

Supplementary report to the Planning Applications Committee
on 12 January 2022

LW/21/0705
Seaford

Page 11

Correction to the report – at paragraph 3.13.and 7.3.3 which relate to permitted development of the single storey element of the side extension, this is incorrect as all parts of the extension require planning permission and would not benefit from permitted development rights.

The views of the Design and Conservation officer in relation to the application are not changed as a result of this correction, neither has the overall view or assessment of the application, as the impact of the whole of the proposed development was considered against its impact on the conservation area, wider surroundings, and neighbours.

Corrected plan number in condition 9 -

JP/12A and 13 A should read JP/12B and 13B

Two additional conditions are recommended by officers -

Prior to the first use of the rear facing balcony hereby approved, an obscure glazed screen to the side of the balcony adjacent to the neighbouring property at 5 Easmore Road will be installed in accordance with details which shall have been submitted and approved in writing by the local planning authority, and thereafter retained.

Reason – in the interests of amenity with regard to policy DM25 of the Lewes District Local Plan Part 2.

No development shall commence, including any works of demolition, until a Construction and Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the LPA. Thereafter the approved Plan shall be implemented and adhered to throughout the entire construction period. The Plan shall provide details as appropriate but not necessarily be restricted to the following matters:

- the anticipated number, frequency and types of vehicles used during construction,
- the parking of vehicles by site operatives and visitors,
- the loading and unloading of plant, materials and waste,
- the storage of plant and materials used in construction of the development,
- the provision of wheel washing facilities and other works required to mitigate the impact of construction upon the public highway ;
- dust mitigation measures,
- demonstrate that best practicable means have been adopted to mitigate the impact of noise and vibration from construction activities;

Supplementary report to the Planning Applications Committee
on 12 January 2022

Reason: In order to safeguard environmental and residential amenity and in the interests of highway safety and the wider amenities of the area having regard to Policy CP11 of the LPP1, policies DM20 and DM23 of the LPP2.

Additional representation received:

'The recommendation made by the Design and Conservation Officer to approve the scheme has been based upon a report which contains material inaccuracies and significant omissions designed to steer the Planning Committee into a prompt approval of the scheme.

This is clearly wrong as, with any important Planning decision, all the facts related to an application need to be included for consideration and, on that basis, I would ask you to withdraw this report immediately, while these inaccuracies and omissions are fully investigated.

It is self-evident that the current amendments made to the original application for Easemore House do nothing to reduce the size, location and nature of this extension. It is still not in keeping with the building's original design nor in keeping with the other houses around it. It remains a large and unattractive extension on the eastern side of the building where it will overshadow and overpower the adjoining property and, given the final size of the extended building, all the houses at that end of Homefield Road. Indeed, it appears totally appropriate to create a mansion among a street of houses, particularly right next to a number of historic and listed houses.

Homefield Road has an "avenue" character, enhanced by its attractive mix of houses, particularly at the end which joins Blatchington Hill. Notably, all the owners of the historic houses at that end (and on Blatchington Hill) have gone to great lengths to respect the local environment and ensure any updates or additions remain in keeping with the original design of their buildings. The proposed extension to Easemore House does not. I would urge the Council to vote against it'.

A further email was received containing 2 PDF letters. One letter contained the typed names of an additional 30 names supporting the previously submitted complaint letter against the application. A second letter was a summary sheet containing extracts from the objections already submitted to the Council was also received - this is attached to this report at Appendix 1.

LW/21/0615
Seaford

Page 25

Proposed additional condition –

Before occupation of the extension hereby takes place, details of the new drive to the garage hereby approved, and details for the removal and replacement of the existing drive with a landscaping scheme shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and

Supplementary report to the Planning Applications Committee
on 12 January 2022

those details shall be implemented as approved within 6 months of the first use of the development hereby approved.

Reason: to protect and enhance the amenities of the wider area in accordance with Policy DM25 of the Lewes District Local Plan.

Comments objecting to LW/21/0705 as being overbearing

EXTRACTS FROM OBJECTIONS SUBMITTED OCTOBER-DECEMBER 2021 WHERE OVERBEARING IS MENTIONED;
FULL VERSIONS INCLUDING OTHER COMMENTS ARE ON THE LDC PLANNING APPLICATIONS PORTAL.

ClIr Sam Adeniji**Over Bearing**

The bulk, scale and mass of this application are overbearing and domineering both on its neighbours and on the landscape. This plan does not differ significantly in its mass, bulk, scale or location from a previous application LW/21/0278 which was refused. This extension is contrary to DM28 of the Lewes Local Plan Part 2. The extension would dominate the existing property rather than being subservient to it.

