



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 May 2026

by JJ Packman MPlan MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 06 July 2026

Appeal Ref: 6006916

10 Sussex Road, Worthing Central, West Sussex, BN11 1DS

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Clayton against the decision of Adur and Worthing Councils.
 - The application Ref is AWDM/1580/25.
 - The development proposed is demolition of existing side extension new side extension and street boundary wall.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the demolition of existing side extension new side extension and street boundary wall at 10 Sussex Road, Worthing Central, West Sussex, BN11 1DS in accordance with the terms of the application 25/4875/HSE and the plans submitted with it subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be undertaken in accordance with drawing no.s: D 1225/761/01, D 1225/761/02, D 1225/761/03, D 1225/761/04, D 1225/761/05, D 1225/761/06, D 1225/761/07, D 1225/761/08.
 - 3) The external materials of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing dwelling.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed extension on the character and appearance of the area, including the host building.

Reasons

3. No.10 Sussex Road comprises a double-bay end-terrace dwelling occupying a prominent corner plot at the junction of Sussex Road and Stanley Road. The appeal property fronts Sussex Road with its side elevation and associated garden area facing Stanley Road. Whilst Stanley Road itself is characterised through much of its length by a consistent terrace rhythm with small front gardens, low boundary walls and a uniform building line, the appeal property does not read as forming part of that terrace composition. Instead, it presents as a Sussex Road frontage property with a side boundary and elevation facing onto Stanley Road.

4. The pattern of development and spatial relationships at either end of Stanley Road differ materially from the consistent arrangement found through the middle of the street. In particular, the corner properties situated at each end have varying setback arrangements and boundary treatment.
5. The area of the appeal property that faces Stanley Road already has an enclosed and slightly developed appearance. A tall masonry wall, with fencing above, flanks the footway and a small shed-like structure adjoins this to create a relatively hard edge to Stanley Road.
6. My attention has been drawn to the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) "Extending or Altering Your Home", which advises that properties situated on corner plots should avoid breaching the building line of the adjoining street.
7. Whilst I acknowledge the Council's concerns regarding the established building line along Stanley Road, I do not consider the appeal property relates to Stanley Road in the same way as the intervening terrace properties immediately to the rear. The more consistent terrace rhythm becomes less apparent at either end of Stanley Road where the spatial relationships, setback arrangements and boundary treatments differ. As such, I do not find that the proposal would appear as a disruptive encroachment into an otherwise uninterrupted terrace frontage.
8. The proposal would remain single storey in scale and would not exceed the height of the host dwelling. The extension would appear visually secondary to the double-bay terrace house and its siting close to the boundary would result in an unduly dominant or oppressive form of development within the street scene.
9. Although the proposed flat roof would differ from the pitched roof form of the existing house, I do not find this harmful in this case. Given the modest scale of the proposals and its relationship with the boundary, the flat roof assists in limiting the overall visual bulk of the proposal when experienced from Stanley Road. The proposed rendered finish and boundary treatment would reflect materials already present and would appear appropriate within the street scene.
10. Given the above, whilst I acknowledge that the proposal would not fully accord with the guidance contained within the Council's SPG relating to corner plots and building lines, I do not find that the degree of conflict would result in material harm to the character and appearance of the area in this case. Having regard to the site's visually distinct corner position, existing development, the modest scale and form of the proposal, I conclude that the development would preserve the character and appearance of the host dwelling, street scene and local area.
11. Consequently, I find no conflict with Policy DM5 of the Worthing Local Plan 2023, which seeks to ensure good design, or the overarching design objectives of the Council's SPG "Extending or Altering Your Home", with particular regard to dominance. It is also considered that the proposal accords with the design aims of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Conditions

12. In addition to the standard time limit condition, I have imposed a condition requiring the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans in the

interests of certainty. A condition requiring the external materials to match those of the existing dwelling is also necessary in the interests of safeguarding the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons outlined above, and taking into account all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

JJ Packman

INSPECTOR