

Development Management – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/0416/26

Recommendation: – APPROVE

Site: 8 Marshall Avenue Worthing West Sussex BN14 0ES

Proposal: Proposed front porch, single storey rear extension, raised patio, and demolition of a chimney.

Date of Site Visit: 02/06/2026

Neighbours Checked: Y

Additional Neighbours Notified:

Site and Surroundings

The site is located on the northern side of Marshall Avenue in Findon Valley. The property has a large two storey detached building with a driveway to the east and parking to the front. The property has already undergone a number of alterations including a first floor side extension and additions of outbuildings.

The neighbouring property to the west (no.10) of the site has a single storey rear extension to approximately 5m with a conservatory off that further to the rear. The neighbour to the east (no.6) has a garage to the side and rear of the site on the western boundary shared with the application site.

There is sufficient space for car parking within the site. There is also on street parking available throughout Findon Valley. With the size of the properties along Marshall Avenue there are a number of varying styles including properties with porches and rear extensions of varying scales.

Proposal

The application relates to the introduction of a single storey extension to the rear of the site extending their current galley kitchen.

The rear extension is proposed to measure approx. 4.1m depth, due to the sloping plot with the western side being higher than the eastern side the maximum eaves height (on the east) would be 3.5m. 6.5m is retained to the boundary on the eastern side where the neighbouring property has a garage. 1.6m is retained to the boundary on the western side.

In addition, there is proposed to be a patio to the rear of the site the existing patio will be extended to run the full width of the house.

The other aspect of the proposal relates to the introduction of a front porch. The front porch has a depth of 1.8m with a width of 2.2m. The roof of which will be pitched and overhang the front elevation of the porch by 0.85m creating a total depth to the front of the site of 2.65m. The pitch height proposed is at 3.3m with an eaves at 2.4m.

Relevant Planning History:

AWDM/0730/25 - Proposed front porch, single storey rear extension and demolition of a chimney.

STATUS: Application Permitted 31st July 2025.

The scheme proposes alterations to the application previously proposed. The porch remains the same but the rear extension would be wider and the patio extended.

Neighbour Representations

None

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:

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

Due to the nature of the application it will be visible from within the street scene with a front porch.

The front porch was previously approved with the following discussion: "The front porch will be screened from view due to the boundary treatment to the front and side of the site being formed of mature shrubbery. The scale of the porch is also considered to be subservient to the host property at single storey with a relatively small footprint increase. Whilst the shrubbery to the front of the site could be removed, due to the scale, it is not considered that a small lobby and front porch would be visually obtrusive and result in an out of character appearance. As such the front porch is considered to be acceptable in terms of visual amenity."

The enlarged rear extension by virtue of its location would not be visible from within the wider locality. In addition to this the wider area has a number of single storey rear extensions creating a wide array of differing alterations which would ensure that the introduction of a rear extension would not be out of character.

The loss of the chimney would result in an impact on the visual amenity of the property. However, it is not considered that it would be detrimental to the visual amenity due to the wide variety of property types and styles. The retention of a chimney on the western side ensures that there is still some of the characteristics preserved. Overall, there would not be a significant impact to the visual amenity of the area and would be acceptable.

Matching materials can be conditioned to ensure the extensions complement the existing building.

As such it is considered that overall, the proposed development would still be acceptable in terms of visual amenity.

Residential Amenity

As previously, the front porch, due to the location is not considered to impact the amenity of the neighbouring properties. This is due to the separation of the property from the neighbours to the east and west.

The proposed extension to the rear by virtue of its location will have an impact on both properties to the side but with the topography a greater impact on the property to the east. This neighbour (No.6) will be impacted by the proposed development due to the sloping topography with the west of the site being higher than the east. As such the neighbour to the east will be the more affected. With the existing arrangement and relationship between the properties and the buildings on the boundary there would not be any significant overbearing impact on the neighbour. This paired with the separation distance would ensure that there is no oppressive feeling created from the extension. The windows within the proposed extension will face the rear and one to face the side of No.6. As previously expressed, the flank elevation is blocked by a single storey garage that will ensure that there is no demonstrable overlooking created by the proposal.

The increase in width would bring the extension to within 1.6m of the boundary, compared to 7 metres previously. The impact on the neighbour to the west would be mitigated by their own rear extension and the boundary treatment which would block the views onto the proposed extension. The proposed extension does not project within 45 degrees of the centre of a neighbouring window. As such with the topography and the existing arrangement there is not considered to be any unacceptable impact that arises from the proposed development on the neighbour to the west. There would be no overlooking achieved on this neighbour due to the omission of windows within the western elevation of the proposed extension.

The sliding doors and windows to the rear of the extension would provide views over the applicant's rear garden and as such would not overlook the neighbouring property. There is a large garden to the rear with mature shrubbery that would protect any views to the properties to the rear.

Due to the extending of the existing patio, there is the potential for some overlooking on the neighbouring properties to either side. To the west the mature boundary screening and topography ensure that the views from the patio would not be directly into the habitable rooms of the neighbours or to their amenity space. To the east the main extension would be closer to the house where the views are blocked by the neighbours outbuilding. To the rear the width of the patio is increasing into the garden but does not seem to be increasing in height resulting in no adverse overlooking.

As such the proposed development is considered to be acceptable in terms of residential amenity and compliant with Policy DM5 of the Worthing Local Plan.

Recommendation:

APPROVE subject to condition(s):-

1. Drawing Numbers
2. Standard time limit
3. Matching materials
4. No 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

Case Officer: Finlay Gardner Date: 11/06/2026

Authorised by: Louise Prew Date: 16/06/2026