Alan Baker

Reasons for objection: - Overbearing Building/Structure

We object to the proposed changes to this property. Loss of privacy re the neighbouring property, I believe that part of the proposal will affect the neighbouring properties

Sue Baker

The extension proposals within both these new applications are still far too big for this particular setting. The location of them has not changed so they will again overpower No 5 and again spoil the character of the road and our neighbourhood. The unacceptable bulk, mass and overbearing was corroborated by comments previously made by the District's Design and Conservation Officer, to be found in the Case Report for LW/21/0278, as follows:

"The building frontage is considerably taller and wider than other houses in the street and a large additional two bay extension which extends considerably beyond the principal plane of the street frontage will result in the adjacent buildings being dwarfed creating a visually imbalanced street scene"

We feel strongly that the impact of both LW/21/0705 and LW/21/0712 would be exactly the same.

Andrew Baldwin

This is overdevelopment of an already overbearing property. It is already the largest private residential property in Homefield Road. This development would overlook neighbours, cause shadowing of neighbouring properties which will devalue them not to mention the invasion of privacy caused.

Alan & Pam Batty

Reasons for objection: - Overbearing Building/Structure

James Benning

The overbearing extension will consume a carefully considered strategic gap between houses, now violating [the neighbours'] privacy, sense of space and views.

Paul Bower

Reasons for objection: - Overbearing Building/Structure.

The extension to the property will result in considerable overshadowing to its neighbour at No.5.

Edmond Burchell

It remains a large and unattractive extension on the eastern side of the building where it will overshadow and overpower the adjoining property and, given the final size of the extended building, very likely, all the houses at that end of the road.

Jenny Campbell and Patrick Heath

It appears that whatever plan is proposed, the sheer size of the new structure would be both horribly out of character and overbearing to the houses around it, altering the character of the entire road. ... In particular the proposed extension would be overbearing and visually intrude upon the house next door (no 5), rendering their garden overlooked.

Rodney Castleden

The overall mass of the extension is still large. The ground floor of the extension measures 17.4 x 5.7m. Easemore House is already far and away the biggest house in the neighbourhood, and the additional mass of the two-storey extension will make the property overbearing, particularly in relation to No 5, a significantly smaller building.

Pauline Cheetham

The proposed extension would be large, overbearing and would totally dominate the area and in particular number 5 which would be dwarfed by the structure. It would impact number 5's light, sense of space, privacy and general enjoyment of their home and garden.

Carole Clarke

The huge size and design of this structure will overpower neighbouring buildings and be out of keeping with the area. ... I know No 5 and their garden and feel that the whole ambience will change. The impact on the residents will be negative.

Margaret Cunliffe

No.3 is already a huge property compared to other neighbouring houses. These plans will have an adverse effect on the special character of this part of the road because it will dominate other homes particularly No. 5. Visually it will take too much of the gap between No.3 and No.5, spoiling the rhythm of the street. I've been in the garden of No.5 and on looking at the plans can see how overbearing this extension would be on the owners.

Bob Downing

LW/21/0705 and LW/21/0712 both ignore the reasons for which LW/21/0278 was refused in respect of proposed size and massing (ie it would have been overbearing)...

The distance between the eastward extension of Easemore House and its boundary with its immediate neighbour at 5 Homefield Road remains unchanged. The Block Plan shows that this will *significantly and disproportionately* shift the overall siting of Easemore House, already a relatively large presence, *towards its eastern neighbour*. It has been obvious from the outset that any substantial extension eastwards would have the effect of dominating 5 Homefield Road – ie it would be *unacceptably overbearing*.

Lois Fuller

The planned introduction ... is totally out of keeping with the style, size and placement of neighbouring properties. The plans contradict the guidelines for Seaford extensions and alterations!

R Gateson

I object to the proposed development due to the negative and overbearing impact it would have on the neighbouring properties and the quintessential beauty of the surrounding area

Chris & Janet Goode

We do not feel the applications submitted reflect a material change to the proposals to which we have previously stated our objections [LW/21/0278], namely the impact of the proposals on the immediate properties in terms of their loss of amenity.

Helen Guyatt

If extended the building will become overbearing and overshadowing and represent over-development of an already large and imposing property.

Gillian Hartley

Out of character with road, other houses and neighbourhood.
Dwarf neighbouring buildings.

Linda Hill

The character of both Easemore House itself and the Conservation Area will be seriously eroded by this overbearing, unneighbourly overdevelopment.

David Joyce

I feel this application is out of keeping with this residential road. It is overbearing and unneighbourly.

I have previously commented on the refused LW/21/0278 and although this new application has made changes, my main concern remains, that this extension is an out of character overdevelopment which is both overbearing and unneighbourly. ... This proposed extension would have a huge impact on the neighbouring property. ...The proposed extension will tower above this garden. I would urge planners to view this site in order to full appreciate the scale of this extension, particularly with regard to loss of privacy in the rear garden of 5 Homefield road.

