

Development Management – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/0442/26 **Recommendation:** – Approve

Site: 57 Hollingbury Gardens Worthing West Sussex BN14 0EB

Proposal: Single storey front extension and removal of bay window.

Date of Site Visit: 30.06.2026

Neighbours Checked: Y

Additional Neighbours Notified: N

Site and Surroundings

The site relates to a bungalow on the west side of Hollingbury Gardens. A porch on its north side has been recently removed. There is a garage attached to its south side where it connects to the garage at the neighbouring bungalow to the south at No. 55. This is a sloping site, sloping downwards from east to west.

Proposal

Permission is sought for the construction of a pitched roofed extension to the ground floor which would square off the north-east corner of the building and with the bay window removed and entrance door relocated to the front elevation. Matching materials are proposed.

Relevant Planning History:

AWDM/0049/26 - Ground floor front infill extension; raising of roof ridge with gable ends and rooflights to create first floor accommodation within roof space

STATUS: Application Refused 12th March 2026.

AWDM/0809/26 - Ground floor front infill extension; raising of roof ridge with gable ends and rooflights to create first floor accommodation within roof space (re-submission of refused application AWDM/0049/26).

STATUS: Pending Consideration .

Consultations

None relevant

Representations

One representation has been received from the occupiers of a neighbouring dwelling at No.59 objecting to the proposals on the following grounds:

1. Loss of light. On the south side of our building facing next door no.57 (on their north elevation) we have a rear bedroom with a window. The proposed infill to no.57 will place a single storey addition with a pitched roof opposite our bedroom. The distance

between the two building facades is 2.9 mts. We cannot determine the height of the new pitched roof opposite our bedroom with any degree of accuracy but we believe that it will be sufficiently high enough to have a deleterious effect on the amount of light that we now enjoy from this south facing window. This not only impacts on the room itself but on the passageway where we leave the day open during the day to benefit from the light coming through this window into the passage. Did the applicant consider the impact of loss of light? Will the council require an assessment to be submitted to evaluate potential impacts on our properties' light access? We believe the proposed development will lead to a loss of light.

2. Loss of privacy. At present the only loss of privacy comes from visitors to the property at no.57 as we can see the entrance area where their front door is located on their north elevation. This loss of privacy could be described as minimal given that when we become aware of visitors we can take steps to block any view into our bedroom on our south facing elevation by lowering the blind temporarily. With the proposed development their front entrance area will be replaced with an infill addition and a bedroom with a window facing ours (bedroom 1 on their proposed plan). This new bedroom opposite ours will intrude on our privacy because we will not necessarily be aware of any people in a room opposite who can view into our private space at any time. The fence that separates the two rooms is 1.9 mts high and their land appears to set at a higher level than ours. The only way to mitigate this risk of people being able to view into our private space would be have the blind permamnently closed. We believe the proposed development will lead to a loss of privacy and an overbearing sense of enclosure, with the addition of the loss of light.

In relation to these material planning considerations we have referred to 'Worthing Borough Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance Extending or altering your home' pages 4-5, headed 'Extending or altering your home'.

In addition while not a material consideration, from this same room mentioned in points 1 & 2, looking eastwards we have a view of bungalows opposite and the hillside adjacent to Cissbury Ring. We would suffer a loss of the majority of this view and instead have a brick wall less than 3 metres from our facade and a roof obstructing the outlook.

We believe it is relevant to note that when the property we now reside in was redeveloped and a similar infill was made to this property in 2024 on the south side (AWDM/0758/23), it did not cause a loss of light, privacy or obstruct the view to the neighbouring property at no.57.

The new owner has already cut down large trees including one directly in the area where the proposed infill extension is planned to be built. In the planning application submitted it was stated that no trees will be trimmed or cut down in relation to the building works proposed.

For the reasons set out above, we respectfully request that this application is refused.

Relevant Planning Policies:

Worthing Local Plan policies (WBC 2023): SP1, DM5

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.

The application follows a previously refused application which proposed a ground floor infill extension and which also included raising the roof ridge with gable ends and rooflights to create first floor accommodation within the roofspace. Application AWDM/0049/26 refers.

This was refused for the following reasons:

The proposed development would, by reason of its height, scale, siting and design, be inconsistent with the form and shape of the existing dwelling which would adversely affect the character of the existing dwelling and visual amenity of the surrounding streetscene and would result in a loss of amenity to neighbouring occupiers to north. As such the proposal is considered contrary to policy DM5 of the Worthing Local Plan, the Council's SPG 'Extending or Altering Your Home' and the relevant paragraphs of the NPPF.

The current application has deleted the main roof extensions which were to create the first floor accommodation. The application under consideration relates solely to a single storey infill extension and fenestration changes.

As before, the proposed single storey extension would infill to the north east corner of the building, effectively squaring off the footprint at this corner. It would not be set back from the front elevation as is common in most other front extensions in the vicinity. However, the proposals would be similar in footprint to the neighbouring front extension at No.59 which has a second gabled front projection (AWDM/0758/23 refers), but in this case the proposals would have a hipped roof. The front door would be recessed and the bay window replaced with a 3-pane window. Although the proposed extension would be to the full width of the side wall and to the depth of the existing front projection, and represents a change to the positioning of the front door, the overall height would be subservient to the main roof and in the context of the neighbouring dwelling and that there is some variety elsewhere in the street it is considered that the proposals would not cause any significant harm to the overall appearance of the dwelling or wider streetscene. Matching materials can be secured by condition in the interests of visual amenity.

In terms of the impact on the amenities of neighbouring occupiers, the main impact would be to the occupiers of No.59 to the north who are sited most closely to the proposed development, with other neighbouring dwellings more remote from the proposals.

In considering the previously refused application, the ground floor extension element was not considered on its own to result in any significant impact on the amenities of No.59 and the impact in this respect related largely to the scale of the extension to provide a two storey element which was to include raising the overall ridge height. There are other examples in the streetscene where single storey extensions fill in the gap similarly to the current proposals and although there is a slight change in level at the site with No.59 sited at a lower ground level, in this instance there would be a reasonable separation distance to the neighbouring dwelling at No.59, including to the neighbours' side facing bedroom window, to avoid any significant loss of light or outlook given the single storey scale.

The representation also points to the positioning of the proposed side window and that this would cause a loss of privacy. It is acknowledged that that this would create some intervisibility between the windows of No.57 which are at a slightly higher level, and No.59 where the neighbour has added a window in their own side extension facing the site. It is also noted that recently removed vegetation in this area has created a more open aspect. However, in the context of the original front door arrangement where there would be some loss of privacy arising from comings and goings in this area, although this would differ in the impact from a window this relationship has previously existed, and the position of the new window, which would be slightly offset from the neighbours own side window and the angle of No.57 is tapered away from No.59 to the frontage, would limit direct views. It is therefore considered reasonable in this instance and would not cause any significant loss of privacy in this context.

Recommendation:

APPROVE subject to condition(s):-

1. Drawing Numbers
2. Standard time limit
3. Matching materials
4. No further windows (north elevation)

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? Y

Case Officer: Rebekah Hincke

Date: 10.08.2026

Authorised by: Louise Prew

Date: 11/08/2026