

Expiry: 16/7

Development Management - Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWD/0388/26

Recommendation – Approve

Site: 22 Cecil Road, Lancing

**Proposal: Two storey side extension, single storey rear extension.
Dormer to extended rear roof and rooflights.**

Date of site visit: 19/6

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

This application relates to a detached house with fully pitched roof and set back double width garage on its north side. It presents with a narrow elevation to the road with its deeper south elevation and front door obscured by a 1970's block of two storey flats. To the north and attached to the site's garages is a late Victorian two storey end of terrace house with rendered finish. Opposite are more elaborate Edwardian red brick houses with decorative double storey square bays and gabled roofs.

The site is not in a conservation area and is not a listed building. There are no TPO's on the site and the site is not associated with any known flood risk.

Permission is sought to add a two storey side extension in place of the garages and a rear roof extension. A flat roofed single storey rear extension is also proposed with a maximum depth of 6 metres.

The application has been revised since first submitted to pull the extension off the north boundary by a further 200mm ensuring a 1 metre gap. The original roof is unaltered and the two storey extension, set back from the frontage, maintains the existing eaves line with a lower ridge line. The rear dormer is reduced in size. The rear extension has been reduced in depth to 2.7 metres closest to No. 20. North facing bi fold doors have been removed.

Relevant Planning History

L/223/04/TP - Enlargement & conversion of House into 3 self-contained flats (including extension on north side & additional storey with raised roof).
Refused.

L/75/04/TP - Conversion of dwellinghouse to 3 self-contained flats with north-side extension & roof alterations. Withdrawn.

Expiry: 16/7

Consultations

Lancing Parish Council:

It was RESOLVED: that, having considered the new information presented, including confirmation that the plans considered during the previous determination of the application were incorrect, the Council objects to the application. The objection is made on the grounds that the proposal constitutes an overdevelopment of the site, would have an unacceptable adverse impact on the amenities of neighbouring properties, is out of keeping with the character and appearance of the street scene, and would place additional pressure on parking provision in Cecil Road.

Southern Water: No objection.

Environmental Health: Precautionary contamination condition.

Highways:

This proposal is a new roof with raised eaves and ridge and rear dormer. Two storey side extension, single storey rear extension. The site is located on Cecil Road, an unclassified road subject to a speed restriction of 30 mph.

No alterations are proposed to the existing access arrangement. The proposed development is not anticipated to give rise to a material intensification of use of the existing access point.

A single-bay garage will be lost as part of the proposals. This would result in a loss of 0.5 car parking provision as garages are considered 0.5 car parking spaces under WSCC Parking Standards. An existing driveway is to be retained with provision for two cars.

The WSCC Car Parking Demand Calculator indicates that a dwelling of this size and location would require three car parking spaces. As such, any overspill parking would have to be accommodated on-street. There are parking restrictions in place that prohibit vehicles from parking in places that would be detrimental to highway safety. So, whilst no highway safety concerns would be raised in regards to the shortfall in parking provision, the LPA are advised to consider the potential impacts on on-street parking from an amenity point of view.

The LHA does not consider that this proposal would have an unacceptable impact on highway safety or result in 'severe' cumulative impacts on the operation of the highway network, therefore is not contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework (paragraph 116), and that there are no transport grounds to resist the proposal.

Representations

Objections received to revised proposal from owner of No. 20 and their architect representative as follows:

1. The business is registered to this address. There is concern that it will be used as a 5 bed HMO.
2. Removing a garage and maintaining existing parking levels to an extended 5 bed house will increase parking pressures locally.
3. The Council should verify all submitted plans and measurements before making a decision.
4. The scheme is similar in height and mass to one refused in 2004 but includes a single storey extension.
5. The plans are inaccurate or incomplete including the omission of neighbouring windows that are relevant to assessing overlooking and loss of light.
6. Loss of light to rear dining room, breaks 45 degree line to neighbours dining room, failure to comply with BRE guidelines.
7. Extension appears disproportionate to the size and form of the original dwelling; excessive scale, bulk and massing.
8. Construction traffic will worsen noise and congestion
9. Design out of character with the established Victorian terrace streetscape.
10. Overbearing impact due to the scale, height and proximity of the extension.
11. Loss of privacy through overlooking from new first-floor windows.
12. Request that any side windows be conditioned as obscure-glazed and fixed shut below a specified height if approval is granted.
13. Loss of privacy from the proposed rear dormer and any associated windows.
14. Bulky and visually intrusive rear dormer that dominates the existing roof slope.
15. Overshadowing of the rear garden, reducing enjoyment and usability of outdoor amenity space.
16. Underground WW2 bomb shelter located in back garden of 22 Cecil Road.
17. Possible sense of enclosure created by a long or high boundary wall close to neighbouring property.
18. Bi folds adjoining No.20's garden, east and north facing, would intensify use of this rear part of No. 22 and are likely to increase noise, disturbance and activity directly beside No. 20's private amenity space. These serve a substantially enlarged living space and would create a more intensive relationship between the two properties.
19. The applicant's revised submission does not appear to include a daylight/sunlight assessment or any assessment of the impact of the proposed folding/sliding doors on the amenity of No. 20.

