ADDENDUM TO PLANNING COMMITTEE AGENDA

MEETING DATE - 22ND JUNE 2010

The following agenda items have updates to the original Committee report.

WB/10/0383/FULL 32 HAYLING RISE

UPDATES

The Highway Authority's comments have been received as follows:-

"The proposal is for the demolition of a partially built block of flats and the construction of 7 no. dwellings comprising of 5 no. 4 bed houses, 1 no. 4-5 bed house and 1 no. 3-5 bed house. Units 1-3 and 5-7 will be accessed from a new access point onto Woodland Avenue and Unit 4 will utilise the existing access onto Hayling Rise. The most recently available verified accident records reveal there have been no personal injury accidents in the vicinity of the points of access.

The site has existing permission for 16 flats with underground parking in a similar position to this proposal, therefore the principle of the proposed access onto Woodland Avenue has already been established. The access is to be positioned further west than the previous proposal but this does not raise any highway safety concerns.

The number of car parking spaces proposed is within the WSCC maximum standard. These spaces should be 2.4 metres x 4.8 metres in accordance with guidance from Manual for Streets. It is noted from the design and access statement that cycle parking spaces for at least two bicycles per dwelling will be provided in the underground car park. This is in accordance with the WSCC minimum cycle parking standard.

If the Local Planning Authority are minded to approve this application, a condition securing the access and provision for temporary contractors' buildings, plant and stacks of materials within the site should be included."

It calculates that a development contribution of £11,205 is required for local transport improvements.

Four letters of objection have been received from Nos. 26 and 49 Hayling Rise and Nos. 19 and 23 Woodland Avenue raising the following points:-

i) Some of the proposed dwellings will directly face No. 49 Hayling Rise, with the upper floors overlooking our premises (kitchen/bedroom), resulting in a loss of privacy (Units 4, 6 and possibly 8)

ii) The existing drainage infrastructure does not exist to cope with further developments of this size. (See regular flooding on Arundel Road).

iii) The erection of 7 premises is 'not in keeping' with existing properties in the area and is effectively over development on a site that contained 1 dwelling previously.

iv) The inevitable increase in traffic and parking on the road side, will result in a higher risk of accidents, on what is already a 'blind' corner.

v) Whilst I accept it is likely more than one property will be 'fitted' into what was a sizeable area for one dwelling, I would urge the Planning Committee to think in broader terms about the ecological impact 7 dwellings would have.

vi) Two pairs of semi detached houses are out of character with the area, and the proposal would double the density of the area and result in an excessive number of properties on the site.

vii) The twelve parking spaces are inadequate for the seven houses and visitors and any office use of the properties.

viii) Object to any business use of the properties.

ix) The plans indicate the provision of a tall boundary wall which could prejudice the existing high hedge and would be out of character with the area. The views of the Arboricultural Officer should be sought.

x) Object to any security of flood light which can be seen from outside the site.

xi) The same tight controls over the construction arrangements should be applied to the current scheme as the previous planning permission.

xii) After the disaster and fiasco of the last planning permission, this is a golden opportunity for the planning department to get it right but were horrified when we saw the new proposal. Concerns are there are too many properties, their heights are too high (three not two storeys); type of property is not single dwelling; cutting down beautiful hedge; and new Woodlands entrance; the proposal is not in keeping with the area.

xiii) Three storey building overlooking No. 26 Hayling Rise.

xiv) The present proposal continues along the lines of the previous high density development in a low density area and setting and sets a dangerous precedent.

OFFICER COMMENTS

The Highway Authority's comments raise no significant issues and the control of construction access arrangements is addressed in the recommended conditions.

In response to the concerns raised by local residents, issues on the scale, density and form of the development and impact on facilities are addressed in the substantive report.

Nos. 26 and 49 Hayling Rise are across the road from the site and no unacceptable loss of privacy would result.

The applicants have previously confirmed the existing front boundary hedge is to be retained and the principle and detail of any supplementary wall to Woodland Avenue is addressed in the recommended conditions.

Specific controls on external lighting are rarely justified for schemes other than flats. Recommended condition 16 provides adequate controls.

Controls over the construction arrangements are addressed in the recommended conditions.

The Highway Authority has not raised any objections to the scheme which, in any event, would generate less traffic than the approved scheme.

Restrictions on any future business use of the dwellings would apply as elsewhere.

CHANGES TO RECOMMENDATION

Amend recommendation to exclude the words 'THAT SUBJECT TO THE COMMENTS OF THE HIGHWAY AUTHORITY.....'

