

COMMITTEE DATE:	14 th November 2019
-----------------	--------------------------------

APPLICATION NO: RR/2019/1874/P

ADDRESS: 21 Ninfield Road Bexhill

PROPOSAL: Mansard Roof Extension to Create Second Floor Composing of Two Self-Contained Flats. Change of Use of Ground Floor from a Combined Use as a Baker's Shop (Class A1) and Café (Class A3) to a Single Use as a Retail Unit (Class A1)

Correspondence from Planning Agent

Paragraph 9.3 - Design/Street-Scene

At no point in the Report is the Planning Officer unhappy with the appearance of the proposal as a stand-alone item, however, the Officer is unhappy that it has not yet been done before.

Response:

It is the principle of a second floor level addition that is unacceptable as a stand-alone feature. If the principle of a second-floor addition was acceptable, then it may be there could be a case in support of a mansard-style, given there is precedent for mansard roof designs in the surroundings. It is not disputed that the advice was given during the discussions with the agent that *"...it is the fact that none of the other units in this parade has been enlarged by way of a second floor extension and the enlargement of no 21 in this way, when it is not part of a comprehensive scheme for the whole parade"*... that results in a proposal that harms the appearance of the parade and the street-scene.

Whilst the parade is no architectural merit, the fact that it is flat-roofed throughout is the critical unifying feature that visually ties all the units within the parade together as one architectural entity. There might be small steps up between units, reflecting the rise in levels along the street, but these are very slight and are not noticeable from the street, from which the overall appearance is of a uniform flat-roofed design. Such minor differences in levels do not justify acceptance of a full-height second floor addition.

The agent argues that the proposal would not detract from the appearance of the parade and street-scene. Officers do not share that view.

Paragraphs 9.4 to 9.6 - Housing Land Supply

The agent argues that, because the Council does not currently have a 5 year supply of land for housing, the presumption in favour of the grant of planning permission should apply, because he does not consider *"...the adverse impact of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the policies in this Framework as a whole."*

Response:

The Council accepts that it does not currently have a 5 year supply of land for housing. The proposal would create an additional two flats, which would make a small contribution.

Whether or not the adverse impact of granting planning permission “...*would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits...*” is ultimately a matter of judgement.

The suggestion that the proposal “...*does not present significant adverse impacts which might outweigh the benefits of this proposal*”, in turn that “*the test has not been met and the presumption in favour should be applied*”, is not accepted.

RECOMMENDATION: AS REPORT