Development Management - Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: **Recommendation – Approve**
AWDM/0556/13

Site: **Royal Coach Brighton Road Shoreham-By-Sea, West Sussex**

Proposal: **Application for non-material amendment AWDM/1532/12 for boundary treatment, parking landscaping and lighting.**

Date of site visit: 23rd January 2013

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

The application relates a former public house the Royal Coach which closed in July 2012. The property has since been vacant and is currently undergoing extensive renovation to facilitate the operation of the Public House by Marstons. The Public House has taken on the name The Longshore, the Design and Access Statement states that "Marstons aim to create a family public house with a business model that achieves a majority of its revenue from food sales, like other existing pubs Marstons have converted in this way across the UK."

Permission was granted under AWDM/1532/12 in April 2013 for external works to the building which included new windows and doors increased openings, removal of existing canopy. The re painting and decoration of existing windows, new parapet, new entrance porch and new timber boarding. Also approved were improvements to the rear yard/store, a new plant area on the rear flat roof and a 1.1 metres high new screen along the edge of the flat roof.

A new garden area was approved with ancillary landscaping, seating and play equipment, changes to the parking area have also occurred.

This application seeks permission for non-material amendments to the scheme, comprising:

- The removal of the concrete posts and steel rail surrounding the car park.
- Demolition of low level rendered brickwork walls on the north-east side of the car park, (resulting in the creation of three additional parking spaces.)
- Height of fence on south west boundary of the garden reduced from 2.1 metres to 1.1 metres.

- Minor changes to planting beds in the garden and around the building and alterations to seating arrangement in the garden.
- Low level ground spike lights are proposed within the landscaped area.
- Amendments to feature wall lights at ground floor level and small floodlights at first floor to illuminate horizontal boarding.

Consultations None

Representations: 1 Comment has been received: - The reduction in height of the fence enclosing the garden and change to a picket fence exposes the garden/public footpath. It will encourage people to 'hop' over the fence into the pub garden and cause additional noise to residents. It would make the garden an insecure place for children to play.

Relevant Planning Policies

Adopted Adur District Local Plan 1993-2006 (ADC 1996) (saved policies): AG1, AE16 (existing business in residential areas.)
National Planning Policy Framework (CLG 2012)

Planning Assessment

Principle

The proposed amendments are relatively minor, however due to the location of the site within a residential area and prominently positioned on the roundabout the potential impact on surrounding dwellings and locality must be considered.

Visual Amenity

The removal of the post and rail is considered to be acceptable in this case. This boundary treatment is decorative only and has no function within the site its appearance is not considered to be in-keeping with the new character of the building and site. The removal of this will enable the grassed highway verge to be maintained along with the landscaping within the site and will therefore be of benefit to visual amenities of the area.

The rendered brick walls on the north east side of the car park formed part of the now redundant entrance to the site. It is proposed that these will be removed and there will be an increase of 3 parking spaces within the site. As with the post and rail fencing above these features were in-keeping with the previous character of the site. The modernised refurbishment and has given rise to a more clean and much improved and upgraded appearance to which these features no longer relate and contribute to. It is therefore acceptable that they be removed.

Changes to the seating within the garden, landscaping and lighting in relation to the building are considered to be minor changes that are acceptable and will not impact significantly on the visual amenities of the surrounding locality.

The applicant's agent has stated that the reduction in height of the fence to the south west garden boundary promotes views into the garden and enhances the character and appearance of the surrounding area. The picket fencing of a reduced height promotes the openness of the site. The lower fence also avoids a 'tunnelling' effect down the public footpath which could be oppressive and this in turn improves natural surveillance and security.

Residential amenity

The changes to the frontage of the site, lighting, parking and landscaping are all considered to be minor alterations to the site that will not result in any detrimental impact to the residential amenities of the occupiers of the surrounding dwellings.

The main consideration is the reduction in height of the fencing on the southwest garden boundary. The garden area is in close proximity to dwellings in Fishermans Walk to the south west. These properties have rear solid boundary fences up to 1.8 metres in height along their rear boundaries. Beyond this is a public footpath which runs adjacent to the garden of the public house. Under AWDM/1532/12 a fence of 2.1 metres was approved along this boundary. The applicant's proposed to reduce this to 1.1 metres in height and a picket fence of this height has already been erected on site. A concerned neighbour has commented that this results in a security issue and it would encourage people to access the garden and would make it insecure and cause additional noise to local residents.

After consideration of these comments it is considered on balance that this minor amendment should be approved. The adjacent dwellings have sufficient boundary fences offering screening and privacy from the adjacent public house. The fencing at the site allows views into the landscaped area which will improve the visual appearance of the site when viewed from the adjacent public footpath a high solid fence would not offer this and could be oppressive. As approved under AWDM/1532/12 the play equipment is sited adjacent to the main building and away from the boundary with the public footpath therefore any use of this equipment would be overseen by the managers and staff of the public house. In addition at first floor within the public house is manager's accommodation therefore the site will be occupied at all times, this should allow for increased site security.

The applicant's agent has also argued that the garden area is not a secure space and that anyone passing the site could gain access to the garden from the boundary with the car park if they wished. They argue that by having a lower fence there would be no evidence to suggest that this would encourage anti social behaviour at the site out of hours. They have stated that if this was to become a problem that it would be in the operator's interests to address the issue immediately to improve on site security. They state that Marston's do

not wish to present a defensive image to the surrounding area with an unnecessarily high fence. In the light of the above the lower fence is considered to be acceptable.

Accessibility and Parking

The non material amendments will give rise to an additional three car parking spaces within the site. This is beneficial and the level of parking on site is acceptable. Access will remain as approved under AWDM/1532/12.

Recommendation

APPROVE the non material amendments in accordance with the application and accompanying plans. For the avoidance of doubt these plans comprise:-

3299/P103 Rev H – received 8th May 2013
3299/P107 Rev F – received 8th May 2013
3299/P110 Rev D – received 8th May 2013
SPP1767 P 002 Rev A – received 8th May 2013

…….. existing planning permission AWDM/1532/12 still stands and that the conditions imposed upon it continue to apply to the development except that the above plans can be substituted for 3299/P103 Rev F, 3299/P107 Rev E, 3299/P110b, SPP1767 P001.

Is recommendation contrary to letter(s) of representation? **Y**

Case Officer: Hannah Barker Date: 11th June 2013

Authorised by: Jo Morin Date: 13 June 2013