WB/10/0732/FULL

DELEGATED APPLICATIONS

ASSESSMENT SHEET

APPLICATION NO./ ADDRESS: WB/10/0732/FULL 27 Ladydell Road

DATE OF SITE VISIT: 15 September 2010

NEIGHBOURS CHECKED : Y

ADDITIONAL NEIGHBOUR NOTIFICATIONS (LIST ADDRESSES): N

1. THE PROPOSAL AND THE SITE

The site relates to a detached bungalow on the west side of Ladydell Road almost opposite its junction with Dawes Avenue to the south. The bungalow is a distinctive property, unlike any other in the street. It sits at a lower ground level than the pavement and the ground level of Ladydell Road falls slightly to the north. The site has a flint wall along the frontage with vehicular access on the north side serving the garage. The site is within Flood Risk Zone 2.

This is a predominantly residential area with a mix of terraced, semi detached and detached houses, largely of the inter war period.

Full permission is sought to replace this bungalow with a detached four-bedroom house and a pair of four-bedroom semi detached houses, all with forecourt parking and their own vehicular access onto Ladydell Road. This is a revised scheme following permission for a three-bedroom detached house and two three-bedroom semi detached houses (WB/08/0077/FULL refers). The fourth bedrooms for the houses would be within the roof space facilitated by a barn-hip roof design and dormer windows to the front elevation of the semi detached houses. However, amended plans have been received to revert back to the original roof forms but with the addition of dormer windows and roof light windows for the semi detached houses.

2. APPLICANT'S DESIGN AND ACCESS STATEMENT

The applicant has submitted a Design and Access Statement summarised below:-

"Amount

The site area is 714m^2
The proposed amount of development to replace the existing property is a four bedroom house and two four bedroom semi detached houses.

The previous application WB/08/0077/FULL which was 'demolish existing dwelling and erection of one detached three bedroom house and two three

bedroom semi detached houses', which was approved. This application is essentially the same but with additional rooms in the roof.
This application reflects the previous application and takes note of the current street scene and in particular the recent development opposite.

The existing ground floor footprint of the bungalow is 179m^2 (inclusive of the front porch area) and the proposed ground floor footprint of the detached and semi-detached properties would be 178m^2, representing a nominal decrease.

The proposed increased density would be considered appropriate.

The proposal also provides adequate amenity space and provision for access for cars and bicycles.

The proposed dwellings have taken into account the site dimension and the layout of the surroundings.

The density has been assessed in terms of the site and in terms of the impact on the neighbourhood services. The proposed would relate sympathetically with the existing built environment and current street scene and provide additional housing capacity.

The elevational treatment and proportions of the proposed are in keeping with the existing mixed street scene.

The layout of the site has been assessed given the frontage which is 21.5m and provision of access to the site.

Account has been taken of the site topography and the proximity to the adjoining properties. The site is positioned slightly lower relative to the ground levels of the adjoining sites. The orientation reflects the orientation of the existing street scene and the stepped positioning reference a notional building line.

Layout
The proposed dwelling would be a replacement of the existing property. An assessment of the surrounding area has lead to the proposed development as consistent with the local vicinity and the existing diverse street scene and dwellings.

The proposed redevelopment has been proposed to reflect the character and diversity of the surrounding area in terms of detailing and proposed materials. The design and layout is in keeping with the locality.

Car parking has been provided within the proposed plots along with secure bicycle parking/storage.

Energy conservation has been considered and evaluated, as the proposed dwellings would be detailed to code 3 standards meeting the current requirements of part L.

Scale

The height of the detached house is proposed to be 8.75m. The height of the semi detached house is proposed to be 9m.

The area of the detached house is proposed to be 146.50m^2.

The area of the semi-detached house is proposed to be 143m^2 to each.

The proposed dwellings have been scaled to be proportionate and to fit the plot and to restrict the impact and over looking aspects reference the adjoining and abutting properties.

Taking into account the relative heights to the surrounding properties and the proposed height and dimensions have been proposed to produce well designed dwellings in scale with the surrounding development and of appropriate scale and mass.

Given the positioning and elevational detailing the proposed would not have an adverse impact on the amenities of the adjoining properties.

