Expired.

Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: ADC/0642/07 Recommendation - Permit

Site: **185 Brighton Road Lancing West Sussex BN15 8JB**

Proposal: **Subdivision of chalet bungalow into 2 semi-detached chalet bungalows (1 x 3-bed and 1 x 1-bed) including extension on SE corner, enlargement of roofs and new shared access to A259 (existing access closed)**

The Application

The application property is a detached hipped roof bungalow on the north side of the A259 Brighton Road. The application site is the corner plot on the west of the junction with Kings Road, set back from the Brighton Road by a 10m verge and pathway.

The property has been extended previously out to the east side with an attached flat roof garage (L/74/80) which was subsequently converted into a habitable room with the addition of another single storey extension with dummy pitch roof (L/105/87).

The proposal is for the extension of the original house with a part-hipped gable roof, the addition of a full part-hipped gable roof above the existing side extension, with front dormer and rooms in the roof, infill extension at the front, and subdivision of the property into two dwellings (1x three-bed and 1x one-bed).

The property is surrounded by two-storey houses, to the west No.183 is located 1 metre away, and to the north is a house which fronts onto Kings Road. On the south side of Brighton Road are large detached houses well set back from the road.

An application for a similar proposal (ADC/0448/07) which incorporated alterations to the verge and use of the existing access at the front of the house for turning and a two bedroom dwelling rather than a one-bedroom dwelling was refused on the grounds that:-

1. The increased use of the existing access to the public highway would add to the hazards of highway users to an unacceptable degree.
2. The proposal does not include adequate provision on the site for the parking of vehicles in a satisfactory manner to the standard required by the Local Planning Authority.
3. The proposal would be detrimental to highway safety in that it does not provide for adequate facilities to enable vehicles to turn on the site and so enter and leave the highway in forward gear.

4. Having regard to the limited size and type of property involved, the proposed new east side dwelling is unlikely to obtain a satisfactory standard of residential amenity for the occupiers, and a potential car parking problem incapable of solution within the limits of the site and the proposal would therefore be detrimental to the residential environment of the locality.

Consultations and Representations

West Sussex County Council: The Highways Officer feels that the applicant has addressed the parking concerns expressed in the previous application, and requests that conditions be attached which secure the new driveway and reinstatement of the verge over the old driveway, plus parking and turning and storage of construction vehicles and materials clear of the highway through the course of construction. A TAD contribution of £ 1,138 would be required.

Lancing Parish Council: No objection.

Third Parties: The owner of No.1 Kings Road directly to the north raise slight concerns about potential loss of privacy and loss of light to their property, specifically the south facing windows of the lounge, bedroom, bathroom and window.

Relevant Planning Policies and Guidance

Adopted West Sussex Structure Plan 2001-16 (WSCC 2005) (saved policies): LOC1, CH1, NE1, ERA1, DEV1, DEV3-5.
Adopted Adur District Local Plan 1993-2006 (ADC 1996)(saved policies): AG1, AH2, AH5 and Appendix II 'Suplementary Planning Guidance' comprising Development Control Standard No.2 'Space Around New dwellings and Flats'.
PPS1 'Delivering Sustainable Development' (ODPM 2005)
PPS3 ' Housing' (DCLG 2006)
PPG13 'Transport' (DTLR 2001)

Planning Assessment

Structure Plan policies give significant weight to making the best use of land through higher density development provided that the impact on the character of the area and environment is acceptable (LOC1, ERA1, CH1) and subject to policy DEV1 requiring high quality development. Policy DEV4 states (amongst other things) that development should not be permitted unless the travel needs it generates are met. DEV5 states that "Development should not be permitted unless the level of parking is compatible with the need to avoid environmental or safety problems and the need is to encourage walking, cycling and the use of passenger transport where this is or can be a realistic alternative".

Local Plan policy AH2 relates to new residential development (by way of infilling and redevelopment) and states that new dwellings should be designed so that their appearance, character and scale create a pleasant place in which to live and are in keeping with and enhance the existing local environment with particular attention being paid to architectural form, height, materials, density, layout of buildings and hard surfaced areas; they do not have an unneighbourly effect due to loss of privacy; daylight/sunlight; outlook or open space, incorporating adequate standards of residential amenity for the new dwellings in terms of amenity space, daylight, outlook and privacy; access and parking provision meets the adopted standards; and they accord with the Council's DC Standard No.2 'Space Around New Dwellings and Flats'.

Government policy guidance PPS3 encourages best use of urban land for housing at higher densities and without rigid application of parking and amenity space standards.

Visual amenity
The current application would visually be unchanged from the previous refused application. In terms of the affect on the visual amenity of the area it was determined that, on balance, there would not be an overbearing effect and is considered to be acceptable in terms of design.

Residential amenity
It was also determined that the proposed alterations and additions would not have an effect on the residential amenity of the dwelling to the east (No.183) or to the north (No.1 Kings Road). The owner of No.1 King's Road has raised concern that the proposals will result in a loss of light to the south facing windows of her property, however no objection was made to the previous application.

The existing dwelling has a side extension to the east which would make up most of the proposed east side one-bedroom dwelling. As existing the side extension has a dummy pitch roof which terminates at approximately 3.5m above ground level. The proposed roof extension would have a ridge height of 6.3m, although the roof would slope away from the rear of No.1 King's Road, and given the separation that exists between the application property and the objector to the north (4m – 6.5m) it is considered that the effect on levels of direct sunlight from the south would not be so bad as to warrant a refusal.

The proposed sub-division would result in there being a three bedroom bungalow to the west side making up most of the existing dwelling, and a one bedroom bungalow on the east side of the dwelling, with the bedroom and bathroom located within the new pitched roof. The western half of the property would be unchanged in size and arrangement, with the rooms in roof being slightly enlarged from the existing situation. The eastern property would incorporate a lounge dining room and kitchen at ground floor with the bathroom and bedroom above. It is considered the proposed reduction of scale of the east side dwelling from the previously refused application would now be of a standard that is acceptable.

Each of the dwellings would have a garden space of 65 square meters which is considered to be acceptable given the relative size of gardens within the surrounding area. Neither garden would have a minimum depth of 11 metres however this is due to the siting of the existing dwelling rather than the proposed development. The new east side dwelling would have the shorter of the two gardens however the main amenity area would be to the side which is very well screened by a high hedge, and would provide adequate private outdoor space.

Access and parking

The fundamental alterations to the proposals are the arrangement of on-site parking and access. The existing driveway is proposed to be removed and the dropped kerb stopped up with the introduction of a new, centrally located driveway for access to the two dwellings. The amended parking and access plan has been set out in consultation with West Sussex Highways and are now considered to address the issues of the previous refusal, and are therefore acceptable.

Recommendation

APPROVE for reason that :-

2PPi

1. C1Ci
2. C14Aii – (20.11.07 DEV4-5)
3. C8Bi – amended
   The additional one-bedroom bungalow hereby approved shall not be occupied until the parking spaces and access facilities shown on the submitted plan 932/3/05 B have been ...etc
4. C9Ai
5. C9Ki
6. C9N
7. C12Ei
8. C7Ci – amended
   ....LPA and the new one-bedroom unit of accommodation shall not be....etc
9. C11D
10. C18B – amended
    ....the proposed dwellings shall not be extended or any incidental building (exceeding 10 cubic metres in volume) erected within its curtilage or any roof-light in the rear roof slope of the one-bedroom unit of accommodation unless permission....etc

Case Officer: [signature] Date: 22.10.08

PB 23/10/08