Dec 11/07

Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: ADC/0293/07 **Recommendation - Application Refused**

Site: **78 Brighton Road Lancing West Sussex BN15 8LW**

Proposal: **3 terraced townhouses with integral garages**

The Application

The site consists of a rectangular shaped plot of land approximately 14m wide and 22m deep, located on the south side of Brighton Road. The plot backs onto the Golden Sands Caravan site, to the east of the site is Southbank Court a 3 storey hipped roof block of flats built in the 1980's. To the north side of Brighton Road are a number of traditional bungalows and two-storey houses.

Construction has recently begun on the application for 3 town houses approved under L/44/04. The site is levelled up until a secondary sea defence bank, which rises approximately 2.5m above the level of the site.

The application proposes to alter the scheme approved under L/44/04 to construct a three storey building containing 3 x 3 bedroom townhouses with integral garages. The block will measure approximately 10.6m in height and 13m in width, with south facing mansard to accommodate the proposed third floor bedroom, dressing room and bathroom in the roof of each town house. One internal parking space is proposed is proposed at the front of each house.

Consultations and Representations

LPC : Objects

Third Parties

1 letter of objection stating that there has been very little change from the previous plans, light will be restricted to property but if the east gable end was at more of an angle (hipped) it would improve light.

Consultations

Environmental Health:- No objection subject to comments previously made in respect of sound insulation for the two bedroom properties previously permitted.

WSCC Highway Planning:- Objection. Comments raised in connection with planning application ADC/27/07 (substandard parking provision, inadequate width of parking spaces, poor visibility at access points and lack of on site turning) have not been addressed as part of this submission. In addition and in line with WSCC policy, a Stage 1 Safety Audit has not been submitted.

Environment Agency:- No objection in principal, subject to conditions.

Relevant Planning Policies and Guidance

Adopted West Sussex Structure Plan 2001-2016 (WSCC 2005) : LOC1, NE1-2, CH1, ERA1, DEV1, DEV4-5Adur Development Plan – submission Core Strategy 2006-26 (ADC 2007): H1, H2, H3, T3, T4, ENV4Adur District Local Plan 1993-2006 (ADC 1996): AG1, AP3, AT12, AH1, AH2 and Supplementary Planning Guidance including Development Control Standard No. 2 'Space Around New Dwellings and Flats' Planning Policy Statement PPS1 'Delivering Sustainable Development' (ODPM 2004)Planning Policy Statement PPS3 Housing (DCLG 2006) Development and Flood Risk PPS25 (DCLG 2006)

Planning Assessment

Planning History

The most relevant planning history to this application includes:

~~Adc~~/27/07

- L/40/03/TP: Demolition of the existing dwelling and erection of 3 townhouses, three storeys high with garages on the ground floor. Refused 14/1/04

- L/44/04/TP: Demolition of existing dwelling and erection of 3 townhouses, three storeys high with garages on the ground floor (resubmission of L/40/03/TP). Approved 4/5/04

- L/1/06/TP: Demolition of existing dwelling and redevelopment with 5 x 2 bedroom flats in a 4 storey block including rooms in the roof (with parking on ground floor. Refused 9/2/06

- L/44/04 Demolition of existing dwelling and erection of three townhouses with garages on ground floor. Approved 4/5/04

Planning Policy
Policies in the Structure Plan encourage the re-use of previously developed land by infilling, redevelopment and conversion at higher densities providing the impact on the character of the area and environment is acceptable (LOC1). Policy DEV1 requires development to be of high quality having regard to the local context including the characteristics of the site, the landscape, townscape, streetscape and the use of materials and building styles in the area.

Policy AH2 of the Adur District Local Plan is particularly relevant as it allows for redevelopment in the built up area subject to various design criteria including that the development is in keeping with and enhances the local environment, respects the existing natural features and does not have an unneighbourly effect on the existing dwellings by reason of unacceptable loss of privacy, daylight/sunlight, outlook or open amenity space and incorporates acceptable access and parking arrangements.

