Application Number: ADC/0318/08 Recommendation – APPROVE

Site: Public Car Park, Ship Street, Shoreham-by-Sea BN43 5DH

Proposal: 4 three-bedroom townhouses with 4 parking spaces at rear (application for full permission with revised layout)

The Application

This application seeks full planning permission for 4 three-bedroom townhouses with 4 parking spaces at the rear. This application follows the outline planning permission granted in August 2007 (ADC/0371/07) for 4 townhouses, resulting from the resolution of the Council's Policy & Strategy Committee on 5 December 2006, in line with the Shoreham Renaissance strategy, to discontinue the use of the site as a public car park. This involved provision of additional parking at Pond Road to compensate.

The site has a maximum depth of 23 metres and maximum width of 20 metres (0.05 hectare). It is bounded to the rear (west) and south side by a 1.8 metre high wall. Within this wall are two gates giving pedestrian access to the rear gardens of No.14 Ship Street to the south and No.14 West Street to the west. No.14 Ship Street is a two-storey end of terrace house which abuts the southern boundary of the site and the back of the pavement. To the rear of the site are the rear gardens of houses at No's 12, 14 and 16 West Street which are grade II listed buildings. To the north of the site are the White Lion Court flats, separated from the application site by a vehicular access way leading to a covered parking area to the rear of the flats. On the boundary there is a dwarf brick wall.

The existing outline permission ADC/0371/07 for 4 terraced houses, included approval of the layout, scale and access details. On the approved layout, the houses adjoin the pavement, the two northernmost houses set 1m further back than the other two, and they are shown with two storeys plus rooms in the roof. The layout plan and indicative elevational drawings and floor plans showed the entrances to the houses at the rear. The vehicular access to the proposed houses was approved via the existing access way serving White Lion Court to the north of the site, with permission granted to widen this to 4.5 metres with a barrier to prevent access by unauthorised vehicles. This lead to the rear of the site where one parking space was shown at the rear of each house, off a proposed 6 metre wide access way providing turning space. A separate pedestrian access was shown via a gated access to the south of the terrace along a 1m wide gap between the side of No.14 Ship Street and the proposed southernmost house. To the north, a pedestrian access to the rear of the site was shown on the south side of the existing vehicular access.

The latest application seeks full permission (including external appearance and landscaping) for the same amount and scale of development as previously approved, with the houses in the same position on the site but with revisions to the parking layout and external rear space.

The access remains as previously approved and the revised rear parking still proposes 4 car spaces including 2 spaces directly to the rear of the two northernmost houses (3 and 4). However, the other 2 spaces are now at a right angle, sharing the turning space to the north. This enables most of the area to the rear of the southernmost houses (1 and 2) to

be laid out as amenity space (instead of parking and turning space) with soft landscaping. Also shown within this space is bin storage and lockable bicycle storage. The internal layout of the townhouses (only indicative on the outline application) remains similar other than a proposed kitchen-diner to the rear on the ground floor and the lounge to the front, with bedroom four now shown as a study.

Consultations and Representations

West Sussex County Council: From a highways and transport aspect, have no objection subject to at least 12 cycle parking spaces (one per bedroom) being provided and a section 106 Obligation undertaking to pay a TAD contribution of £5,120. Visibility from the access is acceptable. The four car parking spaces are within WSCC maximum parking standards and appropriate for this sustainable location.
From an archaeological aspect, state that evidence of pre-existing structures could be encountered by groundworks for foundations and a standard condition should be imposed.

Adur District Conservation Advisory Group: No objection.

Third Parties: - 12 letters of objection or concern have been received, from residents of No's 11,13, 30, 32 & 2 White Lion Court in Ship Street and No.11 John Street; from a business at 82 High Street; from other persons in the wider area (No's 43 & 45 Downside, Shoreham; No.3 Lakeside, Lancing; and a regular car park user from Steyning) and from the Shoreham Society, on the following grounds:-

- Loss of public car park, with comments including that it is used by those with mobility issues and physical disabilities; that lack of parking facilities in Shoreham is allowing the town to become rundown because of lack of access with local businesses suffering from lack of parking for customers; and that it will impact on the quality of life of those people living in Ship Street who will have no parking, only two disabled bays (residents will have to pay to park; there should be free resident only parking in Ship Street).
- Highway safety issues, with increased on-street parking.
- Concern that adjacent car park at White Lion Court will be used for extra parking.
- Large vehicles during construction will result in limited access to Ship Street and neighbouring streets, including for emergency vehicles.
- Noise will be unwelcome in this small street.
- The building will result in loss of privacy and light.
- The style of architecture does not complement the area.

The Shoreham Society express regret about the loss of parking in Ship Street.

