

**LA01/2024/0699/F**

**Demolition and erection of 4 no apartments, improvements to existing access and new site access, parking provision, and all ancillary works including 4 no. storage sheds and bin store**

Chairman, members, I would like to thank you for the opportunity to address the Committee today. With me this morning is David Burrows, Applicant, and we are happy to answer any questions that you may have.

At the outset, I would like to emphasise that this is a modest, well-considered development that has been carefully designed in response to both the site context and relevant planning policy. Importantly, all technical matters raised through consultation—including those highlighted in neighbour objections—have been thoroughly assessed by statutory consultees and your planning officers and found to be acceptable.

We acknowledge local concerns which we have carefully evaluated and considered throughout the processing of this planning application. I will briefly address the key issues raised.

In terms of scale, mass and design, the proposed building has been designed to sit comfortably within the established character of Beach Road. Its height, footprint, and overall massing are comparable to surrounding development and do not appear excessive or overbearing within the street scene.

The design of the proposal adopts a contemporary but respectful architectural approach, which closely aligns with the key design features associated with the attached apartment block No. 63, which in turn would provide a more balanced design between both properties.

Materials, proportions, and detailing, including the provision of sea-front balconies have been selected to remain consistent with the local vernacular and design characteristics expressed by numerous properties along Beach Road.

Concerns have been raised to reduce the number of apartments proposed as part of the application. The proposed apartments all exceed minimum space standards, each served by individual private amenity and a communal area, providing in excess of 40sqm of amenity space per apartment, as such the application site is capable of absorbing the scheme as

proposed and is not representative of the typical characteristics associated with overdevelopment.

The privacy and amenity of neighbouring properties has been a key consideration throughout the design process. Window placement associated with habitable rooms have been carefully arranged to prevent directly opposing views avoid unacceptable overlooking or loss of privacy. All raised terraces and balconies where applicable are defined by boundary screening to ensure amenity of No. 67 and No. 63 remains protected.

The windows to the rear of No. 63 have also been a key consideration to ensure that the proposed rear return does not create overshadowing to habitable rooms. As covered by the detailed planning officer report, any overshadowing to No. 63 would be limited to windows serving non-habitable rooms and the degree of impact is not considered significant due to the southern orientation of the associated plots.

The existing 7- bed dwelling is not currently served by formal parking provision, which is largely accommodated by on-street parking. The proposal includes the provision for 4 no. formalised car parking spaces within the curtilage of the site and as such is a betterment on the existing arrangement.

The proposal delivers four new residential units in a sustainable location, making efficient use of land while adhering to policy requirements. There are no technical objections from consultees, and it has been concluded that the development is acceptable against all material planning considerations.

In summary, we would like to thank your officers who have been involved in this process to date, and we would respectfully ask members to endorse their officer's recommendation to approve this scheme.

Thank you for your time, David and myself are happy to answer any questions you may have.

Tom Stokes MRTPI