Expiry Date - 04/08/2025

Development Management – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/0745/25 **Recommendation – APPROVE**

Site: **28 Vale Avenue Worthing West Sussex BN14 0BY**

Proposal: **Proposed single storey rear extension with raised patio and balustrade, and boundary treatement (existing conservatory removed).**

Date of site visit: 25/07/2025

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: Y

Site and Surroundings

The application site lies on the east side of Vale Avenue. It comprises a semi detached bungalow on a sloping site with detached garage to the north. The property has a glazed conservatory to the rear. There is a parking area/garden to the front and a good size garden to the rear enclosed by approx. 1.8-2m high fencing.

The site is in a residential area not within a conservation area and the property is not a listed building.

Proposal

The application proposes the demolition of the rear conservatory and the erection of a single storey rear extension. The proposed extension would project a maximum of 6m from the original rear elevation of the property on the east side. The proposed extension would be across the whole width of the house at approx. 7.5m. To the side of the rear extension it is proposed to have a 2.5m by 2.9m utility room.

The extension would have a flat roof with a sky lantern above the lounge and dining room. The proposed extension would be built in matching materials with render walls and upvc windows.

Protruding from the rear of the new extension it is proposed that there would be a raised patio with steps down into the garden. The depth of the patio would be 2m wrapping around the extension and filling the space to the north of the extension.

Finally, there would be the addition of 0.5m of trellising to the fence to provide additional screening to a total of 2.3m in height.

Relevant Planning History:

None

Consultations:
None

Representations:
None

Relevant Planning Policies

Worthing Local Plan policies (WBC 2023): SP1, DM5
National Planning Policy Framework
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.

Visual Amenity

The proposed extension would be to the rear of the property. The proposed extension would be in matching materials and would be of a size proportionate to the size of the property.

The side aspect of the rear extension may have glimpse views available from within the public realm, however, with the single storey nature of the development and the eaves being set below that of the existing dwelling it is not considered to dominate and would be a subservient addition to the host. Within the locality there are garages to the side of properties and in this instance, it is not considered that a side extension set back from the principal elevation would result in a dominant feature within the street. As such it is considered to be acceptable in terms of visual amenity impact.

Residential Amenity

The most affected properties are those to the north and south Nos. 30 and 26 Vale Avenue.

The property to the north, no. 30, is separate from the host dwelling by approximately 3.6m and have their own extension to the boundary. With the position of the neighbouring property and their extension there would not be an unacceptable level of overbearing on the neighbour with their extension blocking the impact. There are no windows in the side elevations of this therefore, there is not considered to be any overlooking of this property.

In terms of the impact on No 26 to the south, with the relationship of the properties there is going to be a greater impact. There is an existing

conservatory to the rear of the site which illustrates that there is some existing impact, but the proposed extension is significantly larger at 6m in depth. The applicant was asked to reduce the depth of the extension to minimise the impact on this property. However, the applicant was not willing to make revisions to the plans. It is recognised that the extension would be to the north and therefore there wouldn't be any overshadowing of the neighbour's amenity space. The gardens are long and relatively wide which also helps to reduce the impact on the neighbours.

The patio to the rear will increase the potential for overlooking. Currently the boundary treatment is mature and well established. In order to create the space for this extension some of this will be removed. To overcome the overlooking from the patio 0.5m of trellis would be installed above the existing fence. This will provide reduce overlooking of the neighbouring property.

There are no windows within the side elevation of the extension. The windows on the side elevation would face the boundary treatment and the neighbour's side extension which would not result in any overlooking. The sky lantern would not provide any views onto the neighbouring property due to its location with the conservatory in the current location any views would not be greater than the existing.

The separation to the properties to the rear on Findon Road is significant which mitigates any overlooking.

As such it is considered that taking into account the above, the impacts on neighbours are just considered to be acceptable and refusal on this basis is not justified.

Recommendation

APPROVE subject to Conditions:-

1. Drawing Numbers
2. Standard time limit
3. Matching materials
4. No additional openings to side elevations of extension

Informative

The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by assessing the proposal against all material considerations, including planning policies and any representations that may have been received and subsequently determining to grant planning permission 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? N

Expiry Date - 04/08/2025

Case Officer:	Finlay Gardner	Date: 01/10/2025
Authorised by:	Louise Prew	Date: 03/10/2025