

Comments for Planning Application AWDM/0618/26 Reps and Consults x



planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk
to me ▾

14:07 (1 hour ago)

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 08/09/2026 2:07 PM from Mr Sean ODell.

Application Summary

Address: 7 St James Avenue Lancing West Sussex BN15 0NN

Proposal: Extension to roof incldung raised ridge line, raised front and rear gables, dormers and rooflights to both side roof slopes and two storey rear extension; single storey extension to north side. (Revised Proposal).

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:

I note that in this plan revision that the ridge height is now reduced from 1350mm to 600mm higher than the existing Ridge.

I also note that there is now an additional Dormer extension with larger windows facing directly towards the south elevation of No 9 St James (Bedroom and Bathroom)

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 600mm above the existing 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 is typically identified in appeal decisions as creating 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:

Three ground floor windows, Glazed entrance doorway, 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 of No.9 St James Avenue 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 and 2 x Windows in Dormer extension facing No. 9, creating downward and direct views into first floor windows (Bathroom, Bathroom, Kitchen, Entrance Hall and Sitting room)

Proposed Full-height glazing and double doors at first-floor level (east-facing gable), overlooking the Sun room, Rear garden and Garden room of 9 St James Avenue.

This would result in a clear and harmful loss of privacy, conflicting with the requirement under Policy 15 to protect neighbouring amenity. Even more so than the first proposal!!)

4. Harm Arising from Proximity to the Boundary

The proposed single-story extension appears to sit approximately 900mm from the shared boundary with No. 9.

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

Overshadowing and loss of light at ground floor level

Increased sense of enclosure and 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 constructed in facing brick, which establishes a consistent and coherent streetscape character.

The original proposal indicated the use of smooth cream-coloured render, I note that this has now been changed to "White" in the revision 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 and 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

Additional 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.

Conclusion

The proposal:

Conflicts 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.