The overriding principle of the design is to ensure a well-designed and visually attractive dwellings so making a positive contribution to the visual environment and adding to the housing stock in accordance with policy H1 in relation to a supply of unidentified sites. The siting, layout, height, massing, scale and proportions are compatible with the surroundings and take full account of the characteristics of the site.

The proposed would make the most efficient use of the site, provides a mix of development and the intensification would not result in an unacceptable reduction in amenity in line with Policy H2 H9 and H18.

The planned mass and scale has been influenced by the existing character of the local area as well as the immediately surrounding properties.

Landscaping

The site area is 714m^2

The landscaping has been considered in that the proposed dwellings will have their own amenity space. Adequate provision has been made for parking and pedestrian access to the property.

Appearance

The visual impact/impression the proposed would make has been addressed/assessed in the context of producing houses that would blend with the street scene and reflect the diverse character of the area.

It would be evaluated that the proposed would not detract from the surrounding area, but rather, would be a positive contribution to the visual amenity of the area.

The finishes have been proposed as being representative of the local detailing and finishes in the vicinity.

Access
The proposal details the access to the site and in terms of the access to the dwellings. The proposed provides good access, adequate vehicular access with parking. See the extract from the drawing reference the proposed access and parking arrangements (NTS).

Access for cycle s is good and there is adequate space for provision of secure cycle storage within the garden sheds to the dwellings.

In terms of transport and infrastructure one would note that the site is close to railway and bus links. Consideration has been taken of achieving a sustainable environment and to utilise the existing public transport links. The sustainability of the proposed development would be considered a positive aspect.

With respect to access internally this will be dealt with by compliance with part M with respect to building control."

3. PLANNING HISTORY

Permission was granted in 2008 for the construction of a three bedroom detached house and two three bedroom semi detached houses to replace the existing property (WB/08/0077/FULL). This was a re-submission following withdrawal of an earlier scheme for a four bedroom detached house and two three bedroom semi detached houses (WB/07/1287/FULL).

At no. 40 Ladydell Road, permission was granted (initially at appeal WB/07/1252/FULL and later 09/0340/FULL refers) for the conversion of the existing property into two dwellings and the construction of two semi detached houses.

4. CONSULTATIONS

The **Executive Head of Health, Housing and Community Safety** raises no objections subject to conditions relating to dust suppression, limiting hours of construction and contamination precaution.

The **Borough's Engineer** has provided the following comments:-

'It is noted that the applicant within the submitted Flood Assessment proposes that a rain water recovery system be provided. It would be interesting to understand exactly what this refers to.

With regards to surface water run off I would suggest that the proposed concrete driveways be opposed and permeable concrete blockwork be requested. I would further propose that roof down pipes discharge to soakaways rather than being connected to the public sewer.

Therefore our comment would be that the proposal is in principle acceptable but that we would require a soakage test to be undertaken in order to calculate the soil infiltration rate and that the three soakaways are sized in

accordance with the guidelines in BRE 365, and that the hard landscaping be opposed.'

The **Highway Authority** have commented as follows:

WSCC previously made comments on a similar proposal at this location in 2007 and 2008 under application numbers WB/77/08 and WB/1287/07. At both of these times modifications were sought on the access and parking arrangements. This latest proposal does not appear to incorporate any of these recommendations is there any reason for this?

Please raise this with the applicant and re-consult.

Revised plans were forwarded to the Highway Authority and the following comments were received:

Given the similar scheme at number 40 Ladydell Road, I think we would find it difficult to sustain an objection to this application. I would have some further comments to make regarding the plans previously submitted. The existing access which is to be retained is 2.6 metres in width but we would advise that the new access should be 3.0 metres in width. With this arrangement the proposal will result in the loss of two parking spaces along Ladydell Road, this is something the LPA may wish to consider. Whilst the existing arrangement does benefit from a turn on site, the layout of the proposed dwellings does not have sufficient space to offer this facility. However, having checked the most recently available accident records which reveal there have been no RTA's at the proposed point of access and also it is noted that there are other properties with a no turn on-site facility in close proximity to this site, there would be no concerns with this arrangement.

If you are minded to approve this application I would advise a condition securing the new access and a condition securing cycle parking should be included. The usual Informative should also be applied to this application advising the applicant to obtain a licence from the area engineer to carry out the site access works onto the highway.

