Development Management - Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/0523/15 Recommendation – Approve

Site: **4 Kings Crescent, Shoreham-By-Sea, West Sussex BN43 5LE**

Proposal: **Construction of end of terrace 1 bedroom maisonette (Amended re-submission of AWDM/1223/13)**

Date of site visit: 8 October 2013

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

The application relates to a semi detached dwelling on the corner of Kings Crescent and Fishermans Walk on Shoreham Beach. It is proposed to construct a new dwelling attached to the side of the existing house, to match the existing pair and to form a terrace of three houses. The accommodation to be provided consists of a garage and kitchen on the ground floor (i.e. non habitable accommodation) and a bedroom, bathroom, lounge and study at first floor. A conservatory would be attached to the side wall of the proposed dwelling. Access to the garage would be from the rear, off Fishermans Walk. A new 1.8m high brick wall is to be constructed along the northern boundary with 13 Fishermans Walk. The garden to the new dwelling would be at the side with a new garden wall to be constructed in line with the front wall of the proposed porch.

This application follows the refusal of a similar application last year for a 2 storey attached dwelling (AWDM/1223/13). That application was refused solely on flood risk grounds.

Relevant site history

See above.

Consultations

West Sussex County Council – The Highway Officer has no objection subject to conditions securing cycle parking, car parking, pedestrian visibility splays and the new access.

Adur and Worthing Councils – The Environmental Health Officer has made no comments, subject to imposing the PFA informative.

Environment Agency – No objection. The submitted Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) shows that in an extreme flood event the property could suffer internal flooding to a depth of up to three metres. Most habitable rooms are on the first floor above the predicted flood level for the year 2115, other than the kitchen which could be subject to deep flood water.

The flood resilient design would provide some level of protection for all but the more extreme events.

The FRA states an Emergency Flood Plan will be drawn up, and that the first floor will provide a place of safe refuge. We do not normally comment on or approve the adequacy of flood emergency plans accompanying development proposals, as we do not carry out these roles during a flood. Our involvement with this development during an emergency will be limited to delivering flood warnings to occupants/users. We would recommend the applicant discusses any specific emergency planning issues with the LPA.

Representations

None received

Relevant Planning Policies

Adopted Adur District Local Plan 1993-2006 (ADC 1996) (saved policies): AG1, AH2 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)
National Planning Policy Framework (CLG 2012)

Planning Assessment

Principle

The proposal comprises new housing development 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, the effect on the character and appearance the surrounding area and the flood risk implications of the development.

Visual amenity

The proposed dwelling would largely match the size and appearance of the existing dwellings, being 5.8m wide and with similar window, door and porch arrangements. It would leave a distance of 6.1m to the side boundary at first floor level (3.3m at ground floor) and will not appear cramped or out of character in the street scene. On the opposite corner to the west, 6 Kings Crescent has a distance of 5m to the boundary so there will be no unacceptable closing of the space on this corner.

The existing boundary treatment will be retained, thereby ensuring that the Kings Crescent frontage will remain open, with only a low wall running alongside the pavement. The new garden wall will be level with the front of the porch and will not be intrusive or harmful to the street scene.

The new 1.8m high boundary wall along the northern boundary is acceptable visual terms. However, it will be required to stop short of the pavement to

enable visibility splays to be provided for pedestrians. Final details can be secured by condition.

Residential amenity – impact on existing occupiers

Being at the side of No. 4 it will not cause any loss of light or outlook to that property. Internally, the layout does offer the potential for noise disturbance between the lounge of the proposed dwelling and the smallest bedroom of the existing dwelling. However, no objection has been received from the Environmental Health Officer and the Building Regulations will require sound insulation between the properties which should help to minimise any potential for disturbance.

At the rear (north) No. 13 Fishermans Walk is perpendicular to the site and is broadly in line with the rear of 4 Kings Crescent. The rear of the proposed dwelling would face towards the blank side wall and front of 13 Fishermans Walk and would not cause any adverse overlooking or loss of privacy. The orientation of the dwellings and the distance of 6.9m from the boundary means that the proposed dwelling is also unlikely to cause any harmful loss of light or outlook. The proposed boundary wall will be sufficiently distant from the nearest windows of No.13 to avoid any adverse loss of light or outlook. Effectively, the existing boundary wall is being moved 2.5m further north and the impact is not considered to be significant.

The side window will serve a landing only and will be 20m from the side of No.6 and will not cause any loss of privacy.

Residential amenity – impact on proposed occupiers

The existing dwelling, No.4, will have a side landing window blocked up which is of no consequence. Its garden will be reduced to 45sqm which is substantially smaller than existing but is only just below the 50sqm required for 2 bed terraced dwellings. The proposed dwelling will have one bedroom only so the garden area is considered to be adequate.

The floor area of the dwelling is approximately 67sqm (excluding the garage) which exceeds the requirement for this size of property (51sqm).

Parking and access

The new dwelling will have use of the existing garage currently serving No. 4, but this means there will be no parking for the existing dwelling. However, there is considered to be sufficient on-road parking space available, as well as use of a layby in front of the terrace. The site is in a sustainable location, within walking distance of public car parks, and has close links with the public transport network. The proposal is not anticipated to generate a material increase in vehicle movements over and above what currently exists and the peak usage times would not be expected to coincide with peak traffic levels in this area.

There is no highway objection to the proposal. A cycle parking condition has been requested but there is considered to be adequate space available to store bicycles within the garage to make this condition unnecessary.

Flood Risk

The site lies within Flood Zone 3 defined by the Planning Practice Guide to the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) as having a high probability of flooding. The applicants have submitted a FRA prepared which confirms that all habitable accommodation (bedroom/lounge) will be on the first floor at least 5m AOD. While the kitchen and conservatory on the ground floor will flood during an extreme event, safe refuge will be able to be provided at first floor level within the house. The house will also be constructed to incorporate flood protection measures such as bringing down electrical services from ceilings, solid concrete floors and wiring and power outlets 600mm above floor level.

The Environment Agency has confirmed that it has no objection to the proposal.

Recommendation

APPROVE subject to conditions:

1. Standard time limit
2. Materials
3. Pedestrian visibility splays
4. No habitable accommodation on ground floor and to be constructed in accordance with FRA
5. Removal of PD rights
6. Approved plans

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

Case Officer: Peter Barnett Date: 3 June 2015

Authorised by: Gary Peck Date: 4 June 2015