

Comments for Planning Application AWDM/0618/26

Reps and Consults



planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk

09:05 (7 hours ago)

to me

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

Planning Application comments have been made. A summary of the comments is provided below.

Comments were submitted at 15/06/2026 9:05 AM from Mr Sean ODell.

Application Summary

Address:	7 St James Avenue Lancing West Sussex BN15 0NN
Proposal:	Raising of roof eaves and ridge to include front and rear gables and a dormer to south roofslope; two storey rear extension; single storey extension to north side.
Case Officer:	Marie O'Keeffe

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Name:	Mr Sean ODell
Email:	
Address:	9 St James Avenue Lancing West Sussex

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	- Design - Loss of General Amenity - Overdevelopment - Privacy Light and Noise
Comments:	Planning Application Reference: AWDM/0618/26 Address: 7 St James Avenue, Lancing.

Whilst recognising that homeowners are entitled to improve and extend their properties, I write to formally object to the above application on the grounds that it would cause material planning harm, conflicting with the Adur Local Plan (2017), particularly Policy 15 (Quality of the Built Environment and Design), and

established BRE guidance on daylight and sunlight.

1. Excessive Scale, Massing and Overbearing Impact (Policy 15)

Policy 15 requires development to respect the scale, height, massing and proportions of neighbouring properties.

The proposal introduces:

A ridge height increase of approximately 1350mm above the existing roof.

A roof design from a small square Hip roof to a large Box Gable roof.

A roof length extending from 6,650mm to approximately 13,000mm.

This represents a substantial and disproportionate increase in bulk, resulting in a building that would appear over dominant and overbearing when viewed from No. 9 St James Avenue.

Such a form of development will create an unacceptable enclosure and visual dominance, contrary to Policy 15.

2. Material Loss of Daylight and Sunlight (Policy 15 & BRE Guidance)

The proposal would significantly reduce light reaching the south-facing elevation of No. 9, affecting:

The ground floor windows.

Glazed entrance doorway and side lights.

First floor bathroom and bedroom windows.

These are primary light sources serving habitable rooms, and the impact is therefore significant.

In line with BRE guidance (Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight - BR209), the scale and proximity of the development is likely to result in:

A breach of the 45-degree rule.

A material reduction in daylight and sunlight.

Increased sense of enclosure, particularly to a south-facing elevation which is most sensitive to obstruction.

This represents clear and demonstrable harm to residential amenity, contrary to Policy 15.

3. Unacceptable Overlooking and Loss of Privacy (Policy 15)

The proposal introduces:

Roof lights facing No. 9, creating views into the ground floor and first floor windows

Full-height glazing and double doors at first-floor level (east-facing gable), overlooking:

Sun room, Rear garden and Garden room of 9 St James Ave.

This would result in a clear and harmful loss of privacy, conflicting with the requirement under Policy 15 to protect neighbouring amenity.

4. Harm Arising from Proximity to the Boundary

The proposed single-storey extension appears to sit approximately 900mm from the shared boundary with No. 9 St James Ave.

Due to its proximity, the development is likely to result in:

Overshadowing and loss of light at ground floor level.

Increased sense of enclosure.

Visual intrusion.

These impacts further contribute to the overall harm and raise concerns regarding compliance with Policy 15 and accepted design standards.

5. Inappropriate Materials and Harm to Character (Policy 15)

Policy 15 also requires development to use materials that are appropriate to the

local context and contribute positively to the character of the area.

The existing property at No. 7 and neighbouring dwellings, including No. 9, are predominately constructed in facing brick, which establishes a consistent and coherent streetscape character.

The proposal indicates the use of smooth cream-coloured render, which would represent a marked and incongruous departure from the prevailing material palette.

This would:

Disrupt the visual continuity of the street scene.

Result in a development that appears out of keeping with its surroundings.

Fail to respond positively to local character.

Such a contrast in materials, particularly when combined with the increased scale and massing, would exacerbate the visual harm and conflicts with Policy 15.

6. Cumulative Impact and Planning Balance

The combined impact of:

Increased ridge height and roof mass.

Loss of daylight and sunlight.

Overlooking and loss of privacy.

Boundary proximity impacts.

Incongruous materials.

results in a development that causes significant and demonstrable harm to residential amenity and local character.

There are no apparent public benefits that would outweigh this harm.

7. Conclusion

The proposal seems to conflict with Policy 15 of the Adur Local Plan (2017).

Fails to accord with BRE daylight and sunlight guidance.

Results in material harm to residential amenity.

Introduces inappropriate materials that harm the character of the area.

Represents overdevelopment of the site.

For these reasons, I respectfully request that planning permission be refused.