Original objections from No. 20 and on their behalf and from a resident of 3 Burghley Court. These objections are summarised as follows:

1. Raised roofline imposing
2. Overbearing in terms of height, depth and proximity to boundaries
3. Loss of parking will increase local parking stresses
4. Hugely disruptive in terms of noise, dust and deliveries.
5. Loss of light to rear of No. 20

Expiry: 16/7

6. Excessive scale, bulk and massing, disproportionate to original house
7. Out of character in the Victorian streetscene
8. Overlooking from new first floor windows and dormer
9. Side windows must be obscurely glazed and non-opening below 1.7m
10. Overshadowing of rear garden
11. Rear dormer excessively bulky and visually intrusive
12. Loss of fruit trees
13. Rear garden bomb shelter should be investigated.

Relevant Planning Policies

Adur Local Plan 2017 Policies 1, 2, 15, 28, 34 and 35
'Supplementary Planning Guidance' comprising: Development Management
Standard No.2 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings'
National Planning Policy Framework (December 2024)

Planning Assessment

Principle

The proposal involves upgrading the existing housing stock located within the built up area and can be supported in principle. The relevant issues are the effects on the amenities of neighbouring residential occupiers and the effect on the character and appearance of the dwelling and its surroundings.

Visual amenity

The two storey side extension is now 1 metre off the side boundary. It has the same front wall position as the existing garages on site, a set back of 1200mm from the main front wall. It follows the existing eaves line but has a lower ridge height.

The extension is wider than the end elevation that currently presents to the street but it has a lower ridge and is set off the side boundary. The existing house does not follow the late Victorian design of the original houses in the street and the extension will complement the house itself rather than its neighbours. The design of the flats to the south further deviate from the original street's character. The scale and design of the extension is considered to be acceptable in the Cecil Road streetscene.

The dormer extension is now set within the rear roofline consistent with adopted policy in DM2.

The rear ground floor extension is deep and flat roofed. It will not be clearly visible from the streetscene but will be visible across the car park of Burghley Court. This level of exposure is not considered to be harmful to general visual amenity.

Expiry: 16/7

Residential amenity

The flats to the south, Burghley Court, have bathroom windows in their north wall facing the site. The two storey side extension will not be visible to them. The rear extension is 6 metres deep and 2.8 metres in height. It does not extend beyond the rear wall of Burghley Court and there is a gap of 3.5 metres between them. The rear extension will not cause significant harm to Burghley Court occupiers.

No. 20, to the north has no side windows and the two storey extension will sit behind the rear addition at No. 20.

The single storey rear extension has been reduced in depth to 2.7 metres closest to the boundary with No. 20. This is 3.5 metres from the rear of No. 20 and complies with the Council's DM Standard for rear extensions. It is 2.8 metres in height and set off the common boundary by 1 metre.

No. 20 has a window with a high cill closest to the common boundary. There are also double doors and a larger window beyond. These windows are to the same room, a kitchen/diner/home office. No. 20 has a high backed timber seat structure on the shared boundary and taller shrubbery planting beyond it.

It is not considered any significant loss of light will occur.

North facing bi fold doors have been removed from the rear extension. Rear facing bi folds remain. It is not considered reasonable to require these to be altered.

The roof extension is now set within the rear roofslope and smaller than one erected to the rear of No. 12. Overlooking of neighbours' gardens will occur from the new rear windows but this is a dense urban area where mutual overlooking occurs. A rear garden length in excess of 11 metres will remain.

Disturbance during the building process is unavoidable. Environmental Health will control excessive noise nuisance or if outside typical building hours.

The neighbour at No. 20 has raised concern that the intended use is an HMO. This does not form part of the application. Change of use to a small HMO, fewer than 6 individuals sharing some facilities, would not need planning permission.

Highways

Two parking spaces are available on the forecourt, as now. A single garage space is to be retained which will more likely be used for cycle parking purposes and storage. This level of parking represents 2.5 spaces.

The Highway Authority accepts the shortfall of 0.5 space in this location. It is not considered that a refusal could be justified on this basis notwithstanding the high on street parking levels locally. A construction management plan is

Expiry: 16/7

considered necessary however, to control traffic flow at peak times and to minimise the intrusion.

Recommendation

APPROVE

Subject to Conditions:-

1. Approved Plans
2. Standard 3 year time limit
3. Materials to match existing
4. All side windows obscure glazed and non opening below 1.7m
5. No new side windows
6. Garage retained for parking/ancillary storage
7. Details of CMP

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

1. The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by identifying matters of concern within the application (as originally submitted) and negotiating, with the Applicant, acceptable amendments to the proposal to address those concerns. As a result, the Local Planning Authority has been able to grant planning permission for an acceptable proposal, in accordance with the presumption in favour of sustainable development, as set out within the National Planning Policy Framework.
2. SuDS Drainage
3. Party Wall Act
4. SW connection
5. Precautionary contamination
6. Hours of working

Case Officer: MOK

Date: 13/8/26

Authorised by: Peter Barnett

Date: 13 August 2026