Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: **Recommendation – APPROVE**
AWDM/0079/14

Site: **128A Brighton Road**

Proposal: **Extension to rear gable to increase internal floor space**

Neighbours checked: Y
Additional neighbour notifications: /N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

The proposal is for a gabled rear extension with flat roof protrusion and balcony overhang to measure (at max) 6.2 metres in height, 3.9 metres in length, and 9.9 metres in width.

The application property is a two-storey inter-war building and single storey 'annex' to its side, with rendered walls and quoining. It has been subdivided into flats. The ground floor of the main building and the annex consists of one of the flats. Access to this flat is from the front door facing Brighton Road. The rest of the building is put over to the applicant's own flat and access to this flat is from an external staircase on the west side of the building.

The height of the land is raised at the rear as an embankment to Widewater Lagoon. This means the back rooms of the ground floor flat depend on light wells positioned in the rear garden patio of the first floor flat.

The surrounding area is an outer residential area of Lancing, along a busy stretch of the A259 coastal road.

Relevant Planning History
AWDM/0963/13
Single storey rear extension
Permitted 24-09-2013

AWDM/1334/12
Rear and side extension with a pitched roof to flat roof conversion
Refused 04/01/2013
Appeal Dismissed 20/06/2013

Consultations

Lancing Parish Council: *No objections although Committee was conscious that this was part of the secondary sea defences and would be interested to learn if any account is being taken as to the likely effects on these defences due to the inclement weather conditions recently experienced which was raising the water level in the adjoining Widewater lagoon.*

Representations
None

Relevant Planning Policies and Guidance
Adur Local Plan (saved policies): AG1, AH7
National Planning Policy Framework

Planning Assessment

Principle

Upgrading of residential accommodation is acceptable in principle

Visual amenity

The extension is subservient in its scale to the existing building and not disproportionate. The original form of the building would remain identifiable. The exterior materials and finishes of the extension would match those of the existing building's rear elevation. The part of this visible from Brighton Road would be set well back from the street.

For these reasons insufficient visual harm arises as to warrant refusal.

Residential amenity

The existing building is converted into 2 self-contained flats. It is the occupier of the ground floor flat who is principally impacted upon by this proposal (although some impact would be experienced by the neighbours to either side also).

Occupier of ground floor flat

This neighbouring flat is spread across the ground floor of the existing building and the side 'annex'.

The change in land level means the back rooms of this flat depend on light wells positioned at the rear patio in the applicant's rear garden. The proposed extension would build over one of these. However this room is not presently used as any sort of habitable space. It is a store room and in a poor condition. The second light well serves a kitchen. The outlook from this would be reduced by the extension. However the outlook from this room is already compromised and extremely limited so there is not an expectation by the neighbor to depend upon this for outlook. The principal living spaces of the ground floor flat are located at the front onto Brighton Road and in the side annex. These would remain unaffected by the proposal. The extended gabled roof would be built physically off from the shared boundaries. In all, there would be no material loss of light and outlook and adverse overbearing and overshadowing would be avoided.

There would be a greater propensity for overlooking from the larger balcony. However there is currently little privacy afforded to the rear garden of this neighbour as the existing terrace is at a greater height allowing for invasive

overlooking. Against this existing situation, the degree of additional loss of privacy would not be materially harmful to the amenities of this neighbor.

Neighbours to either side

The proposal would be built physically off from the shared boundaries with these neighbours, so any resultant overbearing and overshadowing would not be adverse.

The enlarged balcony would afford the applicant more views of the neighbours' gardens. However these gardens are open with mutual overlooking offering occupier's little privacy at present. Against this, the additional reduction in privacy from the balcony would not be harmful. There are no windows serving principal light sources in the side walls of both buildings to either side, so views into their private habitable rooms would not be invasive.

The new staircase would result in some disturbance and noise. However this replaces an existing external staircase, so the level of activity would be no worse than at present.

Flood Risk

The site falls within Flood Zone 3, the highest category of risk. However the development complies with Environment Agency flood risk standing advice as the building is raised about the water level.

Local Planning policies do not insist upon development contributions for flood defense infrastructure, so would not be justified to request such monies from the homeowner in this instance.

Recommendation

APPROVE for the reason:-

The proposed development would not detract from the local environment and can take place without resulting in unacceptable detriment to the amenities of neighbouring properties and/or highway safety. It would consequently not conflict with 'saved' policies of the Adur Local Plan AG1 and AH7 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Subject to Conditions:-

1. Standard time limit
2. Approved plans
3. Exterior materials/finishes to match
4. Notwithstanding "pd" no further windows/opening in side elevations

Informative:

The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by assessing the proposal against all material considerations, including planning policies and any representations that may have been received and subsequently determining to grant planning permission in accordance with the presumption in favour of sustainable development, as set out within the National Planning Policy Framework.

Is recommendation contrary to any representations? N

Case Officer signed: Matthew Porter Date: 24-2014
Authorised and signed by: Peter Barnett Date: 24 February 2014