Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 June 2026

by K Crutchfield BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23 July 2026

Appeal Ref: 6007205
71 Hollingbury Gardens, Offington, Worthing, West Sussex BN14 0EB

- 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 Mr Adam Hughes against the decision of Worthing Borough Council.
- The application Ref is AWDM/1060/25.
- The development proposed is ground floor extension and new roof with accommodation.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The appellant has included an amended street scene plan as part of their appeal submission, to address an error regarding the existing ground levels. As the amended plan does not change the proposal I have accepted the plan, and my decision is made on this basis.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are:

   - the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area;
   - the effect of the proposed development on the living conditions of the occupants of 73 Hollingbury Gardens, with particular reference to sunlight; and
   - the appellant's personal circumstances and need for the proposed development.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. Hollingbury Gardens primarily comprises detached bungalows and dormer bungalows, many with comparatively modest front projections. The properties vary in design, and many have been extended to provide accommodation within the roof space. Despite this variety, a distinguishing feature of Hollingbury Gardens is the prevailing use of hipped roofs on the main front elevations which reduces the bulk and massing to the front of the properties. The appeal property is a detached bungalow with a fully hipped roof and therefore contributes towards this character.

5. Worthing Borough Council's Extending and altering your home Supplementary Planning Guidance advises, amongst other things, that the design of an extension should achieve an appropriate relationship with the design of the existing property, and if the extension is visible from the street it is important to ensure that the roof form is similar to that of the existing house.

6. The proposal would include a gable roof with a barn hip on the front elevation. I acknowledge the appellant's reasons for the proposed roof design including maintaining space with the adjacent neighbouring properties, and the use of a barn hip to soften the appearance of the proposal. However, the proposed roof form would not relate well to the design and shape of the roof of the existing property. The relationship with neighbouring properties also means that there would be an appreciation from the street of the large overall depth of the roof. The proposal would unduly increase the massing and bulk of the roof and its prominence within the street scene, and would be harmfully out of keeping with the prevailing use of roofs which are hipped away from the street in the surrounding area. The appearance would be more akin to a two-storey dwelling in contrast to the prevailing more modest bungalows and dormer bungalows in the area.

7. My attention has been drawn to other recent developments in Hollingbury Gardens which the appellant contends supports their case. I note that these extensions have been introduced into the area and there is a variety of design of roofs locally. However, despite this variety, the majority of properties have hipped roofs on the front elevation, compared to the appeal proposal which would have a gable roof. I acknowledge that 23 Hollingbury Gardens has a gable roof with a barn hip on the front elevation. However, this example is not so common to have changed the prevailing character of the area. It is not in my view a compelling justification for further development which I find to be unsympathetic.

8. The proposed dormer would be set down from the main ridge, set back from the front elevation and proportionate in scale to the host dwelling. The proposed windows would be different to the existing but would respect the proportions of windows on the existing dwelling, and the proposed materials would match the existing. The proposed front building line would be similar to the adjacent dwellings. However, these matters do not outweigh my concerns regarding the effect of the roof on the character and appearance of the dwelling and area.

9. I conclude that the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area. As such, it would conflict with policy DM5 of the Worthing Borough Council Local Plan (2023). This policy seeks, amongst other things, that development should be of a high architectural and design quality and respect and enhance the character of the site and the prevailing character of the area.

Living conditions

10. The adjacent property 73 Hollingbury Gardens is a detached dormer bungalow located at a slightly higher ground level than the appeal property. The proposed front extension would be located south of no 73, and the Council contend that it could affect sunlight to the east facing windows of this property.

11. There are two ground-floor and one first-floor east facing windows on the front elevation of no 73; two would be set back from the front elevation of the proposed extension, and the other would be approximately level with the front elevation of

the proposed extension. No 73 is located at slightly higher ground levels, and the proposed roof would have a low eaves height and slope away from this property. Therefore, sunlight would still be received over the proposed roof, and the proposal would not result in an unacceptable loss of sunlight to these rooms.

12. I conclude that the proposal would not be unacceptably harmful to the living conditions of the occupants of 73 Hollingbury Gardens, with particular regard to sunlight. As such, it would accord with policy DM5 of the Worthing Borough Council Local Plan (2023). This policy seeks, amongst other things, that development should not have an unacceptable impact on the occupiers of adjacent properties.

Personal circumstances and need for the proposed development

13. Decision makers are required by the Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED) set out in Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010 to have due regard to the need to eliminate unlawful discrimination, to advance equality of opportunity and foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and people who do not share it. Protected characteristics include a person's disability and age.

14. The appellant explains that the proposed additional floorspace is needed because a member of the appellant's family is a disabled person who has moved into the appeal property so that the appellant and family can provide the necessary support and care.

Conclusion

15. I have found that the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area. I attach significant weight to the resulting conflict with the development plan and the harm that would be caused.

16. In favour of the appeal, the proposed development would provide additional floorspace to provide care and support for a disabled person. This is an important consideration. However, I note that the proposal would provide for two additional bedrooms, and would provide ensuites to three of the total bedrooms. There is no substantive evidence to show that development of the large scale and design proposed which I have found to result in harm would be the only means by which needs for support and care could reasonably be met, nor that the development, as it is proposed, is no larger than is necessary. In this context, I find that the adverse effects of dismissing the proposal on those with protected characteristics are mitigated by the possibility of an alternative, less harmful, scheme.

17. On balance, I conclude that the harm caused to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area outweighs the need for the proposed development and its benefits in terms of advancing equality of opportunity for persons with protected characteristics. It is necessary and proportionate to dismiss the appeal.

18. The proposal conflicts with the development plan, when read as a whole, and the material considerations do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it. Therefore, the appeal should be dismissed.

K Crutchfield

INSPECTOR