Expiry Date - 20/12/2011

Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number:
AWDM/0847/11

Recommendation – Refuse Application

Site: **147 Brighton Road Lancing West Sussex BN15 8JA**

Proposal: **Demolition of existing house and redevelopment with three-storey block of 9 flats retaining existing access with parking for 4 cars and 10 cycles (outline with details of access, layout and scale)**

The Application

The application relates to a detached 2 storey hipped roof dwelling located on Brighton Road facing Beach Green. It is located between two large, wide-fronted blocks of 2 and 3 storey flats known as Beachville Court and Swinburne Court. There is also a three storey block at the rear which has recently been constructed known as Rotary House. Directly to the rear is a pair of bungalows within the site of Swinburne Court.

Outline permission is sought to demolish the existing dwelling and replace it with a three storey building containing 9 flats. The plans show 6 x 1-bed flats and 3 x 2-bed flats within a pitched roof building measuring 10m wide, 17m deep and 9.7m high. The site measures 12m wide and 37.5m deep. The building is shown 13m back from the road with the front area reserved for parking and bin storage. A rear amenity space measuring 12m by approximately 7.5m (90sqm) in total is shown for the 9 flats. The application is seeking approval of access, layout and scale.

Consultations and Representations

Consultations/Comments

West Sussex County Council – The Transport Planning Officer objects. The development is likely to lead to an increase in traffic movement to and from the site. This is unlikely to have a significant effect on Highway capacity, but will result in intensification in use of the existing access.

The WSCC Parking Calculator advises that the parking demand for the development would fall between 7 and 8 spaces (total: 7.36 spaces). The development does not satisfy this demand and proposes 4 on-site parking spaces. This could impact negatively on Highway safety as vehicles look to squeeze on-site. Local parking restrictions give further importance to the need to satisfy parking demand on-site.

The application does not demonstrate that it is possible for vehicles to turn within the confines of the site and exit in forward gear, particularly larger vehicles such as removal/courier vans or when the car park is operating at full capacity.

There is no evidence to demonstrate that satisfactory visibility splays can be achieved at the access, particularly to the east where a high wall and soft landscaping could obstruct.

Adur District Council – The Environmental Health Officer has no objection. Recommends contaminated land condition is imposed.

Southern Water – No objection subject to submission of drainage details

Lancing Parish Council - Object. Committee felt this was over development of the site with insufficient areas for parking and gardens for the nine flats. There was also concern that the building would overlook the houses and bungalows on Cecil Road to the rear.

Third Parties:

3 letters of objection received from the occupiers of 33 Beachville Court (2 letters including one from their solicitor) and 30 Cecil Road raising the following objections:

- Inadequate parking
- Overlooking of garden of Beachville Court and bungalows in Cecil Road
- Increased flood risk
- Disturbance to wildlife
- Elderly residents of Beachville Court do not want further disturbance following immediately after recent building developments in the area
- Overdevelopment
- No details of prospective tenure
- Loss of outlook

Relevant Planning Policies and Guidance

The South East Plan 2006-2026 (GOSE 2009): SCT1, SCT5-6, SP3, CC6-7, H1-2, H5, BE1-2
Adopted Adur District Local Plan 1993-2006 (ADC 1996) (saved policies): AG1, AG3, AH2, AH5, AH6 and Appendix 11 'Supplementary Planning Guidance' comprising Development Control Standard No. 2 'Space Around New Dwellings and Flats'
'Good Practice Guidance Note: Internal Space Standards for New Homes' (ADC 2010)

Revised West Sussex Parking Standards & Transport Contributions Methodology (WSCC 2003, amended 2010)
'The Provision of Service Infrastructure related to New Development in West Sussex – Part 1' (WSCC 1999)
PPS1 'Delivering Sustainable Development' (ODPM 2005)
PPS3 'Housing' (DCLG 2006, amended 2010)
PPG13 'Transport' (DTLR 2001, amended 2011)

Planning Assessment

Policies

The site is located within a residential part of the built-up area of Lancing and, is not identified or allocated for any particular use or development in the Local Plan. Residential infilling and redevelopment of unidentified sites, as in this case, is needed in order to meet the Council's 5 year housing land supply required by PPS3 and the housing requirements of the South East Plan. Priority is given to use of previously-developed land.

Local Plan housing policies AH2 and AH5 have been 'saved' and encourage redevelopment to help meet the demand for dwellinghouses suitable for small families, single persons, the elderly, and to make best use of urban land. AH2 relates to new residential development (by way of infilling and redevelopment) and states that new dwellings should be designed so that their appearance, 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, materials, 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'. Also of note is the Council's 'Good Practice Guidance Note: Internal Space Standard for New Homes'.

