Mrs Brenda Foster (owner and occupier)
92 Brighton Road
Lancing
West Sussex
BN15 8LW

10th November 2023

Hannah Barker,
Planning Department,
Adur & Worthing Councils,
Worthing Town Hall,
Chapel Road,
Worthing,
West Sussex,
BN11 1HA,

Your Ref: AWDM/1041/23 – 90 Brighton Road, Lancing, West Sussex, BN15 8LW
Roof extension and rear dormer to form 2nd floor and sub-division of the building to create 2no. 3 storey dwelling houses.

The above amended development proposal has only made minor adjustments and is still considered unacceptable. We reiterate all objections documented in our previous letter dated 11th August 2023, which remain unaddressed. It is apparent that there are still no provisions proposed for parking or storage and no proposed changes to reduce the scale of the development or improve the architectural appearance to the proposed front and rear façades so that it is in-keeping with the existing property.

The only apparent amendment to the proposed development appears to be the substitution of the proposed rear roof balconies with frameless glass Juliette balconies and a small reduction in the depth of the proposed extension. The removal of the balconies is considered an improvement to the previous proposals. However, the single-story extension is still not considered acceptable as it will be overbearing and will still reduce the daylight to the existing garden and sunroom to the adjoining property. In addition, the large, glazed dormer windows will directly overlook the small adjoining garden. The proposed living rooms, appear to have large sliding doors which when open have the potential to cause unacceptable noise levels to the adjoining property.

We note that the Environment Agency's letter dated 14th September 2023 indicates that no habitable rooms are permitted on the ground floor. The proposed development currently indicated an 8.2m2 study and 10.8m2 gym to the adjoining property and 16.9m2 gym and 9.4m2 study to the proposed end terrace. The development proposal also indicated a bathroom to the ground floor in both proposed properties. It is apparent that there is no single legal definition of a habitable room. However, The Town and Country Planning Regulations states that a "habitable room" means any room used or intended to be used for sleeping or living which are not solely used for cooking purpose, but does not include bath or toilet facilities, service rooms, corridors, laundry rooms, hallways or utility rooms. It appears that the proposed study rooms and gyms are rooms designed for occupancy and intended for habitable purposes. With the close proximity of the proposed bathrooms, these rooms could also easily be used as bedrooms. The naming of the rooms will have no bearing on the actual use and intended occupancy of future owners. It is clear that the rooms are designed for multi-function living purposes. The proposed layout appears not to be in accordance

with the Environment Agency's stipulation not to have habitable rooms to the ground floor. We believe the layout of the ground floor should be designed to accommodate the required parking and storage facilities, as necessary to comply with Adur Council's planning policy requirements.

In addition to the objections raised in our letter dated 11th August 2023, the rear extension and dormers are clearly not in accordance with Adur District Council Development Management Standard No. 1 or 2, as set out below.

Development Management Standard No. 1 – Space Around New Dwellings & Flats

DMS1 states that the policy is largely aimed at the provision of dwelling houses and flats on small infill and redevelopment sites. Therefore, we believe the policy is applicable for the proposed development of the additional new dwelling house. The policy objective seeks to ensure good design in all developments and ensure the retention of adequate privacy for and daylight to existing dwellings. Clause 2.2 states that proposals will not be granted planning permission if they have an unacceptable adverse effect on neighbouring properties. We seek planning permission is not granted for the following reasons:

- Privacy - the proposal will result in direct overlooking of the adjacent garden area. The small cottage style garden has limited space and any loss of privacy will have a significant detrimental impact on the quiet enjoyment of the garden by Mrs Foster.
- Daylight – the proposal will reduce daylight to the adjoining neighbouring property garden and sunroom. We seek that the 45 deg. 'rule of thumb' guide is applied in accordance with DMS1, clause 2.12, from the sunroom window to the proposed adjoining building. The diagram clearly indicates that dwellings should not project significantly beyond the rear of adjoining dwellings. Furthermore, we seek that the 'building line' is maintained in accordance with DMS1, clause 3.9, to avoid overshadowing of the garden to the adjoining property.
- Outlook – the small cottage style garden to the adjoining property will be dominated by the proposed rear extension, which is proposed on the boundary line and will extend to nearly half the depth of the existing garden. The extension will be higher than the rear flat roof to the adjoining property and considered overbearing and oppressive. Therefore, we consider the proposed extension completely unacceptable. DMS1 states that a proposed rear extension should normally allow the retention of a rear garden of at least 11m depth. The existing garden to the semi-detached property is only approximately 7m deep. The proposed extension to the boundary is 3m deep leaving only 4m depth for the garden. This is clearly way below the required 11m standard. DMS1, Appendix 1, states that the Council's requirement for rear gardens for dwellings is 50m2 for 2-bedroom terrace dwellings. The proposed adjoining garden is 21.5m2 and the proposed new end terrace garden is 20.5m2. Both gardens are significantly below the Council's requirements (less than half the required area has been proposed).

Development Management Standard No. 2 – Extension and Alterations to Dwellings

DMS2 states that side extensions being clearly visible from the road should be designed to closely match the existing dwelling. In particular, they should have a roof in keeping with the existing dwelling. The proposed development appears to have a total disregard to the Council's planning policy requirements. The proposed development is not considered acceptable as it does not retain the hip end roof, which is required to maintain the architectural style and symmetry to the front façade.

The proposed two rear dormers are linked / joined together and over-dominate the dwelling resulting in a top heavy “box-like” appearance, which is indicated as unacceptable in DMS2, clause 3.11. DMS2 also states that the dormers should also be kept well below the ridge level of the existing roof and should not project as far as the walls of the house. In addition, a large amount of the original roof should still be clearly visible. The flat roof to the proposed linked dormers is proposed level with the existing ridge and the proposed solar panels higher than the existing ridge, which is unacceptable. In addition, only a slither of the existing roof is maintained either side of the linked dormers. It is clear that the existing roof space is of inadequate size to accommodate the proposed rooms without adding the proposed very large flat-roofed dormers. The design of the proposed dormers are considered unacceptable and we believe planning permission should not be granted.

DMS clause 3.12 indicates that proposed dormers should be similar in style and proportion to those on the original dwelling. As the property is an older-style, smaller hipped or gable roofed dormers would be more preferred than the current proposed large flat roofed dormers.

We thank you for taking the time to consider our further objections and trust that Adur District Council will continue to act in the best interest of the district’s residents and environment in assessing this application.

Yours Sincerely



Mark Foster MRICS

For and on behalf of Mrs Foster