Development Management - Delegated Officer Report – Site Notes

Application: AWDM/0187/17 **Recommendation – Approve**

Site: **16 The Haven**
Brighton Road
Lancing

Proposal: **Retention of replacement white uPVC bi-fold doors to balcony to second floor on rear (south) elevation (retrospective)**

Date of site visit: 21.03.17

Neighbours checked: Yes

Additional neighbour notifications: No

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

The Haven is a block of 28 flats facing Brighton Road and the rear faces south towards Lancing seafront. Flat 16 is on the top (second) floor and the balcony is on the rear elevation. It is recessed and originally had replacement uPVC sliding patio doors. These have been replaced with a 3-section set of bi-fold doors in white uPVC. Flats do not have permitted development rights and therefore planning permission should have been sought.

Relevant site history

None

Consultations

Parish: No objection

Representations

Several representations from third parties have been received consisting of:

6 objections on the grounds that the doors are unsympathetic and not in keeping with other doors and the overall design and appearance of the building.

6 in support stating that the doors are a modern addition and there is currently a mixture of doors and windows on the rear elevation and the doors do not detract from it and are hardly noticeable from the beach.

Relevant Government Legislation and Guidance

National Planning Policy Framework (CLG 2012)
Saved Adur Local Plan Policies: AG1, AH7

Planning Assessment

There is a mixture of replacement windows and doors on the rear elevation of The Haven. In addition some rear balconies are enclosed and some are open and recessed; flat 16 is the latter and therefore the doors are set back into the recess.

When the flat is viewed from the car parking area immediately behind the building, the doors are not visible from ground level due to being on the second floor. When viewed from the rear boundary of the site, they are visible and again from further back nearer the beach, they are still visible but from a distance. Most of the recessed balconies appear to have either the original aluminium sliding patio doors or replacement white uPVC, both with a single central division.

The bi-fold doors have two divisions and it could be argued that they are different and therefore out of keeping with the rest of the building. However, the rear elevation is not completely uniform with various original and replacement windows and doors. In addition, the doors are not readily visible from public viewpoints being in a recess and on the second floor. When standing back and viewing the building as a whole, it is considered that their appearance does not seriously detract from the design of the rear elevation and therefore there is insufficient reason to substantiate refusal of the application.

Recommendation

APPROVE:

Conditions:

1. **Drawings**
2. **Standard time limit**

Case Officer: Sarah Crease Date: 4th April 2017

Authorised by: Gary Peck Date: 5 April 2017