[NB. the residents of 30 Ship Street and 3 Lakeside, Brighton Road, Lancing have requested to speak at the committee meeting]

Relevant Planning Policies and Guidance

West Sussex Structure Plan 2001-16 (WSCC 2005) (saved policies): LOC1, NE1, CH4, CH7, ERA1, DEV1, DEV4-5
Adur District Local Plan 1993-2006 (ADC 1996) (saved policies): AG1, AB1, AB3-4, AH2, AH5, AB15, AB25-27, AT6 and Appendix 11 'Supplementary Planning Guidance' comprising Development Control Standard No.2 "Space Around New Dwellings and Flats"

Revised West Sussex Parking Standards & Transport Contributions Methodology (WSCC 2003 & ADC 2004)
PPS1 'Delivering Sustainable Development' (ODPM 2005)
PPS3 'Housing' (DCLG 2006)
PPG13 'Transport' (DTLR 2001)
PPG15 'Planning and the Historic Environment' (DoE 1994)
PPG16 'Archaeology and Planning' (DoE 1990)
'A Strategy for Shoreham Renaissance' (2006)

Planning Assessment

Policies

The above policies encourage redevelopment and infilling to help meet the demand for dwellinghouses and to make best use of urban land. This is encompassed in Structure Plan policy LOC1 but it is on the proviso that "the impact on the character of the area and the environment, resources and assets of the County is acceptable" (para a).

Policy DEV1, entitled high quality development, states that development should not be permitted unless the construction, layout, scale, appearance and landscaping are of high quality taking into account the need to, amongst other things, integrate with and where possible enhance adjoining land uses and minimise conflicts between land uses and activities; have regard to context including site characteristics, townscape/streetscape, views into and out of the site and building styles/materials; give high priority to pedestrians and reduce dominance of cars; create a high quality socially-inclusive adaptable environment; protect and enhance biodiversity; ensure energy efficiency; and meet the needs of service providers.

Policy DEV4 states (amongst other things) that development should not be permitted unless the travel needs it generates are met; it achieves safe and convenient access by a choice of means of travel; it encourages and enables an increase in walking and cycling; and the number and impact of motorised journeys is minimised. 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". The explanatory text refers to a transport contributions methodology.

The relevant Local Plan policy AH2, related to housing development by way of infilling and redevelopment, expects development to be designed so that its appearance, character and scale create a pleasant place in which to live, is in keeping with and enhances the existing local environment with particular attention to the architectural form, height, materials, density and layout; it does not have an unneighbourly effect on existing dwellings by loss of privacy, light or outlook; it incorporates adequate standards of open amenity space, daylighting, outlook and privacy; plus adequate access and parking arrangements and accords with adopted standards (in this case the Council's DC Standard No. 2 'Space Around New Dwellings and Flats' 1996 and the Revised West Sussex Parking Standards and Transport Contributions Methodology 2003).

Government policy guidance in PPS3 encourages best use of urban land for housing development, particularly affordable housing, at higher densities (avoiding developments at less than 30 dwellings per hectare) and without rigid application of parking and amenity space standards. However, it also seeks to improve the quality and attractiveness of

residential areas and urges imaginative designs and layouts which make more efficient use of land without compromising the quality of the environment.

The Council has a statutory duty to pay special attention to the need to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of Conservation Areas. The site is located within the conservation area and within close proximity to listed buildings therefore it is important that the character and appearance of the proposal respects the existing historic environment and local character. Policy AB4 requires development of a high standard of design and construction materials. AB3 states that permission will not be granted for development that would generate a level of traffic flow or other activity likely to affect adversely the character of the conservation area.

Shoreham Renaissance

Shoreham Town Centre has been identified as a key location for regeneration and in 2006, the document 'A Strategy for Shoreham Renaissance' was published with the aim to "regenerate Shoreham town centre as a sustainable community possessing economic, social and environmental diversity".
One of main objectives of the movement strategy as set out in Shoreham Renaissance is to prevent 'traffic churn' throughout the town centre by providing a co-ordinated approach to public parking, which in some instances will require the closure of some of the towns smaller car parks (in this instance Ship Street car park) and rationalisation of others.

The Council's Policy and Strategy Committee, on 5 December 2006, resolved that the Ship Street car park site be disposed of for residential redevelopment as set out in Shoreham Renaissance strategy, subject to extra spaces being provided at Pond Road to compensate for the loss (the latter having been the subject of application ADC/0236/07).

Principle of Loss of Car Park

The principle of the loss of the existing car park is established by the permission that has already been granted and cannot now be reconsidered.

Density and Character

The number of houses and their scale, layout and means of access are established by the existing outline permission.

Visual amenity

It is considered that the proposed design is appropriate in this case for the Conservation Area. In particular, the proposed buildings respect the existing character of the adjacent houses to the south which also abut the street.

Terraced houses two storeys high with rooms in the roof served by small dormers are in keeping with the scale of properties in the locality which are a mixture or two and three storeys with no uniform building height. The proposed traditional design is considered to be acceptable and will enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and the setting of nearby listed buildings.

