submitted 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 a single storey rear extension with decking and balustrades, front porch, hip to barn end roof extensions with front and rear dormers. The application is to Worthing Borough Council.

Following a review of the submitted information, we note that insufficient information has been provided to demonstrate the proposed development is in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and its accompanying Planning Practise Guidance (PPG).

Fluvial Flood Risk: The proposed site is located within Flood Zones 1, 2, and 3 and the proposed development may result in a loss of floodplain storage and therefore a potential increase in fluvial flood risk on site and elsewhere. It is unclear within the submitted Flood Risk Assessment whether the proposed development will have a negative impact on flood risk.

Surface Water Drainage: Currently, insufficient information has been provided regarding the existing and proposed surface water drainage. The applicant should demonstrate how the property currently drains and if the existing drainage is suitable to take an increase in flows as a result of the extension. If the existing drainage has a lack of capacity, information will be required regarding the proposed new drainage. Any new drainage will be required to follow the hierarchy of preference and testing may be required to support the viability of infiltration if it is not currently used in the existing drainage strategy.

We would recommend the application is not approved until updated information is received addressing the above points.

Reason
To prevent flooding in accordance with National Planning Policy Framework paragraphs 165-175 by ensuring the satisfactory management of local flood risk, surface water flow paths, storage, and disposal of surface water from the site in a range of rainfall events and ensuring the SuDS proposed operates as designed for the lifetime of the development.

The agent has provided a revised Flood Risk Assessment and the Council's **Drainage Consultant** commented as follows:

Following a review of the updated information, we maintain our objection and our response has not changed since our response dated 17th September 2025. Currently, insufficient information has been provided to demonstrate the proposed development is in accordance with the NPPF and PPG. The applicant is required to submit a more detailed Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) that includes the following:

•An assessment of existing flood risk from all sources.
•Evidence that the proposed development will not increase flood risk to the site or the surrounding area.

•Provides more specific information regarding existing and proposed surface water drainage.

We would recommend the application is not approved until updated information is received that addresses the above points.

A Flood Risk Assessment and Sustainable Drainage Assessment by Geo Smart Information Ltd has since been submitted in response to these comments. The Council's **Drainage Consultant** has commented as follows:

Following a review of the submitted information, we have noted that the submitted Flood Risk Assessment is sufficient to demonstrate the application is in accordance with the NPPF and its accompanying PPG. Therefore, 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_PDF_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

One representation has been received from the occupier of No.8 Seamill Park Crescent to the north of the site raising no objection but pointing to an error in the site area indicated, as a portion of the neighbours land has been included as originally submitted.

A revised plan has since been received to correct this error.

One comment has been received from the occupier of No.4 to the south raising concerns of overlooking from the proposed raised decking area.

Relevant Planning Policies:

Worthing Local Plan policies (WBC 2023): SP1, DM5, DM20
National Planning 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 and flood risk and sustainable drainage.

Visual Amenity

There are a mix of dwelling types in the streetscene with some variety in their individual design and detailing. Although neighbouring dwellings have full hipped roofs predominantly, there is another example in the vicinity of a barn hip design and in this context the proposed barn-hip form of the extensions and their positioning to each side would not cause any significant harm to visual amenity.

The proposed front dormer windows would appear reasonable in their scale, design and positioning and would be seen in the context of other dormer windows that exist in the streetscene.

Whilst the proposed porch would introduce a more dominant gabled/glazed form, it would not appear unreasonable in its scale and the use of matching materials would help blend with the recipient building.

At the rear the proposed dormer extension would be particularly wide and bulky. However, it would be set down below the ridge level and as it would be set in from the side walls its full extent would not be readily visible in the streetscene.

Although a standard flat roof design is proposed for the proposed rear extension, it would appear reasonable in its scale and would be at the rear of the bungalow where it would not dominate or cause any significant harm to visual amenity in this instance.

The proposed decking would appear appropriate as a garden structure.

Subject to the use of matching materials, design and impact on visual amenity is considered acceptable.

Residential Amenity

The main impact arising from the proposals would be to the occupiers of the neighbouring dwellings to the north at No.8 and to the south at No.4. Neighbouring dwellings on the opposite side of Seamill Park Crescent would be sufficiently separated to void any significant impact from the proposed development. The impact of first floor windows would be similar to the existing dormer window and that of neighbouring two storey dwellings.

To the south side, No.4 is a hipped roof bungalow with a separation distance of between 1.4 to 2.1 metres to the application dwelling at No.6. There are no side windows to No.4 facing the application site. Main outlook is to the front and rear. A low timber fence separates the two dwellings at the side boundary.

Although the proposed extensions would be sited closely to the boundary with No.4, given the scale of the proposals, separation at their rear, and the site orientation with the proposed development being to the north of No.4, there would be no significant

threat in terms of loss of light or outlook. No new side windows are proposed and this can be secured by condition in the interests of protecting privacy.

In relation to the rear decking, ground levels fall to the rear resulting in a raised decking area of approximately 0.7 to 0.8 metres in height. Whilst there are currently views between neighbouring gardens where only a low boundary fence exists to each side, the proposed raised decking area would give scope for overlooking from an elevated position and with scope to look back towards neighbouring, although it is noted that it would be set in from each side wall by approximately 0.5 metres and would be relatively modest in its depth. Given the scale of the proposals, screening to each side would limit the impact to avoid any significant overlooking. A condition is therefore recommended for obscure glazed screening to each side of the decking area in the interests of protecting privacy for neighbouring occupiers.

To the north side, No. 8 is a detached two storey dwelling. There is greater separation to the neighbouring dwelling on this side with a distance of approximately 3 metres at its rear corner. No.8 extends beyond the rear of No.6 by approximately 1.5 metres and has no ground floor side windows in its main south wall, and one first floor south side window which appears to serve the bathroom. Main outlook is to the front and rear. There is a bay window at the rear of the ground floor which includes glazing angled towards the site.

Having regard to the relationship with No. 8 and the scale of the proposals, the proposed development would not pose any significant threat to the occupiers of No.8 in terms of light or outlook. Conditions can be applied as above to avoid side windows and to include screening to the raised decking to avoid any significant loss of privacy.

The front porch extension would be sufficiently remote from neighbouring occupiers to avoid any significant impact.

Flooding

The site is within Flood Zone 2/3 and parts of the site are at risk of surface water flooding. The applicant has provided a revised FRA and sustainable drainage assessment. No objection has been raised by the Council's Drainage consultant on the basis of the revised and additional information.

Recommendation:

APPROVE subject to condition(s):-

1. Drawing Numbers
2. Standard time limit
3. Matching materials
4. No openings to side elevations of extensions
5. Obscure glazed screening to sides of raised decking

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.
- Householder - SUDS

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

Case Officer: Rebekah Hincke Date: 13.04.2026

Authorised by: Louise Prew Date: 16/04/2026