



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 September 2025

by **Martin Andrews MA(Planning) BSc(Econ) DipTP & DipTP(Dist) MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20 October 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/C3810/D/25/3370950

50 Ocean Drive, Ferring, Worthing, West Sussex BN12 5QP

- 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 Steven Ballard against the decision of Arun District Council.
 - The application Ref. is FG/46/25/HH.
 - The development proposed is two storey side, rear, and front extensions; enlargement of existing rear, west, dormer; demolition of detached outbuilding.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for two storey side, rear, and front extensions; enlargement of existing west (rear) dormer; demolition of detached outbuilding at 50 Ocean Drive, Ferring, Worthing, West Sussex BN12 5QP in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref. FG/46/25/HH and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions.
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this Decision;
 - 2) Prior to the commencement of groundwork, the details of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall be first submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority;
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Location Plan; Drawing No. 01: Existing Floor Plans; Drawing No. 02: Existing Elevations and Section; Drawing No. 03: Proposals (Floor Plans); Drawing No. FG/0D/04: Proposals: Elevations & Roof Plan; Site Plan with annotations;
 - 4) The first-floor windows in the southern flank wall shall be obscure glazed and / or non-openable below 1.7m above the finished internal floor level, in accordance with details first submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The windows shall thereafter be permanently retained in that form.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling, the street scene of Ocean Drive, and the wider area.

Reasons

3. The Council's Notice of Refusal refers to the appeal scheme as dominating and subsuming the host dwelling contrary to Policies D DM1 and Policy D DM4 of the Arun Local Plan 2011- 2031 ('the Local Plan') adopted 2018. Of particular relevance in this appeal is Item 'b' of Policy D DM4, which requires an extension or alteration to be visually subservient to the main building. Item 'a' of the policy also requires the development to sympathetically relate to and be visually integrated with the existing building in siting, massing, design, form, scale, and materials.
4. At present the host dwelling is of a bespoke design and modest size, referred to in the Officer's Report as one of the small original chalet style properties of the estate which have an Arts and Craft architectural styling. The 1925 construction date of the building slightly post-dates that period, but be that as it may, the proposed tall and narrow gable of the front extension with its apex higher than the existing ridge, together with the comparatively large scale of the side and rear extensions would significantly change the character and appearance of the dwelling.
5. On this basis, the Council's objection under Policy D DM4b) would ostensibly appear sound, but if weight is given to the overall thrust and objectives of the Local Plan policies, and indeed Government policy in Section 12: 'Achieving Well-Designed Places' of the National Planning Policy Framework ('the Framework'), I consider that there remains the scope for alterations and additions to change the character and appearance of the host dwelling more fundamentally.
6. This potential applies to smaller buildings, as is the case here, but with important provisos for the design to be of a good quality and the scale of the altered building not to draw the eye as a jarring feature in the road. In this appeal I do not see a harmful conflict with items 'a' or 'b' of Policy D DM4 or indeed item 'e' which says that the extensions or alterations should not compromise the established spatial character and pattern of the place but instead be a positive addition. I consider that this includes not having the effect of negating any positive contribution already made by the appearance of adjacent and nearby dwellings through an alteration of their setting because of the development.
7. In particular, I have come to this view of the acceptability of non-compliance with item 'b' of Policy D DM4 because, as the appellant's grounds of appeal explain and illustrate, a substantial number of other dwellings in the locality, many of them originally holiday properties, have been significantly enlarged through permissions given by the Council. And whilst older original houses such as No. 50 Ocean Drive remain largely as built, from the appellant's information and a tour around the locality including South Drive as part of my visit, it is clear that the original character and appearance of the area has indeed evolved to a significant extent.
8. The cumulative effect of these changes is that the appeal scheme would also meet the requirement of Policy D DM1 for the scale of development to keep within the general confines of the overall character of the locality. In essence, there is clearly a noticeable absence of uniformity as regards both the size and design of many of the dwellings, and the proposals for No. 50 would be no more and no less than a further example.
9. Nor are there any site-specific reasons to prevent this. The Council's correct assessment of the existing '*sense of spaciousness with visual gaps at first floor level around the property*' allows the changes to occur but still leaving sufficient

space to Nos. 46 and 44a to the north and rearwards to the west. The proposal does increase the built form in the much smaller gap to No. 52 to the south, but the proposed extensions would not extend a significant distance beyond the rear elevation of this neighbouring dwelling.

10. Overall, on this issue I find that the proposed alterations and additions, which includes the replacement of unsightly flat roofed extensions, would not draw the eye as being out of keeping with the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the street scene of Ocean Drive and the wider area, including South Drive. Furthermore, I regard the design as being visually coherent and at least of comparable quality to the many other extensions and alterations already approved by the Council. Accordingly, whilst there would be a technical conflict with item 'b' of Local Plan Policy D DM4, when the relevant Local Plan and Government Framework policies are taken as a whole, I consider that the appeal scheme is acceptable.

Other Matter

11. The Officer's Report has examined in some detail the effect of the alterations and extensions to No. 50 on the 'residential amenity' of neighbours but has concluded that the appeal scheme would not unacceptably harm their living conditions as regards outlook, light and privacy. I agree with this finding as the scale of the extended building, its proximity to boundaries, fenestration and size of the plot / rear garden would be similar to many other dwellings in Ocean Drive and South Drive.
12. I have read the objections to the application on these grounds but concur with the Council's analysis and conclusion that *'overall, the proposed development would not result in significant harm to neighbouring properties in terms of overbearing, overshadowing, or overlooking impacts'*. The dwellings to the north and west are sufficiently distant not to be materially affected. As regards No. 52, the closest dwelling to the south, because the side extension would be to the north there would be little if any loss of light, whilst the altered fenestration would in fact improve the privacy for those occupiers compared to the existing situation.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons explained above and having had regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is allowed. A condition requiring the Council's approval of the external materials will safeguard visual amenity, whilst a condition requiring the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans will avoid doubt and is in the interests of proper planning. Finally, a condition securing the restriction of views from the south side windows will confine any overlooking to windows at the rear, which is the normal situation in linear suburban development as exhibited in Ocean Drive.

Martin Andrews

INSPECTOR