Development Management - Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: **Recommendation – Approve**
AWDM/0375/12

Site: **56 Cokeham Road, Sompting,Lancing.**

Proposal: **Vehicular access**

Date of site visit: 05.04.12

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

The application property is the western half of a pair of semi-detached hipped roof 1940's bungalows, located on the northern side of the road. The pair sits to the west of the Sompting United Reform church, and to the east of a similar pair of bungalows. To the west (in front of the neighbouring bungalow No. 58) is a bus stop and shelter on the footpath.

The dwelling currently has a 9m deep front garden which has a low front boundary wall of rendered brick.

Permission is sought for the creation of a vehicular access onto the dwelling frontage to allow parking of vehicles off the main road. The applicant proposes a shingle hardstanding area for the parked cars and a 3m wide access onto the front of the site. 2m wide visibility splays are proposed.

No.54 to the east has a historic vehicular access located on the eastern side of the frontage.

Consultations

West Sussex County Council: The Highways Officer states that the proposed gravel hardstanding may result in material being dispersed onto the public Highway affecting the surface of the road. The applicant should provide a gravel trap or area of block paving, or other bound material, at the point of access onto the road, on land within the applicants control. There is a bus stop a short distance to the west of the proposed site access, however this is unlikely to have any detrimental affect on the proposal for an access in the location shown. The proposed crossover will require visibility splays of 2m by 2m for pedestrians. Based on the submitted information no objections would be raised to the proposal subject to the securing of the new access and pedestrian visibility splays.

Sompting Parish Council: No objection.

Representations

Third Parties: One letter of objection has been received from the owner of the adjacent bungalow (No.58) who objects to the loss of the on-street parking which is valuable as their property has a bus stop in front of it (rather than parking). They are also very concerned about the height of the vehicles to be parked on the proposed hard surface close to the boundary of their property. They feel that mini buses would take most of the light from their south-east facing living room.

Relevant Planning Policies
Adopted Adur District Local Plan 1993-2006 (ADC 1996) (saved policies): AG1, AH7 and Appendix 11 'Supplementary Planning Guidance' comprising: Development Control Standard No.3 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings'
South East Plan (GOSE 2009): CC1, CC6, BE1
National Planning Policy Framework (CLG 2012)

Planning Assessment

Visual amenity

The proposed pair of bungalows are fairly simple in style, and the front boundary wall reflects this, being as they are 0.6m in height with little adornment, other than the block-work finish. The creation of an access onto the frontage would require a minimum 3m wide section from the western side to be removed, allowing for the vehicle movements. The dwelling is one of a pair, with the attached bungalow sharing a similar front boundary wall. Whilst the opening would erode some of the character of the pair, it is felt that given the vast mixture of property types in the vicinity that it would not detract particularly from the amenity of the area.

Residential amenity

The proposed vehicular access and shingle hardstanding would result in vehicle movements towards (and away) from the property frontages of the adjacent neighbours, however it is not felt that this would have a harmful impact on the residential privacy of the occupiers, given the limited number of vehicle movements expected, and given the busy location of the site which is close to a bus stop, lay-by for shops, and junction with Cokeham Lane.

The objector raises concerns that parking of mini buses on the site would diminish the amount of light to their front lounge. There is no suggestion that the hardstanding will be used for the parking of commercial vehicles but it is considered reasonable to impose a condition restricting its use to the parking of domestic vehicles ancillary to the enjoyment of the dwelling only.

The proposed hardstanding is located to the east of the neighbour and it is proposed to retain a footpath 1m wide at the side of the hardstanding. The neighbouring bungalow is also inset from the boundary by a further metre. Given the separation between the neighbours' lounge to where the closest vehicle would park, and that they would be in an easterly location, it is not considered that the impact on natural daylight from the parking of cars would be so significant as to warrant refusal.

Highway safety

The Highways Officer has raised no objection in principle to the proposals provided that visibility splays are secured by condition. The use of a gravel driveway is ordinarily not acceptable however in this case they have requested a gravel trap or area of block paving to prevent migration of loose gravel into the street.

Recommendation

APPROVE for the reason:-

The proposed development would not detract from the local environment and can take place without resulting in unacceptable detriment to the amenities of neighbouring properties or from highway safety. It would consequently not conflict with the saved policies of the Adur District Local Plan (AG1, AH7) or the policies of the South East Plan (CC1, CC6, BE1)

Subject to Conditions:-

1. 3 years standard permission.

2. 2m by 2m Visibility splays to be provided prior to use of the access.

3. The hardstanding hereby approved shall not be used unless and until a 1.5m deep kerb of a bound material, or other suitable gravel trap is installed the entire width of the access, the details of which shall be agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

4. The hardstanding shall be used for purposes incidental to the enjoyment of the dwellinghouse only and shall not be used for the parking of a commercial vehicle.

5. Plans as approved.

Plan No: !:1250 Location Plan. Date Received: 03.04.12.

Plan No: 1:200 Block layout plan. Date Received: 03.04.12.

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

Case Officer: C.Hone Date: 30.05.12.

Authorised by: P. Barnett Date: 30.05.12