Development Management - Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/0540/18 Recommendation – Approve

Site: 66 Middle Road, Shoreham-By-Sea

Proposal: Single storey rear extension, two storey side extension to west elevation and new vehicular access to front

Date of site visit: 26 April 2018

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

The application relates to a semi-detached dwelling located on the junction of Middle Road and Adelaide Square. It has a pitched roof side extension and a rear conservatory which the application proposes to replace with a two storey side extension and a single storey rear extension.

The two storey extension measures 5m wide and is to be constructed virtually up to the side boundary with Adelaide Square. The first floor is to be set back from the front of the house by 0.4m and is to be timber clad.

The rear extension, as amended, measures 3.5m deep.

A new access and hardstanding is proposed at the front off Middle Road. Amended plans have been received relocating the access to the west of an existing pedestrian crossing dropped kerb, closer to the junction with Adelaide Square.

Relevant site history

Side extension approved 2003.

Consultations

West Sussex County Council: The **Highway** Officer has no objection.

Access and Parking
Space is achievable within the site for an average size vehicle to park off of the publicly maintained highway at an angle fronting the dwelling.
The parking area fronting the property would not allow a vehicle to turn on site to egress in a forward gear. The LHA does note however that this is an existing practise by residents of Middle Road and has been operating with no known highways safety concerns.
Any illegal or unsafe parking could be dealt with as an offence under Section 22 Road Traffic Act 1988 –(leaving vehicles in a dangerous position on the road including verge) and Section 137 Highways Act 1980 (wilful obstruction of the free passage along a highway including footway.) Both of these acts are enforceable by Sussex Police.

The LHA has consulted the Area Officer regarding the positioning of this access in close proximity to the junction of Adelaide Square. As yet there has not been a response regarding the suitability of this, therefore the applicant is advised to seek guidance from the Area Officer to ascertain the suitability of the proposed positioning. The Area Office would also be required to issue a license for the applicant to carry out the works on the highway to WSCC specifications, informative included below.

[NB subsequent comments of Area Manager received as follows:

"As this is within 10m of a junction we would not usually allow this, however I would not be significantly upset if planning over ruled this."]

The existing access to the rear of the property should be closed and returned to match the existing street scene. As previously mentioned the Area Office operates a policy in this area which outlines that properties will not be granted a license for a second VCO due to existing on street parking pressures.

Extension
The proposed extensions to the dwelling result in a single additional bedroom being supplied. The additional room does not alter the parking demand for this dwelling. Currently this dwelling generates the requirement for two parking spaces and this demand is retained with the proposed alterations.

Sustainability
The existing and proposed arrangements fall short of the required parking provision as outlined by the WSCC Parking Demand Calculator (PDC.) On street parking is an existing practise within Adelaide Square and it is anticipated that overspill parking could be accommodated for in this location. The LHA must also consider the sustainable location of the development, bus services run along Middle Road which offers services to Rottingdean and Portslade and the 700 Coastliner runs along the A259 to the south which provides regular services to Brighton, Littlehampton and Worthing. Furthermore Southwick railway station is a 20minute walk from the development site offering a sustainable alternative for commuters.

Cycle parking can be accommodated for in the associated shed, it has not been stated that this will be removed but should this be removed- means of secure and covered cycle parking should be provided and demonstrated- a condition is attached to seal this.

Conclusion
The LHA does not consider that the proposal would have a 'severe' impact on the operation of the highway network, therefore is not contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework (para 32), and that there are no transport grounds to resist the proposal. Should the LPA be minded to approve this proposal, the following should be sealed via condition: Access closure, pedestrian visibility and cycle parking

Representations

None received

Relevant Planning Policies

Adur Local Plan 2017 Policy 15
'Supplementary Planning Guidance' comprising: Development Management Standard No.2 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings''
National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012)

Planning Assessment

Principle

The proposal comprises upgrading the existing housing stock located within the built up area and can be supported in principle. The relevant issues are the effects on the amenities of neighbouring residential occupiers and the effect on the character and appearance of the dwelling and its surroundings.

Visual amenity

The side extension is large and wide and will be a significant addition to the property. However, a similar extension has been built at 52 Middle Road to the west, at the other end of Adelaide Square. A planning inspector considered that bringing the mass of the building closer to Adelaide Square at first floor level

"*would not have an adverse impact upon the character of the area, as there would remain a good spacing between the properties to the south, to the east, and on the opposite side of Middle Road to the north. There is a mixed character to the area, particularly along Middle Road, where there is variety in the design of houses, and scale and type of buildings. This includes differences in the appearance of houses at the junctions of road, including at the appeal site where the existing building represents a change from the original appearance of the area. The proposed change would not be harmful to this mixed character of the area*."

With regard to potentially setting a precedent for similar developments on other corner sites, such as is now proposed at No.66, the inspector advised that "*the proposed development would not be harmful to the character and appearance of the area, given the particular circumstances of the case, and any future applications in the area would be continue to be determined on their own merits*."

It is considered that the current proposal is very similar in scale to that built at No.52. The roof ridge is lower and it is set back from the front at first floor and is considered to be suitably subservient to the host dwelling. The use of timber cladding on the extension only could accentuate the extension as a separate entity and will be unusual in the street, but it is considered to be an acceptable contemporary material which will add interest in the street scene.

The rear extension has been reduced to 3.5m and accords with the Council's guidance.

The crossover and hardstanding will be similar to that at the attached property and will not cause visual harm.

Residential amenity

The side extension will not cause harm to neighbouring residents due to the separation caused by Adelaide Square. The rear extension complies with the Council's guidance and will not cause harm by way of loss of light or outlook.

Access and Parking

The plans have been required to be amended to ensure that the new vehicular access avoids interfering with an existing dropped kerb, tactile paving pedestrian crossing in front of the site.

Following receipt of amended plans, WSCC Highways have no objection to the proposal in highway safety terms. The Area Highway Engineer has stated the proximity of the access to the road junction is not normally allowed but he would not be concerned if planning permission was granted for the access in this position on this occasion.

Recommendation

APPROVE

Subject to Conditions:-

1. Approved Plans
2. Standard 3 year time limit
3. Materials as specified
4. Access closure
5. Cycle parking
6. Pedestrian visibility

Informative: Highway licence

Is recommendation contrary to letter(s) of representation? N

The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by identifying matters of concern within the application (as originally submitted) and negotiating, with the Applicant, acceptable amendments to the proposal to address those concerns. As a result, the Local Planning Authority has been able to grant planning permission for an acceptable proposal, in accordance with the presumption in favour of sustainable development, as set out within the National Planning Policy Framework.

Case Officer: Peter Barnett Date: 28 June 2018

Authorised by: Gary Peck Date: 28 June 2018