PLANNING APPEAL STATEMENT:
147 Brighton Road, Lancing. West Sussex.BN15 8JA.

1. The appeal site is situated on level ground to the north side of the Brighton Road, which is the coast road running along south Lancing and is set amongst newly developed 3 storey flat developments.
This area would originally have consisted of detached and semi detached dwellings, although over recent years the character has somewhat changed to very large 3 storey flat complexes.
The appeal property is a detached two storey house on a plot of 12m wide and 44m depth and which is set 13m back from the highway.
It has existing parking to the front accessed from a private driveway.
The house is the sole remaining house along this section of Brighton Road being dwarfed on each side by large flat developments.
The general appearance of the street is certainly dominated by the bulky blocks of flats leaving the appeal site looking totally out of character; out of proportion to and dwarfed between two blocks.

2.The appellant has lived in this family house for some years and naturally they would have wished to enjoy many more where they have been happy.
Improvements have been completed including a two storey rear extension to enhance the use and their living accommodation.

This was all before the new developments, which has resulted in a total change in quality of life. Now sandwiched between three storey blocks of flats within close proximity they have lost natural light to principal ground floor rooms and serious over shadowing to the rear garden, resulting in flowers and shrubs dying back.

There is also a loss of privacy, where the balconies to Swinburne Court overlook the garden.
Large areas of brick walls facing the appeal site give an oppressive feeling and they also dominate the outlook as those buildings extend so far back onto the site.

In short, because the Local Authority have encouraged these developments it has resulted in 147 Brighton Road being dwarfed and has reduced the quality of life regarding loss of natural light, over shadowing, loss of privacy and has made living standards unacceptable for a family house.

3. There are other issues with regard to the adjoining developments involving ground excavation close to the appellants wall resulting in subsidence to the side wall, which could involve part demolition of no.147 in order to resolve.

4.Therefore, the considered conclusion of the appellants position, where they now have a detached house set between a mass of building is to follow the council supported developments and propose a flat development similar in style and content.
Although, the appeal site is smaller than other developments in the immediate area it none the less can satisfy a similar standard of accommodation, providing very good living space and outside amenity equal to that on the adjoining sites.

5.The proposal is in Outline for the demolition of the existing house and redevelopment with a three storey block of 9 flats, retaining the existing access with parking for 4 cars and 10 cycles spaces.

6. We have provided a design option for a three storey building, which we feel is sympathetic to the recent adjoining developments with a fresh contemporary appearance with main windows facing front and rear. With front balconies to enjoy the open seafront aspect.
All materials will be subject to approval by the council, although those suggested are complimentary to existing buildings.

7. Each flat provides good, well laid out accommodation and follows local policy recommendations.

8. There is communal amenity space to the rear of 12 x 8 metres, which we again feel is adequate for the residents and certainly comparable to that of adjoining sites.
It is important to note that residents want to live in this location not because of spacious gardens but because of the close proximity to the beach and the open space it provides. The beach and lawns are their garden and amenity.

9.As such, the appellant feels the proposal to be correct and a good form of development, having regard to all material consideration and was surprised the application was refused.

10. The councils reasons for refusal are therefore considered inappropriate and inconsistent with other recent developments and we would comment as follows.

11. The height of the proposed building is consistent with those adjoining, although in terms of being out of proportion we have little option because of what has gone before. The adjoining developments have formed this 'small island' of a site leaving no alternative.
It is considered the existing house is dwarfed and left out of proportion in the general street scene and this proposed enlargement of building helps to bridge the gap and in the context of recent developments, would not represent an over development of the site or detract from the visual amenities of the residential environment of the locality. In fact the appellant feels there would be a greater balance along this section of the Brighton Road and providing some continuity.

12. The size of the building is consistent with the bulk of other similar buildings and is certainly not cramped on site.
The main aspect is front and rear and although there are some windows to the sides these have deliberately been kept to a minimum.
The flats provide good accommodation with a mixture of one and two bedroom units, which are in great demand as low cost housing for rent or purchase.

It is important to note that while consideration was being given to this proposal, in an attempt to agree the bulk of building, it was suggested to the Planning Office that the appellant would consider the reduction in the number of flats and the height of the building, although this was rejected as not being helpful.

13. There is 8.4 metres between the rear of the new building and the bungalow to the north, which we do consider reasonable having regard to the fact the adjoining 3 storey flats have full view into all adjoining gardens including the appellants and so we feel this suggestion to be rather weak.

14. The existing vehicular access is to be retained and presently has a full 3 x 3 metres visibility splay and affords the same highway safety as other sites along Brighton Road. However, if the Highway Engineers require an adjustment or alteration to improve this the appellant would be pleased to agree.

15. This scheme has been designed to adhere with sustainability in terms of transport. The site front a main public bus route and is a short walk from a main line railway station. Shops are within close walking distance and so car use could be kept to a minimum. 10 cycle space have been allocated on site and retaining the existing 4no car parking spaces, which we feel complies with both local and central government policy. Additional on site car parking spaces could be provided but we have decided to trust the policy for sustainability in terms of transport and also retain the existing front landscaping.
However, if it is considered additional parking is necessary the appellant would agree.

16. We feel the 4no car parking spaces have adequate on site turning space to enter and leave the site in a forward gear as this is what happens now. The 4no spaces are existing and in daily use with little difficulty or detrimental to highway safety.

17. The appellant strongly feels the proposal accords with both well established and more recent planning advice issued by central government in the form of Planning Policy Guidance Notes, Circulars and Ministerial statements.
Policy guidance suggests there is always a presumption in favour of allowing applications for development, having regard to all material considerations, unless that development would have demonstrable harm to interest of acknowledged importance or unless there are sound and clear cut reasons for refusal.

In this case the appellant does not consider the councils reasons are clear or correct.

18. It is argued the proposal would be sympathetic with the scale and design of the existing developments and would not cause detriment to the residential amenities of adjoining premises or appearance of the street scene and as such, respectfully request this appeal be upheld.

.....