Exp 30/11

Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: ADC/0203/09 Recommendation - Approve

Site: **34 Loose Lane, Sompting**

Proposal: **Detached three-bedroom house on north side (existing outbuilding demolished)**

The Application

The application relates to the plot currently occupied by the northern half of a pair of semi-detached houses, on the south-western corner of the junction between Loose Lane and Tristram Close.

The corner plot is orientated in such a way that No.34 is located towards the southern side, with a 14m wide rear garden and a front garden that extends across the whole front of the dwelling (adjacent to Loose Lane) and round onto Tristram Close to the north. The garden area to the north of the existing dwelling is 16.7m deep, and is partially used as a hardstanding for off-street parking.

Permission is sought to subdivide the existing plot so that No.34 would retain a traditional rectangular plot, 8m wide by 25m deep, leaving an 'L' shaped plot to the north for the erection of a detached three bedroom house. The proposed new dwelling would be 8.4m wide, by 6.2m deep, by 7m in height to the roof ridge. It would have a single-storey rear projection 1m deep, by 3.8m wide. The house would be arranged with three bedrooms (one en-suite) and one bathroom upstairs, and a lounge diner, kitchen, utility, and w.c. downstairs. Parking for two cars would be provided using the existing vehicular access from Tristram Close.

To the west of the site is 1 Tristram Close, the eastern half of a pair of semi-detached houses which has a single-storey side extension, with driveway and side garden which interlocks with the application site. Permission has been granted for the demolition of the side extension and the erection of a two-storey side extension (ADC/0246/08).

To the north of the site on the opposite corner of Tristram Close are No.32 and a new house No.32A Loose Lane. No.32A is an infill dwelling that has been erected to the south of No.32 (S/95/04). The plot sizes and characteristics of the surrounding dwellings are very similar to those of the current proposals.

Consultations and Representations

West Sussex County Council: The Highways Officer has made an inspection of the plans alone, and there is no apparent visibility issue at the shared point of access onto Loose Lane, and the most recently available verified accident records reveal there have been no personal injury accidents

in the vicinity of the existing point of access. The access point is in close proximity to the junction to the East, however no safety issue is anticipated to arise as a result of this. From the submitted plans, the access appears to provide adequate pedestrian visibility onto Loose Lane. However, WSCC recommend that pedestrian visibility is conditioned in order to keep this access point safe for pedestrians in perpetuity. Visibility splays of 2x2m from the centre of the access point in this location are adequate for pedestrian visibility.

WSCC has no concerns over the new pedestrian access, and also notes that this new dwelling is located in a sustainable location with access to a range of services and public transport. A TAD contribution of £880 is required pursuant to s106 of the Town and Country planning Act 1990 to mitigate the impacts of the subject proposal in terms of demand on Highways and Sustainable Transport that would arise in relation to the proposed development.

The Highways Officer does not consider that the dwelling at No.34 Loose Lane would require specific off-street parking due to the sustainability of the location.

Adur District Council: No comments received from Adur Homes.

Sompting Parish Council: No objection, but require assurance that adequate off-road parking and driveway provision will be provided on site should the application be approved.

Third Parties: There have been two letters of objection regarding the application from the owners of No's 36 Loose Lane , and No.1 Tristram Close.

The owner of No.1 Tristram Close has concerns that the proposals will be closer to their property than 14m if they were to build their own extension (ADC/0246/08), that there will be overlooking (of their owner extension window), additional parking may cause highway safety problems, that the proposals will result in the loss of the appearance of space and openness, and the loss of sunlight from their front garden.

The owner of No.36 Loose Lane feels the proposals will result in parking problems.

Relevant Planning Policies and Guidance

The South East Plan 2006-2026 (GOSE 2009): SCT1, SCT5, H1-2, H5, T4, BE1-2.
Adopted Adur District Local Plan 1993-2006 (ADC 1996) (saved policies): AG1, AH2, AH5 and Appendix 11 'Supplementary Planning Guidance' comprising: Development Control Standard No.2 'Space Around New Dwellings and Flats.'
Revised West Sussex Parking Standards and Transport Contributions Methodology (WSCC 2003 and ADC 2004)
PPS 1 'Delivering Sustainable Development' (ODPM 2005)

PPS3 ' Housing' (DCLG 2006)
PPG13 'Transport' (DTLR 2001)

Planning Assessment

Policies

The site is located within the built-up area of Lancing-Sompting. It is not identified for any particular use or development in the Local Plan and, in principle, its development for infill residential development accords with Local Plan policy AH2. In order to meet the housing requirements contained in The South East Plan, it is necessary that a significant proportion of new residential development takes place by way of 'unidentified' small redevelopment and infill sites such as this.