Christa Kingswood

The increase in size of this already very large property will dominate the surrounding houses

Cllr Carolyn Lambert

The applications remain out of character and overbearing in contradiction to local planning policies.

I am very concerned in addition, to note the substantive mistake in the [LW/21/0278] decision notice, which replaces 'overbearing' with 'overshadowing'. This needs immediate and public correction.

Emma Lynch

It's the oppressive size and bulk, particularly on our garden amenity that I most object to. The refusal decision report for LW/21/0278 concluded that the proposed extension was contrary to policy DM28 '*through the introduction of a large mass to the rear of the property, which is sited in such a way that it will be overbearing on adjoining neighbours*'. (This clarification to the original decision report was made in an email from the Case Officer on 29/09/21, although the report and decision on the website stand uncorrected at the time of writing).

Given its similar location and mass, it follows that the design of this extension will have the same unacceptable impact on No 5 (the only adjoining neighbour) in terms of being overbearing, as well as affecting outlook and being over dominant.

Jean Mote

The plans will over dominate the neighbour, Pine Grove (5 Homefield Road). That is a very attractive character home and it would end up looking and feeling very oppressed by such a vast side extension. Pine Grove is already much smaller than Easemore House. I know the aspect from their rear garden will be particularly impacted by having such a large extension overbearing it.

I notice in the Design Statement that the applicant wishes "to create a family home". However, Easemore House is already the biggest home in our community. These plans will make an already large home truly enormous, turning it into some sort of institution that belongs out in the countryside, not suited to this neighbourhood.

Charles Pearsall-Horner

I feel that the sheer scale of the proposed extension will turn Easemore House into a super sized 'mansion', totally out of keeping with other homes on this road.

Easemore House sits on a raised platform at the back and already dominates because of its height and the way it stretches out beyond the back of No 5. All of us who live on this this side of Homefield Road are aware of the slope at the back of our gardens. This slope will make the proposed extension and house look excessively big at the rear of No 5. ... I would urge all Councillors to see this impact for themselves.

In summary, this is an unneighbourly, overpowering side extension proposal which will particularly impact the character of No 5 Homefield Road and enjoyment of the occupiers. It is far too big and I respectfully request that this planning application is refused.

Eric Scott:

The extension will be a towering eyesore over the neighbouring house at No5, overshadowing that house and garden. Its sheer mass and volume will be overbearing and overlooking, thus adversely affecting the privacy and enjoyment of the family at No5. ... It is unsympathetic, out of character, and overbearing.

Seaford Town Council (9 Members; unanimous)

The proposed building would have an unacceptable impact on this street scene and, contrary to the Seaford Design Guidelines, it would dominate the existing property rather than being subservient to it. The extension would also have an overbearing impact on the smaller property adjoining at no. 5 with significant overlooking and loss of privacy issues arising from the proximity and height of the extension

Carol Townsend

Reasons for objection: - Overbearing Building/Structure.

I have noted the small changes made to the most recent application but I am still of the opinion that this development is still far too large. The impact on the neighbouring property is not acceptable and is out of keeping with the area.

Caroline Townsend-Coles

Above all, I find the sheer enormous, overbearing bulk and size of both these proposals LW/21/0705 and LW/21/0712 to be wholly unacceptable. The impact on the very attractive house at No 5 - a much smaller home - will be significant. A towering extension on that scale, extending front and back at their side of their property, will feel oppressive and domineering.

Brian Tucker

From what [my wife and I] can see, the plan to extend Easemore House at the side will make the house unacceptably large and imposing, particularly over 5 Homefield Road (Pine Grove). It is clear that the volume, scale and height of the extension will be detrimental to their neighbour. We are especially aware of the impact of the downward slope/hill at the rear as we know that garden and this area well. In our opinion, the extension will mean Easemore House becomes so big it will overpower everything in the immediate neighbourhood.

Kevin Weaver

I object to the proposed extension on the grounds that such a large development overpowers and overshadows number 5 and is not in keeping with the street scene.

Anthony Young

The LDC Local Plan says designs must "respect and respond positively to the scale, height, site coverage, bulk, massing and character of the adjacent properties and the wider street scene" and "extensions should not result in unacceptable overlooking of, or loss of daylight to, the nearest

habitable rooms or private amenity space of neighbouring dwellings." The proposed extension is very large, very high and seems excessively dominant in relation to the street plan. ... On all these grounds, it seems that it fails to comply with the design guidelines. Indeed, it seems almost to typify the kind of development which the Council may have had it in mind to clamp down on when formulating those guidelines.

FULL VERSIONS INCLUDING OTHER OBJECTIONS ARE ON THE LDC PLANNING APPLICATIONS PORTAL.