Development Management - Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/0941/12 **Recommendation – Refuse**

Site: **80 Crabtree Lane, Lancing, West Sussex, BN15 9PJ**

Proposal: **Retrospective application for the erection of a single storey extension for food storage and preparation**

Date of site visit: 15 August 2012

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

The application relates to a commercial property (pizza takeaway) within a parade of shops/takeaways in Crabtree Lane. Retrospective permission is sought to retain a single storey extension at the rear which measures 4.44m wide, 2.7m tall and 2.81m deep. It has been constructed of plywood, stained orange/brown with polycarbonate roof sheeting. It has a lower element at its eastern end. The extension is used for food preparation and as a freezer storage area.

The rear of the premises is accessed off Second Avenue via a service road which serves a number of garages at the rear of dwellings and shops in Crabtree Lane and Second Avenue.

Relevant site history

None relevant

Consultations

Adur & Worthing Councils: The Environmental Health Officer has no adverse comments

Lancing Parish Council: No objections but concerned that this was another retrospective application.

Representations

1 letter received from the occupier of 13 Crabtree Arcade querying whether the proposal was for another extension (in addition to what was already there).

Relevant Planning Policies

Adopted Adur District Local Plan 1993-2006 (ADC 1996) (saved policies): AG1, AS1
South East Plan (GOSE 2009): CC1, CC6, BE1
National Planning Policy Framework (CLG 2012)

Planning Assessment

Principle

The site lies within a local shopping centre and Policy AS1 of the Adur District Local Plan supports applications for extensions to such premises provided, among others, that there is no loss of amenity to nearby residents and the development is of a scale and design, including construction materials, which are appropriate to the locality.

Visual amenity

The extension is unattractive and has no architectural or design merit. It has a temporary appearance and its external finish and use of materials does not match the original building. While it is not a prominent structure, and can only be glimpsed between other extensions and outbuildings at adjoining properties when viewed from the service road, its design and use of materials is inappropriate and should not be encouraged. Granting consent would set a precedent for future extensions to follow and the application should therefore be refused on visual amenity grounds.

Residential amenity

The extension fills much of the small yard at the rear of the premises and is very close to the angled boundary with 13 Crabtree Parade to the north west. That property is divided into 2 flats and the ground floor flat has a window which looks out onto the side of the extension. It is considered that the relationship with the adjoining flat is poor and restricts the outlook for the occupiers of the flat, as well as forming a rather overbearing structure.

The property to the east is also in commercial use and has its own rear extension which is not affected by this development.

The use of the extension for food preparation was considered to be unsatisfactory but the Council's EHO has no adverse comments to make.

Conclusion

For the reasons outlined above, the application should be refused and enforcement action authorised to secure the removal of the unauthorised extension.

Recommendation

REFUSE for the reasons:-

1. The extension, by reason of its design and inappropriate use of construction materials, forms an unsympathetic and unsightly addition which is out of keeping with the appearance of the existing building and which detracts from the visual amenities of the locality, contrary to saved policies AG1 and AS1 of the Adur District Local Plan.

2. Having regard to the limited area of the site and its relationship to adjoining residential properties, the extension has given rise to an unneighbourly and overbearing form of development which is detrimental to the residential amenities of the occupiers of 13 Crabtree Arcade. The extension is therefore contrary to saved policies AG1 and AS1 of the Adur District Local Plan

Is recommendation contrary to letter(s) of representation? N

Case Officer: Peter Barnett Date: 25 September 2012

Authorised by: Jo Morin Date: 25 September 2012