Policies SCT5 & H1 of the South East Plan set housing targets for the Sussex coast sub-regional area and Adur for 2006-2026. These targets are to be met by focusing development in existing towns, by optimising the use of previously developed land. H5 aims to raise the quality, adaptability and sustainability of new housing and at higher densities (overall regional target 40 dwellings per hectare). T4 states that Local Development Documents should apply guidance on parking standards for housing in line with PPS3, reflecting local circumstances, and ensure sufficient and secure cycle parking for new flats and houses. BE1, entitled management for an urban renaissance, states that opportunities will be taken to improve the built environment, including by promoting design solutions relevant to their context and building upon local character and by supporting opportunities for appropriate higher density and mixed use development schemes. BE2 states that Local Development Frameworks should identify areas where suburban intensification could assist wider planning objectives subject to providing clear planning and design guidance based on local character appraisal.

Local Plan policy AH2 relates to new residential development (by way of infilling and redevelopment) and states that new dwellings should be designed so that their character and scale create a pleasant place in which to live and are in keeping with and enhance the existing local environment with particular attention being paid to architectural form, height, density, layout of buildings and hardsurfaced areas; they do not have an unneighbourly effect due to loss of privacy; daylight/sunlight; outlook or open space, incorporating adequate standards of residential amenity for the new dwellings in terms of amenity space, daylight, outlook and privacy; access and parking provision meets the adopted standards; and they accord with the Council's DC Standard No.2 'Space Around New Dwellings and Flats'.

Government policy guidance in PPS3 encourages best use of urban land for housing development, particularly affordable housing and a mixture of types to create a balanced community, at higher densities (avoiding developments at less than 30 dwellings per hectare) and without rigid application of parking and amenity space standards. However, it also seeks to improve the quality and attractiveness of residential areas and urges imaginative designs and

layouts which make more efficient and sustainable use of land without compromising the quality of the environment.
PPS3 also states that Councils should "facilitate good design by identifying the distinctive features that define the character of a particular local area..... ...Careful attention to design is particularly important where the chosen local strategy involves intensification of the existing urban fabric... .....successful intensification need not mean high rise development or low quality accommodation with inappropriate space.....The density of existing development should not dictate that of new housing by stifling change or requiring a replication of existing style of form.....If done well, imaginative design and layout of new development can lead to a more efficient use of land without compromising the quality of the local environment."

Density character and appearance

The previously approved development to the north at No.32 offers a close comparison to the current proposals. The plot now occupied by No's 32 and 32A is 450sqm in area which is equivalent to 44 dwellings per hectare, whereas the existing area occupied by the site and No.34 is 460sqm, equivalent to 43 dph. Government and regional guidance set targets of 30-40 dpg as a minimum in urban areas but with consideration being given to the character of the surrounding area. Despite the resultant density being higher than dwellings in Tristram Close (25dph), and Loose Lane (26dph) it would be less that houses in Peveril Drive which is 48dph. It is considered that the proposal house would not appear overly dense and given that it would match that of the existing dwellings at 32 and 32A they would not be out of character for the surrounding area.

The proposed erection of a house further towards the corner of the street would enclose the entrance to Tristram Close more than currently exists, however No.1 Tristram Close is well set back from the junction, and it is not considered that the openness of the area would be detrimentally affected. The addition of the proposed dwelling would make the entrance to Tristram Close more symmetrical with the dwelling erected at No.34A.

Surrounding properties all are ex-authority owned houses and have a rather utilitarian appearance with little external detail. Despite the proposed dwelling being particularly plain in design terms it would have a similar external appearance to the new dwelling at No.32A, and it would match the next door house (No.34) in terms if the eaves height and roof ridge, as well as the window heights being of comparable deign and height.

The rear elevation of the dwelling would appear a little cramped in terms of the location of all of the windows being towards the southern side, despite this detail it is felt the proposals would not appear incongruous within the streetscene.

Residential amenity – proposed dwelling

In terms of the space surrounding the proposed dwelling, the Council's above Development Control Standard states that rear gardens should be 85sqm for a small three-bedroom house up to 120sqm. The proposed dwelling (as amended) would be 89sqm floor area with a rear garden of 63 sqm which would be smaller than the above standard, however there would be other outdoor areas available. The side parking area would cater for two cars and would be 50sqm in area, whilst the front garden area is well screened by hedges and would be 69sqm.

