Expiry Date - 24/11/2025
Extension of Time – 22/12/2025

Development Management – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/1233/25 Recommendation: – APPROVE

Site: 43 West Way Worthing West Sussex BN13 3AX

Proposal: Application to Vary Condition 1 (approved plans) of previously approved application AWDM/1122/24. Amendments: Increase in height of roof to approved rear extension and addition of rooflights to roof of east side extension.

Date of Site Visit: 26/08/25

Neighbours Checked: Y

Additional Neighbours Notified: N

Site and Surroundings

The site is located to the south side, at the end of West Way within a residential area of Worthing. The property comprises a detached chalet bungalow with brick and render elevations, a pitched roof with dormers to the front and rear and front projecting gable. The property is set back from the road behind a post and rail fence and front garden. There is a garage to the front/side of the property and high fence to the side boundary.

The property is not within a conservation area, is not a listed building and there are no protected trees on site. The South Downs National Park is located approximately 90m to the west of the site.

Background

Planning permission was originally approved under application AWDM/1704/21 for *'Erection of a proposed single storey rear extension, replacement enlarged rear dormer, new porch with pitched roof and alterations including composite cladding to front gable and dormer and change of roof tiles'.*

An application to amend the above and to include a single storey side extension, reduced rear extension and increased porch extension was approved under AWDM/1122/24.

The rear extension as approved under AWDM/1122/24 was constructed higher than the approved plans and includes rooflights and therefore the current application AWDM/1233/25 for variation of condition 1 (approved plans) seeks to update the plans to show the rear extension as built, including the increase the height and the rooflights to the east side.

Proposal

Permission is sought under S73 to vary condition 1 (approved plans) of the works approved under application AWDM/1122/24. The changes to the approved plans relate to an increase in height to the roof of the single storey rear extension and the addition of rooflights to the side extension.

The height of the roof where the rear extension adjoins the main building was approved under AWDM/1122/24 at a height of 3.86m. The extension as built measures 4.26m high at the same point and it is this increase in height for which permission is sought to update the plans.

Rooflights have also been added to the roofslope of the single storey side extension. The bottom sill of the rooflights is approximately 2.85m above ground level.

These are the only changes to the approved plans; all other measurements remain the same as the proposal approved under AWDM/1122/24.

Relevant Planning History:

07/0785/FULL - Erection of front and side single storey extensions plus widening of existing rear dormer window.
STATUS: Conditional Consent 15th August 2007.

AWDM/1704/21 - Erection of a proposed single storey rear extension, replacement enlarged rear dormer, new porch with pitched roof and alterations including composite cladding to front gable and dormer and change of roof tiles.
STATUS: Application Permitted 1st November 2021.

AWDM/1122/24 - Revisions to approved application AWDM/1704/21 (for the erection of a single storey rear extension, replacement enlarged rear dormer, new porch with pitched roof and alterations including composite cladding to front gable and dormers and change of roof tiles) amendments include a single storey side extension, reduced rear extension and increased porch extension.
STATUS: Application Permitted 17th October 2024.

Consultations

None required

Neighbour Representations

Two objections received from the neighbour to the east side at No.41, in relation to the initial consultation and in relation to re-consultation following an update to the plans to include rooflights.

Initial consultation response:

We wish to formally express our concerns regarding the development. The current build appears significantly imposing and impacts the natural light reaching our garden. Additionally, skylights have been installed on the side elevation, despite the original

plans containing a clear stipulation that no windows or openings were to be permitted on this side.

Furthermore, we have previously experienced challenges with persistent dampness and limited sunlight in our garden due to the proximity of trees associated with Swandean Hospital. These conditions present ongoing safety issues and diminish our family's ability to enjoy our outdoor space. The increased height of the new construction is likely to exacerbate these problems.

For clarity, we did not object to the original plans; however, it is evident that the structure now in place exceeds the dimensions that were approved and does not align with the originally permitted design.

Based on the comments provided above, we respectfully object to the approval of the proposed amendments to the planning application.

Re-consultation response (photos of the extension included):

Our comments are still current, and we wish them to be taken into consideration.

With regards to the roof light, opening Velux windows have been installed to the roof on the East elevation, it was stipulated in the original planning that no windows or openings were allowed on the issued Permit. Again, we object to this we do not want windows, skylights or Velux facing our property.

The dimensions of the roof has already been raised leaving the light blocked into our garden, just to be clear that this is the entire width of our Garden. Furthermore, we have previously experienced challenges with persistent dampness and limited sunlight in our garden due to the proximity of trees associated with Swandean Hospital. These conditions present ongoing safety issues and diminish our family's ability to enjoy our outdoor space. The increased height of the new construction is likely to exacerbate these problems.

What is the point of having plans agreed and permits issued when no one sticks to them?

For clarity, we did not object to the original plans; however, it is evident that the structure now in place exceeds the dimensions that were approved and does not align with the originally permitted design.

Based on the comments provided above, we respectfully object to the approval of the proposed amendments to the planning application and request that this objection be formally acknowledged.