The South East Plan sets out the long term spatial planning framework for the region with the aim of achieving more sustainable development, protecting the environment and combating climate change. Policy SCT1 gives priority to pro-actively pursuing sustainable economic growth and regeneration of the Sussex Coast whilst also protecting and enhancing its high environmental quality, its cultural and historic assets and promoting excellence in design of new developments in recognition of their importance to economic success and quality of life.

Policy SP3 seeks to achieve at least 60% of all new developments on previously developed land and through conversions of existing buildings. Developments in urban areas, including infill, should be well designed and consistent with the principles of urban renaissance and sustainable

development. Policy CC6 requires development to respect, and where appropriate enhance, the character and distinctiveness of settlements and landscapes throughout the region, and to use innovative design processes to create a high quality built environment which promotes a sense of place.

SCT5 & H1 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.

Government policy guidance in PPS3 encourages best use of urban land for housing development and a mixture of types to create a balanced community, at higher densities (although the requirement to avoid developments at less than 30 dwellings per hectare has now been deleted) 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. PPS1 states *"Design which is inappropriate in its context, or which fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions, should not be accepted."*

PPS3 states that Councils "*should develop a shared vision with their local communities of the types of residential developments they wish to see and develop design policies that set out the quality of development that will be expected for the local area, aimed at:-*

- *creating places, streets and spaces which meet the needs of people, are visually attractive, safe accessible, functional, inclusive, have their own distinct identity and maintain and improve the local character.*
- *Promoting designs and layouts which make efficient and effective use of land, including encouraging innovative approaches to help deliver high quality outcomes."*

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."

Visual Amenity

The Design & Access Statement refers to the three storey form of the adjoining flats as being justification for a three storey building on this site. However, the flats on either side of the site have a significantly wider frontage which results in buildings with a greater sense of proportion and scale than would be the case were the current proposal built. A three storey building on this relatively narrow plot, when viewed in context with the much greater scale of buildings on either side, would be visually awkward and would not be a successful addition to the street scene. The adjoining flats also reduce in scale and height where they abut the site and to construct a three storey building would be at odds with this diminution in scale.

Residential Amenity

The proposed flats would have a limited amount of outdoor amenity space, approximately 50% below the 20sqm per flat required by DC Standard No.2. While there is access to Beach Green opposite, such a shortfall in amenity space emphasises that the proposal is an overdevelopment of the site. A distance of 1m to either side boundary is retained giving a cramped feel to the development with restricted outlook for future occupiers as a result of windows to some bedrooms facing the blank side walls of the adjacent buildings.

The internal floor areas are also substandard, with some living/cooking areas having a floor area of just 18sqm which is less than the 22sqm recommended by the Council's Internal Space Standards. The overall floor area of 39sqm for some flats is also well below the 51sqm specified in those Standards.

Three storeys of living room windows will face the bungalows in Cecil Road and the new flats at the rear, at an oblique angle and a distance of over 20m, so that overlooking is not considered to be a significant problem, particularly as there is already overlooking from the existing flats either side. However, the bungalows directly at the rear of the site which abut the rear boundary will suffer from an increase in overlooking, being only 8m from the rear wall of the proposed flats.

Parking and Access

The Transport Planning Officer has objected to the provision of only 4 parking spaces and has stated that 8 spaces should be provided instead. There is

also insufficient turning space provided or evidence that satisfactory visibility can be achieved.

Recommendation

REFUSE for the following reasons:

1) The height and depth of the building results in a development which is out of proportion with the size of the plot and out of keeping with existing development. It would therefore represent an overdevelopment of the site which would detract to an unacceptable extent from the visual amenities and residential environment of the locality and thereby conflict with saved policies AG1 and AH2 of the Adur District Local Plan

2) The size of the building and number of proposed flats results in a cramped form of development which would provide inadequate amenity space and a substandard level of accommodation, contrary to policy AH2 of the Adur District Local Plan, DC Standard No.2 and the Council's Good Practice Guidance Note: Internal Space Standards for New Homes

3) The proposed building, by reason of its height and proximity to the rear boundary, would result in overlooking to the detriment of the residential amenities of the adjoining bungalows, contrary to policies AG1 and AH2 of the Adur District Local Plan

4) The proposal does not make provision for adequate visibility at the junction of the access with public highway and would be detrimental to highways safety.

5) The proposal does not include adequate provision on the site for the parking of vehicles in a satisfactory manner to the standard required by the local planning authority which is likely to result in standing vehicles which would interrupt the free flow of traffic on the public highway to the detriment of highway safety, contrary to the Revised West Sussex Parking Standards & Transport Contributions Methodology (WSCC 2003, amended 2010)

6) The proposal would be detrimental to highway safety in that it does not incorporate adequate facilities to enable vehicles to turn on the site and so enter and leave the highway in forward gear.

Case Officer Peter Barnett Date 16 December 2011

16/12