The same Development Control standard states that there should be a minimum garden length of 11m and that there should be a gap of 14m between the rear of one dwelling an the side of another. The proposals as amended would result in there being a distance of 13.5m to the flank wall of 1 Tristram Close (14.5m from the main two-storey body of the house), and a rear garden length of 11.7m. These measurements do not take into consideration the approved two-storey extension to the side of No.1 Tristram Close (ADC/0246/09) which if built would result in a smaller distance between the proposed house and its neighbour, however the space standards for the garden length and area would remain an acceptable level.

Bedrooms face the roads at the front and side. Ground floor rooms, apart from the kitchen which faces the rear garden, also have their outlook to the front and side, away from the neighbour's proposed extension.

Residential amenity – effect on existing dwellings

The most affected of the neighbouring properties would be No.1 Tristram Close to the west. It is located at ninety degrees to the proposed new house , with the side flank wall facing towards the rear elevation of the house. It has a rear garden to the south with a large open side garden and parking area to the east.

Currently No.1 has a first floor east side window which provides light to the landing at the top of the stairs. The application dwelling would be a significant distance from this window and it is not felt that it would result in their being any loss of light or a significant effect on outlook. The owner of No.1 feels that there side garden would be overshadowed by the proposed house. It is certainly likely that the part of the side garden would be left in shadow by the proposals for part of the morning, however it is considered that this would not be for such a period of time that would warrant a refusal, particularly as the main private rear garden would be unaffected.

The proposed first floor rear elevation of the house would only have an obscurely glazed bathroom and en-suite windows, therefore it is considered that this would not impact side window of the neighbours existing landing window, their rear garden or their as yet un-built extension (which is also conditioned to have an obscurely glazed side window).

Access and Parking

WSCC Highways have no objections to the proposals. The proposed new house would have two off-street parking spaces which are considered to be adequate for the size of the proposed dwelling. The access to the site is existing, and provided pedestrian visibility is retained it is not considered the proposed new house would be detrimental to highway safety.

The existing house (No.34) is to be left with no off-street parking, however there is unrestricted parking within the surrounding streets, in particular identified parking lay-bys in Tristram Close, should the future occupiers be car owners. The dwelling is located directly adjacent to an existing local bus stop, and it would be left with adequate garden area for the parking of cycles in a secure location. Consequently it is not considered that the proposals would lead to excessive on-street parking that would be detrimental to highway safety.

Visibility splays of 2mx2m from the centre of the access point have been recommended by the Highways Authority for adequate pedestrian visibility. The application dwelling will use the existing access from the road which is 7m wide and currently has clear pedestrian visibility which meets the WSCC guidance therefore it is considered that a specific condition is not warranted.

A draft s.106 agreement has been submitted by the applicant for the £880 sought by West Sussex County Council.

Recommendation

A. Subject to a satisfactory section 106 Obligation being completed by 30 November 2009 undertaking to pay £880 to sustainable transport improvements in the locality, APPROVE for reason that :-

The proposed development is within the built up area and would help meet the need for additional housing without detracting from the existing local urban environment. It can take place without resulting in unacceptable detriment to the amenities of neighbouring properties and without detraction from highway safety. It would consequently not conflict with the relevant policies of the Adur District Local Plan (AG1, AH2) and The South East Plan (SCT1, SCT5, H1-2, H5, T4, BE1-2).

Subject to:-

1. C1Ci
2. C14Ai – (18.11.09 AH2)
3. C7Ci
4. C8Gii
5. C9N
6. C11Aii
7. C12Aii
8. C18B
9. C18Cii (amended)

...in the first floor of the west side elevation...

10. C18Ei (west)

B. In the event that a satisfactory section 106 Obligation is not completed by 30 November 2009 (the date that the statutory period for determining the application expires), that authority be delegated to the Executive Head of Planning, Regeneration & Wellbeing to refuse the application on grounds that it does not comply with the Revised West Sussex Parking Standards and Transport Contributions Methodology requiring improvements to sustainable transport in the area.

Case Officer: [redacted] [redacted] 25/11/09
Date 25/11/09

Planning Services Manager: [redacted]
Date: 25/11/09

Development Control Committee Chairman: See e-mail on file giving agreement.
Date: