Development Management - Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/0589/19 Recommendation – REFUSE

Site: Coastal Haven, East Street, Lancing, BN15 8BB

Proposal: Proposed first floor side extension with balcony over with roof access on east roof slope and roof lights to south and north elevations

Date of site visit: 16.05.2019

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Site, Surroundings & Proposal

'Coastal Haven' lies on the north side of East Street opposite 'East Lodge' a large block of 3 storey flats. To the south of 'East Lodge' lies the beach. The area is residential in character comprising a mix of dwelling types and sizes, from 1 to 3 storey properties. The road adjoining East Street to the west of the site is a shopping area within South Street.

The application site is a 2 storey detached dwelling with a later constructed garage that sits against the existing boundary wall to the neighbouring bungalow 'Mildmay' to the east. 'Mildmay' has roof lights and a flat roof garage which is sited approx. 1m from the boundary wall with 'Coastal Haven'; and to the west is an end of terrace 3 storey dwelling 'Seaview Cottage', which has a mono valley pitch 3 storey rear extension.,

The proposal seeks permission to provide a first floor, flat roof extension over the existing garage extension, the full depth of the original dwelling; and to provide a second floor balcony over the first floor flat roof extension to cover the whole of the proposed first floor. Glazed rooflights are to be provided within the west roof slope in order to gain access onto the new balcony area.

Relevant Planning History:

AWDM/1617/17
Single storey extension to the rear
Approved 28.11.2017

L/92/51
Garage and extension to lean-to
Approved 03.07.51

Representations:

Lancing Parish Council: Objection:

1. The overall proposal is overdevelopment of the property
2. The roof terrace is overbearing in nature leading to loss of privacy for neighbouring properties

Objections: 73 Cecil Road; 'Mildmay'

- Both the first floor extension and the balcony is directly overlooking the whole of the south facing section of my garden
- It will directly view into mine and my grandchildren's bedrooms; living and dining room; and the entirety of the garden
- I will lose complete and total privacy both inside my home and in my garden
- The area between our houses is already tight and the proposal will restrict sunlight ever more as the day wears on
- Encroach onto privacy of home and small garden would be overpowering
- The aggressive nature of a double storey extension is excessive and I highly refute this

Consultations: None

Relevant Planning Policies

Adur Local Plan 2017 Policy 15
Supplementary Planning Guidance' comprising: Development Management Standard No.2 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings'
National Planning Policy Framework (2019)

Planning Assessment

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 and residential amenity:

<u>First floor extension:</u>
The proposed first floor extension will be directly above the existing garage, which is positioned abutting the existing boundary wall to 'Mildmay', which itself is positioned approx. 1m from the side elevation of the garage of 'Coastal Haven'.

It is considered that because it is set within the envelope of the dwelling in that it does not protrude forward, backwards or above the existing side elevation of 'Coastal Haven' it will not result in any material overshadowing onto 'Mildmay' from that which currently exists from the existing dwellinghouse.

There may though be a degree of overshadowing and loss of sunlight to no. 73 Cecil Road which lies to the north of the proposal, but a shadow/sunlight survey would need to be supplied in order to assess the degree, if any, of the situation.

The windows within the extension are to the front and rear only and would service a bedroom to the front and bathroom to the rear. The bedroom would

face the block of flats opposite which are some 20m distant at its closest point. It is not considered that the new bedroom window will result in any material overlooking to that property. The bathroom to the rear will be obscure glazed. The distance to the boundary with 73 Cecil Road is some 7m and although there would be an opening fanlight on the bathroom window, it is not considered that there will be demonstrable overlooking resulting from the obscured glass bathroom window to that property. Obscured views could be gained to the rear of 'Mildmay', but again it is not considered that it would be demonstrable for the same reasons. Further, there are already existing bedroom windows in the first floor of 'Coastal Haven' and the resultant views from the proposed obscure glass bathroom window will not be comparable.

Its flat roof design will not sit well with the existing design of the dwelling. It will look cumbersome and does not compliment the 1930's architectural influence. On design grounds, a hipped roof is needed to offset its bulky nature and assimilate better with the existing dwelling, as required by DM Standard No.2. However, whilst a roof will improve the design of the first floor extension, it may result in harm onto the residential properties in close proximity to the property, namely 'Mildmay' and 73 Cecil Road. Any application received that includes a roof would have to fully assess its impact onto those dwellings.

Balcony

The second part of the proposal is for a balcony on the second floor, which utilizes the flat roof of the first floor extension. Access to the balcony would be from the roof, with a staircase being created from the first floor. The roof access will be by way of Rooflights.

From its elevated position on the second floor, the balcony would have a commanding view of neighbouring properties, and the neighbouring properties would conversely, have a commanding view of the balcony. To prevent overlooking to neighbouring properties a screen which is of an obscured nature, i.e. one which cannot be seen through, of a height of 1.8m would need to be provided in order to provide privacy to the neighbouring properties. The screen that has been indicated on the plans is much shorter and is opaque glazing. Even if the screen was the requisite 1.8m this form of glass does not provide a robust visual screen that prevents overlooking. A screen of that height on top of the flat roof at second floor level would also be visually intrusive.

Further, the use of the balcony will generate noise from the conversations between people, a radio etc., which would result in a disturbance onto neighbouring properties, and thereby an unneighbourly form of development.

Greater area

From inspecting the site from East Street and from Cecil Road, the development of the first floor extension and the balcony, would be clearly seen from many points within the area. The flat roofed extension and balcony would be incongruous in nature and form with regard to the design of the existing house and would not be visually attractive or sympathetic to the local character of the locality.

Recommendation

REFUSE

1. The proposed flat roof first floor extension together with the second floor balcony would form an obtrusive and incongruous feature that would be visually out of keeping with the form of the existing house and surrounding development and would be detrimental to the environment. It would therefore conflict with policy 15 of the Adur Local Plan, Development Management Standard No.2 and the NPPF

2. The proposed balcony, as a result of its size, height and position, would result in an unacceptable level of overlooking and disturbance to the neighbouring residential properties in particular 'Mildmay' and 73 Cecil Road. The proposal is therefore contrary to policy 15 of the Adur Local Plan, Development Management Standard No.2 and the NPPF

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

Informatives

The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by identifying matters of concern with the proposal and discussing those with the Applicant. However, the issues are so fundamental to the proposal that it has not been possible to negotiate a satisfactory way forward and due to the harm which has been clearly identified within the reason(s) for the refusal, approval has not been possible.

Case Officer: Eve Hearsey Date: 24.05.2019

Authorised by: Peter Barnett Date: 24 May 2019