WB/10/0381/FULL SUNHILL COURT MILL LANE

UPDATES

Consultation response received from Executive Head of Health, Housing and Community Safety, content of which is summarised below:-

"Although this is a relatively small extension, the property is on cesspit drainage. The applicant should seek advice from a drainage engineer and confirm in writing to the Local Planning Authority the existing cesspit is capable of taking increased loading. No details regarding ventilation to en-suite bathrooms."

Revised plans have been received showing the western dayroom and bedroom windows re-positioned further away from the northern boundary with supplementary planting, a new cycle store and one additional parking space.

A 'Management Action Plan' has also been received and is summarised below:-

"During daytime shift 6 car spaces are taken up by staff vehicles, one of which is a car pool bringing 3 or 4 employees to work daily. These arrive daily at 8am and leave between 4pm and 8pm. For night shift 1 or 2 cars pick up all staff. These arrive at 8pm and take staff back at 8am. Doctor and practise nurse visits are once a week, with additional visits as required. Visitors arrive at various times during day with busiest times between 4pm and 8pm per day. These practises have been in force for 20 years plus and vehicles have never parked off site.

Staff and visitors are reminded to leave site quietly with regard to neighbours. A notice to encourage cycling to work has been put up but given hilly access staff may not be keen.

We endeavour to fill the new bedrooms with 'quiet' residents. These rooms will be fitted with double glazing, which can only open 75mm due to restrictors fitted to all upper floor-opening windows. These usually only opened during summer months.

Proposed day room will be classified as 'quiet room' in which visitors can sit with their relatives, or discuss matters with staff. No television or radios will be allowed in this area."

Seven further letters of objection have been received from occupiers of Fox Hollow, Sunridge, Simpani, and Firtrees Mill Lane plus an anonymous resident of Mill Lane and the occupiers of No. 32 Foxley Lane and No. 41 Cleveland Road, the content of which is summarised below:-

i) Development would cause significant increase in heavy traffic on an unadopted single track. This stretch of Mill Lane is the worst in the vicinity. Crumbling and fill of deep potholes. Sunhill never pay to repair it.
ii) Limited parking.
iii) Overdevelopment which is not supported by a business requirement - purely a desire for business growth. Mill Lane is a residential area, not a business district.
iv) Increased levels of noise and traffic. Some residents are continually screaming.
v) Hardly the most aesthetically pleasing of buildings, the latest application would boost the hotchpotch appearance
vi) Could set a precedent for further upward development which would affect the south side.
vii) Dreadful situation as relates to overlooking, loss of privacy and overbearing impact.
viii) Impairs our view across the Valley.
ix) The applicant fails to adopt good neighbourly behaviour.
x) Often littered with rubbish.
xi) Construction vehicles will block track.

OFFICER COMMENTS

If Members decide to approve the application, it is recommended an additional drainage condition is imposed.

The additional planting and provision of a new cycle store and parking space do not address the objections.

The re-positioned day room and bedroom windows are an improvement and would marginally reduce the loss of privacy and outlook for the neighbour but do not affect the recommendation.

CHANGES TO RECOMMENDATION

None

WB/10/0409/FULL **21 RAGLAN AVENUE**

UPDATES

Revised plans have been received showing a reduced depth of the first floor rear projection by 1.0 metre and the omission of the front bay replaced with a full width front addition, a permeable driveway and a shed in the rear garden for cycle storage.

On 9th June 2010 Planning Policy Statement 3: Housing was reissued with the definition of previously developed land in Annexe B now excluding private residential gardens and the national indicative minimum density of 30 dwellings per hectare has been deleted.

OFFICER COMMENTS

The re-classification of private residential garden now means there is no presumption that the principle of a new additional residential house on this site is acceptable.

The revised scheme has not successfully resolved the issues of unacceptable impact on the residential amenities on neighbours and the effect upon the adjacent tree. It also fails to address the discordant and poorly conceived design in the street scene.

CHANGES TO RECOMMENDATION

The consultation period has not expired and therefore the decision should be delegated to the Executive Head of Planning, Regeneration and Wellbeing to await the expiry of the consultation period with a view to planning permission being refused.

Please be advised that all plans and supporting documentation for the Agenda items are available to view online at the following link:-

http://www.worthing.gov.uk/worthings-services/planningandbuildingcontrol/planningcommitteereports/committeeitemsfor220610/

Worthing Borough Council 18th June 2010