The front windows are shown wider than on the indicative perspective drawings with the outline permission, with 2 dormers per house rather than one. This tends to result in the

windows being a more dominant feature, particularly as there are no doors on the street elevation (which is as already approved). The proposed materials are flint facing with red brick quoins for the front and north side (rather than render as previously indicated), which would be an improvement as it would help to reinforce the historic character of the locality. The roof would be of natural slate, the dormers clad with lead and the window frames of timber which again would reinforce the historic character.

The change to the parking layout to the rear of the site is not considered to have any significant effect on the appearance of the development as it is not visible from the street.

Access and Parking

The access arrangements sharing the access to White Lion Court are as previously approved but the layout of parking spaces and the turning arrangements have been changed. However, one car parking space per dwelling is still proposed. WSCC as the Highways Authority has no objection subject to standard conditions and completion of a section 106 Obligation for a sustainable transport contribution of £5,120.

Residential Amenity

The siting of the building has not changed from that previously approved under the outline application. Therefore, as previously stated, there is not considered to be any adverse impact on the residential amenities of the occupiers of the adjacent properties.

The main properties potentially affected by the proposed development are the White Lion Court flats to the north; the house at No.14 Ship Street to the south; and the houses to the rear, No's 12, 14 and 16 West Street.

There would be a distance of 1 metre between the northern side of No.14 Ship Street and the southern side of the proposed houses. There is only one small secondary window on the side elevation of this existing house. The proposed houses would be set back slightly further than No.14 and they would protrude further rearwards by 1.8 metres than No.14. It is considered that this distance is not such as to cause an overbearing effect or loss of daylight, particularly as they are to the north, and the relationship between the buildings is considered acceptable.

To the north, on the southern elevation of White Lion Court, there is a side window at a distance of 5.8 metres from the northern elevation of the proposed end house. There would be some loss of light but not, it is considered, to such a degree as to warrant refusal.

The houses in West Street to the rear are at a minimum distance of 24 metres from the rear of the proposed terraced houses. The Council's Development Control Standards state that there should be a distance of a least 22 metres between rear habitable windows to avoid unacceptable loss of privacy and overlooking. The proposals show firstfloor rear balconies but it is considered that, at this distance, there would not be an unacceptable impact on the residential amenities of these properties.

Also needing to be considered are the residential amenities of the future occupiers of the proposed dwellings. The indicative floor plans show each dwelling to have 3/4 bedrooms over three levels, so they would clearly be suitable for families with children.

A significant negative factor of the previously approved scheme was that there were no rear gardens and the only amenity space shown were small rear balconies at first floor level. As stated above, the current scheme proposes to rearrange the rear parking layout to allow for some amenity space with soft landscaping to the rear of the southernmost houses. This is a clear improvement on the previous scheme (although it is below the standard contained in the Council's DC Standard No.2).

Recommendation

A. Subject to completion by 7 August 2008 of a satisfactory section 106 Obligation undertaking to pay £5,120 to sustainable transport improvements in the area, APPROVE for reason that:-

The proposed development is within the built-up area and would help meet the need for additional housing without detracting from the existing local urban environment. It can take place without resulting in unacceptable detriment to the amenities of neighbouring properties and without detraction from highway safety. The loss of the car park would be contrary to policy AT6 of the Local Plan but this would be compensated for by enlargement of a nearby public car park. The lack of external amenity space does not accord with one of the requirements of policy AH2 but is considered acceptable in this instance because of the sustainable town centre location. Apart from this, the proposals would not conflict materially with the relevant policies of the Adur District Local Plan (AG1, AB1, AB3-4, [redacted] 2, AH5), the West Sussex Structure Plan (LOC1, NE1[redacted], CH1, CH4-5, CH7, ERA1, DEV1, DEV4-5)

Subject to:-

1. C1Ci (Standard time limit)
2. C7Cii (Details of walls, fences and gates, including the proposed barrier across the access and the infilling of the openings in the rear wall with matching materials) (amended)
3. C8Bii (Parking spaces and access facilities to be constructed and retained)
4. C8Gi (Secure and covered cycle parking provision) (amended)
5. C9Ei (Technical details of access to be approved and sight lines provided and retained)
6. C9N (Temporary provision for contractors vehicles, materials etc on site)
7. C11A3 (Hard and soft landscaping scheme)
8. C12Aii (External materials for walls and roof to be approved including sample panel for flintwork) (amended)
9. C14Dii (Archaeological investigation to be agreed and carried out at developer's expense)
10. C18Civ (Obscure glazing of northern side windows) (amended)
11. C18Ei (No additional windows in north side)
12. C18K (Provision for waste storage)
13. C18B (Removal of permitted development rights for alterations to the front or north side elevations, extensions, front walls or fences and curtilage buildings) (amended)

+ 14. Contam. (EH)

B. In the event that a satisfactory section 106 Obligation is not completed by 7 August 2008 (the date that the statutory period for determining the application expires), that the application be refused on grounds that it does not comply with Structure Plan Policies

DEV3-5 and Revised West Sussex Parking Standards and Transport Contributions Methodology requiring improvements to sustainable transport in the area.

.....