Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: **Recommendation – APPROVE**
AWDM/0963/13

Site: **128A Brighton Road**

Proposal: **Single storey rear extension**

Neighbours checked: Y
Additional neighbour notifications: /N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

The proposal is for a single storey flat roof rear/side extension and new external staircase to side to measure (at max) 5.5 metres in height, 7.9 metres in length, and 7.4 metres in width,

The application property is a two-storey inter-war building with rendered walls and quoining. It has been subdivided into flats. The ground floor of the main building and the single storey 'annex' to its side contains one of the flats. Access to this flat is from the front door facing Brighton Road. The rest of the building is put over to the applicant's own flat and access to this flat is from an external staircase on the west side of the building.

The height of the land is raised at the rear as an embankment to Widewater Lagoon. This means the back rooms of the ground floor flat depend on light wells positioned in the rear garden patio of the first floor flat. The surrounding area is an outer residential area of Lancing.

Relevant Planning History
AWDM/1334/12
Rear and side extension with a pitched roof to flat roof conversion
Refused 04/01/2013
Appeal Dismissed 20/06/2013

Consultations
Lancing Parish Council: No objection

Representations
None

Relevant Planning Policies and Guidance
Adur Local Plan (saved policies): AG1, AH7
National Planning Policy Framework

Planning Assessment
Principle

Upgrading of residential accommodation is acceptable in principle

Visual amenity

The extension is very subservient in its scale to the main building and not disproportionate as the original form of the building would remain identifiable. The exterior materials and finishes of the extension would match those of the rear elevation of the main house. Its flat roof would sit roughly at the same height as the eaves of the main building. The part of this visible from Brighton Road would be set well back from the street.

For these reasons insufficient visual harm arises as to warrant refusal.

Residential amenity

This application property has been extended into two self-contained flats, and it is the neighbouring occupier of this flat who is principally impacted upon by the proposal. However some impact would be experienced by those neighbours to either side also.

Occupier of ground floor flat

One of the flats consists of the ground floor of the main building and the single storey 'annexe' to the side of the building. Access to this flat is from the front door facing Brighton Road. The rest of the building is put over to the applicant's own flat and access to this flat is from an external staircase on the west side of the building.

The change in level of the land means that the back rooms of the ground floor flat depend on light wells positioned at the rear patio in the applicant's rear garden. The proposed extension would build over one of these. However this room is not presently used as any sort of habitable space. It is a store room and in a poor condition. The second light well serves a kitchen. The outlook from this would be reduced by the extension. However the outlook from this room is already compromised and extremely limited so there is not an expectation by the neighbor to reply upon this outlook . The principal living spaces of the ground floor flat are located at the front onto Brighton Road and within the side annexe. The rest of the extension is physically off from the shared boundaries, so there would be no material loss of light and outlook onto this neighbor as a result, and adverse overbearing and overshadowing would be avoided.

There would be a greater propensity for overlooking from the larger balcony. However there is currently little privacy afforded to the rear garden of this neighbour as the existing terrace is at a greater height allowing for invasive overlooking. Against this existing situation, the degree of additional loss of privacy would not be materially harmful to the amenities of this neighbor.

A purported letter of support for the proposal has been received from the occupier of the ground floor flat via the applicant's planning agent.

Neighbours to either side

The extension would be physically off from the shared boundaries with these neighbours, so any resultant overbearing and overshadowing would not be adverse.

The enlarged balcony would afford the applicant more views of the neighbours' gardens. However these gardens are open with mutual overlooking offering occupier's little privacy at present. Against this, the additional reduction in privacy from the balcony would not be harmful. Windows to principal light sources are absent in the side walls of both buildings to either side are absent, so views into neighbours private habitable rooms from the balcony would be oblique and not invasive.

The new staircase would result in some disturbance and noise. However this replaces an existing external staircase, so the level of activity would be no worse than at present.

Recommendation

APPROVE for the reason:-

The proposed development would not detract from the local environment including the identified Heritage Assets and can take place without resulting in unacceptable detriment to the amenities of neighbouring properties and/or highway safety. It would consequently not conflict with 'saved' policies of the Adur Local Plan AG1 and AH7 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Subject to Conditions:-

1. Standard time limit
2. Approved plans
3. Exterior materials/finishes to match
4. No window/openings in flanks 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 any representations? N
Case Officer signed: Matthew Porter Date: 24-9-2013
Authorised and signed by: Peter Barnett Date: 24 September 2013