DMH Stallard

FAO: Peter Barnett
Development Management
Adur & Worthing Councils
Portland House
44 Richmond Road
Worthing
West Sussex
BN11 1HS

Date 2nd August 2017
Your ref AWDM/0588/17
Our ref A57/VYE1/16

Sent by email to planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk

Dear Mr Barnett,

Amended plans and description: Second floor extension and conversion of existing roof space, ground floor rear extension with balcony over, new pitched roof over existing flat roof at rear with new balcony at second floor level, new car part in from garden at 52A The Green, Southwick, Brighton, BN42 4FS

Application Reference: AWDM/0588/17

I write on behalf of my clients Mr & Mrs Vye, who are the owners of the neighbouring property 'Channings', to object to the above planning application.

It is noted that amended plans have been received and the description of the proposal has been amended. We welcome this change of description, which more accurately describes the proposal. However, our clients still have a number of significant concerns regarding the above planning application and would like to draw your attention to the following issues.

Information submitted
Firstly, we remain concerned at the level of information submitted in support of this application. It is our view that given the scale of the works and the amount of additional floorspace created by the scheme, a Design & Access Statement should be provided. In addition, given the site's location within a Conservation Area, further information should be provided regarding the design of the proposal. A planning statement should also be submitted in order to provide information on the proposal, and how the proposed works would be considered to address the relevant local and national planning policies and objectives. It is considered that the information submitted in support of this application

Gainsborough House Pegler Way Crawley West Sussex RH11 7FZ **DX** 57102 Crawley
Main line 01293 605000 **Direct line** 01293 605098 **Fax** 01293 663520 **Email** lisa.dasilva@dmhstallard.com

Offices in London, Gatwick, Guildford and Brighton. Website www.dmhstallard.com

DMH Stallard LLP is a limited liability partnership registered in England (registered number OC338287).
Its registered office is Gainsborough House, Pegler Way, Crawley, West Sussex, RH11 7FZ and it is authorised and regulated by the Solicitors Regulation Authority. The term partner is used to refer to a member of DMH Stallard LLP. A list of members may be inspected at the registered office. The firm is part of Law Europe and is represented around the world through its international network.
DMH Stallard LLP incorporates the practice of Ross & Craig.

Lexcel Practice Management Standard Law Society Accredited
INVESTORS IN PEOPLE

DMH Stallard

is insufficient, and this information is required in order for the council to make an informed decision on this proposal.

Use of the proposed extension

As previously stated, in determining this application, it is important to consider the lawful use of the building. It is our clients understanding that the rooms above the garage are to be used as ancillary accommodation only, and were previously used as a granny annex. Within the application submission there is no mention of the ancillary use of the rooms. It is understood that there may be a condition attached to the planning permission for this granny annex, and it is our clients wish that this ancillary use remain, and that the rooms above the garage do not form a separate unit of accommodation. It is worth noting that these rooms are capable of their own separate access and are not connected internally to the main house. Our clients still remain concerned about this issues and do not feel that this has been addressed in the amendments to the scheme.

Scale of proposal

The scale of the proposal is still of a concern of our clients. The rear elevation of 52a faces directly onto the garden of our clients property, in addition the windows from the habitable rooms within our clients home look out onto the rear elevation of the application site. As shown in the photographs previously provided, the rear elevation of the existing dwelling is visible from our clients garden, and from the ground floor and first floor windows of their property.

The proposed side extension would not be set back from the main wall of the dwelling, the extension is wide in scale, extending across the whole of the existing first floor element, this has the result of being out of scale with the existing dwelling. Furthermore, the proposed extension is not set down from the existing ridge of the main dwelling, and as such it would not appear subservient against the existing dwelling, this is considered to spoil the existing proportions of the dwelling.

It is acknowledged that the proposal will remove the existing flat roof element over the garage, which is unsightly, and this would represent an overall improvement to the dwelling. However, it should be noted that this improvement could be achieved by replacement with a pitched roof at first floor level, and this could be done without the need to provide accommodation at the second floor level.

The additional storey and accommodation over the whole of the dwelling, and the scale of the proposal represents an overdevelopment of the site which would be out of keeping with the character of the existing dwelling and the character of the area. When the size, height, and bulk of the proposal is taken into account, the outlook from our clients property would be dominated by the proposed extensions, and this would be unacceptably overbearing and oppressive to our clients.

DMH Stallard

Overlooking

Policy AH7 of the Adur District Local Plan 1996 sets out the objectives and standards that extensions and alterations to existing dwellings are expected to meet. Part a) of this policy states that *"proposals should not result in an unacceptable degree of overlooking, loss of natural light or overbearing effect on neighbouring dwellings."*

In addition, paragraph 17 of the NPPF, which requires proposals to secure a high quality of design and a good standard of amenity for all existing occupiers of land or buildings.

The amended proposal would still result in an extra floor with 3no. additional windows, and 2no. rooflights at second floor level. Furthermore, it is now proposed that a balcony be provided to one of these additional windows. The provision of these new windows and in particular the new balcony would result in direct overlooking of our clients private amenity space, thereby reducing the level of privacy currently enjoyed by our clients. It is considered that the proposal would result in an excessive amount of overlooking to our clients private garden area, and this has a significant and unacceptable impact upon our clients existing residential amenity.

Whilst it is noted that there are currently windows at first floor level, the scheme still proposes a balcony, which would run along the length of the first floor above the garage. By their very nature balconies give rise to more overlooking and loss of privacy, and would be significantly more visually intrusive and overbearing to our client. The provision of this balcony results in an unacceptable degree of overlooking of our clients garden and property, and is considered to be intrusive to our clients.

One of the main planning considerations in determining this application is whether the proposal would have an adverse effect on the neighbouring properties and their residential amenity. The proposal clearly has an adverse impact on our clients existing residential amenity, and should therefore be considered unacceptable.

Conservation Area

The predominant character of the area is that of two-storey detached or semi-detached dwellings with uncluttered hipped and gabled roofs. It is noted that changes have been made to the scheme to provide a hipped roof and reduce the number of rooflights proposed on the front elevation, however, the scheme is still considered to result in a cluttered roof and a design which is not in keeping with the character of the Conservation Area.

The existing building is also considered to have a symmetry with the scale of the adjoining dwelling, our clients are still concerned that the proposed works would also

DMH Stallard

have the effect of elongating the existing building. The resultant building would be incongruous and harmful within the Conservation Area.

Given the above, the design and scale of the proposal is considered to be of poor quality and harmful to the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and the Conservation Area surroundings. The proposal would not meet the necessary test of conserving the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

Conclusion
In summary, the proposed development by virtue of its scale and design would be overbearing and un-neighbourly, sited in such a way that would visually dominate our clients neighbouring property.

The proposed additional windows and 2no. balconies would lead to increased overlooking of our clients garden and would result in an unacceptable loss of privacy and visual intrusion.

Having considered the statutory development plan and all other material planning considerations, it is our view that the proposal does not comply with the relevant saved policies of the Adur Local Plan, the contents of the SPG, or guidance contained in the NPPF. As such, the planning application should be refused on the grounds of unacceptable overlooking, impact on amenity of neighbouring occupiers, overdevelopment of the site, and detrimental impact on the Conservation Area.

However, should the application be recommended for approval, please note that we would request the opportunity to speak at the Committee meeting against the proposal.

Yours sincerely

[redacted]

Senior Planner
For and on behalf of DMH Stallard LLP