Relevant Planning Policies:

Worthing Local Plan policies (WBC 2023): SP1, DM5
National Planning Policy Framework (MHCLG 2024)
National Planning Practice Guidance
SPG ‘Extending or Altering Your Home’ (WBC)

Planning Assessment:

The principle of development has already been agreed under the previous application AWDM/1122/24. The key considerations for this application are the effects of the increased height of the rear extension and the addition of rooflights on the visual and residential amenities of the locality.

Context

The rear extension is substantially complete, and the height was increased during construction following advice to the applicant from building control, to increase the size of the joists and increase the pitch of the roof from 15 to 18 degrees. These recommendations were carried out and have resulted in the roof being approximately 0.4m higher than approved, at the point where the top of the roof meets the existing building. The eaves height, depth and position in relation to the boundary all remain as approved so it is only the height that has been increased.

Visual Amenity

The part of the roof that has been increased in height is partially visible to the front where the roof projects beyond the side of the existing building and is therefore visible above the garage roof when viewed from the road. Although this part of the roof has been increased in height it has limited impact on visual amenity due to its set back position, over 20m from the pavement and does not appear dominant or intrusive in the street scene.

The addition of rooflights to the single storey side extension are a common addition that do not detract from the character of the area or the building.

There is no significant adverse impact on the visual amenities of the locality as a result of the increase in height of the rear extension or the addition of rooflights.

Residential Amenity

The only neighbours affected by the increase in height and addition of rooflights are located to the east side at No.41. There is a high fence with trellis above to the boundary. The position of the extension in relation to this boundary has not changed and retains a gap of 1.1m. There are no windows to the side of the neighbours building facing west.

No.41 has an extension to the side with a rear facing glass door serving a utility room. Planning permission was granted under application AWDM/1904/20 for a further extension to the side, serving a kitchen/dining room extension with French doors to the rear that extend further back into the garden than the previous door to the rear. The plans confirm that these doors serve the kitchen part of the extension and are secondary to the main bi-fold doors that serve the dining room, these doors serving the habitable part of the space (dining room) are set in approximately 4.3m from the boundary measured from the centre of the doors.

There is no change to the depth of the rear extension or the height of the eaves as previously approved at the application site and the increase in height relates only to the part of the roof that adjoins the existing building and the resulting steeper pitch. It is also noted that the height of the extension was originally approved at 4m high under AWDM/1704/21 which approved a much deeper extension of 4.84m deep, this was reduced in depth to 3.37m under the subsequent application AWDM/1122/24.

The current variation results in a total increase in height of 0.4m adjacent to the rear wall of the main house, the rest of the roof slopes down to the approved eaves height of 2.5m. The increase in height compared to the original application is only 0.26m higher and this together with the reduced depth of the extension and its position set in 1.1m from the boundary is considered acceptable and would not significantly affect light to the rear doors serving the dining room to No.41. The rear facing doors closer to the boundary at No.41 whether they serve a utility room or the kitchen part of the extension, are both classed as non-habitable rooms and as shown on the approved plans for the neighbour's property, would serve the kitchen part of the larger open plan kitchen/dining space which is also served by other south facing doors to the dining room.

There would be very little change in impact on the neighbour in terms of light and overshadowing to habitable rooms as a result of the increased height of the rear extension roof as built in comparison to the earlier approval and this change is not considered to have a significant detrimental impact on the neighbour's living conditions.

The neighbour referred to skylights fitted to the east side of the side extension, these were not there at the time of the site visit and were not shown on the original plans submitted for this application. The plans were updated to include these rooflights and the neighbour re-consulted on the revised application. The rooflights are fitted to the sloping roof and the bottom sill of the rooflights is above eaves height thereby preventing any views from these rooflights as they would be much higher than eye level and facing up.

The east side walls of the extension are subject to condition (5) of the original planning permission and amendment application, and states: *Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning General Permitted Development Order 2015 as amended (or any Order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), no windows or other openings shall be formed in the east side walls of the extension.* This condition prevents openings to the east side walls of the extension but does not prevent openings within the roof. The rooflights installed to the east side roof of the extension are above eye level and therefore do not result in any overlooking or loss of privacy. Rooflights to the roof of a single storey extension, which face the upwards do not result in any amenity impact, which is why openings to the roof are excluded from the above condition. It should be noted that this condition will continue to apply, to prevent openings inserted into the side 'walls' of the extension, as these would be likely to have a negative impact.

The proposal to vary condition 1 (approved plans) of application AWDM/1122/24 to allow an increase in height, rooflights to the side roofslope and updated plans is

therefore considered acceptable and would not result in a significant adverse impact on the residential amenities of the adjacent occupiers.

Other matters

It is noted that the original description for this application copied the previous description for AWDM/1122/24 which was for an amendment to the original application. The description for the current application was updated to refer to the specific amendments proposed by this Variation of Condition application: 'Increase in height of roof to approved rear extension and addition of rooflights to roof of east side extension' and the neighbour re-consulted.

Recommendation:

APPROVE subject to condition(s):-

1. Drawing Numbers
3 Materials as specified
4 Cladding only permitted to dormers and front gable
5 No windows in east side walls of extension

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.

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

Case Officer: Amanda Haslett Date: 22/12/25

Authorised by: Jo Morin Date: 22.12.2025