Design and Appearance
This application proposes 3 x 3 bedroom townhouses to be contained in a building measuring 10.6m in height (approximately 8m to the eaves level) and 13m in width. The proposed building is located in the same building footprint and has similar dimensions as the previously approved 3 x 2 bedroom townhouse (L/44/04/TP), which was proposed to be 10.5m in height with eaves at 7.5m. An additional bedroom, dressing room and bathroom is now proposed in the roof of the proposed building.

The proposed building has a front façade measuring 13m across with a forward central gable projection with eaves at main eaves level. The existing flats to the east are also approximately 13m in width, however, their frontage is broken into two parts, separated by an indented access, causing the building to appear as though it has two smaller front facades at a width of 5.6m. The previously approved scheme (L/44/04/TP) also contained a building13m in width however again the façade was broken by a small front projection (0.3m proud of the main body of the building) with a gable roof set approximately 2m down from the ridge line of the building.

The previously proposed and refused building was also orientated with its ridge line running parallel to Brighton Road with the hipped roof on the northern and southern elevations. The orientation of the hipped roof caused a massing effect on the building which

makes the building appear incongruous within the street scene and resulted in a cramped appearance on the site. In order to try to address this the sides have been part hipped in the current proposals but the mansard effect remains on the rear elevation and the side elevations remain large bland flank walls. It is considered that the design and bulk of the proposal would be detrimental to the streetscene and is inferior to the original approval.

Residential Amenity

It is considered that the impacts on residential amenity would not be significantly altered over the previous approval. Internal layouts and living accommodation are considered acceptable with the revised design.

There is an area of rear garden marked on the plans for each of the town houses ranging from $54m^2$, $30m^2$ and $35m^2$. These amenity areas do not accord with Council's minimum standards of $65m^2$ for three bedroom terraces as outlined in the Development Control Standard No. 2 (although these sizes were more acceptable in relation to the two bed dwellings previously approved). Government guidance in PPS3 notes that dimensional planning standards should not be rigidly applied and the emphasis should be on high quality design. In this instance, the proposed design of the building is not considered to contribute positively to the character of the area and as such the substandard amenity space and the design is considered to detract both from the character of the area and the residential amenity of future occupiers of the proposed townhouses.

Access and Parking

Access is provided from the south side of Brighton Road. The County Transport Services has been consulted on the application and object to the proposal due to inadequate parking and an inadequate access width. The WSCC car parking standards allow for a maximum of three spaces per 3 bedroom dwelling, however, the County have noted that two car parking spaces per dwelling would be more appropriate in this instance. The application currently proposes 1 car parking space per townhouse.

As the proposal does not provide adequate car parking spaces or access to the garages, the proposal does not comply with policy AH2 and AT12 of the Adur District Local Plan.

A stage 1 Safety Audit should have been prepared.

Sustainable and Resource efficient buildings.
Submission Core Strategy Policy ENV4 of the Adur Development Plan states that measures will be required to ensure new buildings achieve efficient environmental performance to meet the Government's new code for Sustainable Homes. Policy H3 also requires that all new homes be designed to 'Lifetime Homes' standards. A condition could be placed on any approval to ensure that the proposed new townhouses are able to meet the code for Sustainable Homes and the application states that the proposal has been designed to accord with the Lifetime Home standards.

Conclusion
It is considered that the proposed design and bulk, particularly of the roof would result in a building dominant in the streetscene out of keeping relative to the existing design of the flats to the east. The massing would cause the building to appear cramped within the site and the substandard amenity space would have a detrimental impact on the residential amenity of future occupants. Additionally the access and parking arrangements do not comply with policies AH2 and AT12 of the Adur District Local Plan.

Recommendation

REFUSE on grounds that :-

The proposal, with particular reference to the design and form of the roof, would result in an ill-proportioned and incongruous ~~form~~

1. B5AR (obtrusive and out of keeping)
2. 7AR (inadequate parking provision)
3. The accesses ~~and parking spaces~~ are substandard and inadequate to serve the proposed development by reason of inadequate width and limited visibility and, in the absence of a Stage 1 Safety Audit, the proposed development is contrary to Policy DEV4 of the West Sussex Structure Plan 2001-2016 and Policy AT12 of the Adur District Local Plan.

Case Officer.....

Date.....29.6.07.....