The **Environment Agency** has made the following comments:

Environment Agency position

The proposed development will only be acceptable if the following measure(s) as detailed in the Flood Risk Assessment (FRA)submitted with this application are implemented and secured by way of a planning condition on any planning permission.

Planning Condition

The development permitted by this planning permission shall only be carried out in accordance with the approved FRA and the following mitigation measures detailed within the FRA:

Finished floor levels to be set no lower than 300mm above existing ground level.

Reason: To reduce the risk of flooding to the proposed development and future occupants.

Planning Advice

Surface Water Drainage

Your Local Planning Authority's own Technical Services should be satisfied with the proposed method of surface water disposal.

Demolition/Sustainability

Due consideration should be given to the possibility of reusing and/or recycling materials produced as a consequence of demolition. All waste must be disposed of by an appropriately licenced carrier and taken to an appropriately licenced disposal site under the relevant Duty of Care Waste Regulations. Further information can be obtained from the following link: *www.environment-agency.gov.uk/business/sectors/32709.aspx*

Pollution Prevention

When carrying out construction and demolition activities, potential sources of pollution from site activities will need to be identified so that appropriate pollution prevention measures are taken to avoid any contamination of controlled waters. Controlled waters include surface waters (bodies of water that are above ground, such as rivers, lakes, and streams) coastal waters and groundwater.

It is necessary to prevent pollution of surface and/or groundwaters especially during site works. There should be no discharge of foul or contaminated drainage from the site into either groundwater or any surface waters whether direct or via soakaways during and after the proposed works.

The risk of pollution at construction and demolition sites can be significantly reduced by providing secondary containment measures for storage tanks. Oil tanks must comply with the requirements of the Control of Pollution (England) (Oil Storage) Regulations 2001.

These comments were copied to the applicant.

5. REPRESENTATIONS

Twenty-two identical letters of representation have been received objecting to the application on the following grounds:

(i) Surrounding area is already over densely populated

(ii) Disruption already caused by development at No.40 during construction – obstructions from builders vehicles, highway safety issues
(iii) Redevelopment of no.27 would increase population on that area at land at least threefold – greater strain on local services, sewerage, drainage.
(iv) Inconvenience and disruption caused by building works – noise, dirt and access problems
(v) Intensify parking problems
(vi) More noise and pollution caused by new residents cars

In addition, three of those letters contain individual comments reiterating and expanding on issues caused by inconsiderate parking and lack of parking, overcrowding, disruption caused by building work, and a comment stating *'I thought this garden grabbing was going to be stopped'.*

Six other letters of representation have been received objecting to the proposal on the following grounds:-

i) Concern over scale of development
ii) Dormer windows will take height up and dominate surrounding development
iii) Too crowded, increase in population
iv) Loss of garden areas
v) Increase traffic/parking problems/ road safety issues/pollution/noise
vi) Loss of on street parking
vii) Small gardens, too close to neighbouring houses
viii) Detract from character of the road
ix) Flooding problems should be anticipated, this is worsened by new builds
x) Scale of development should be reduced to 1 pair of semis with gardens and parking like No.40
xi) Impact of service requirements of 3 dwellings compared with one/drainage issues, potential flooding
xii) Disruption still caused by redevelopment of no.40
xiii) Noise, dirt and access problems would cause severe inconvenience and disruption
xiv) If approved, the council should monitor the building process and builders parking.

6. PLANNING ASSESSMENT

The main issues raised by this proposal are: the principle of residential development; the impact on residential amenity; design and impact on the character of the surrounding area; and parking and access. As such the application should be principally considered against Saved Local Plan Policies BE1, TR9, RES7, RES12 and H18, and Submission Core Strategy Policies 7, 8 and 9 which have assumed material weight since the relevant parts have not been serious challenged at the consultation stage. Government policy is also relevant in Planning Policy Statement 1: Delivering Sustainable Development and Climate Change Supplement, Planning Policy Statement 3:

Housing, and Planning Policy Guidance 13: Transport, together with The Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA), and Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment which underpin the Core Strategy.

In terms of the principle of development, having regard to the planning history of the site where permission has previously been granted for 3 dwellings in 2008, consideration must be given to whether there has been any material change in circumstances since the previous proposal was considered, including changes in site conditions, design revisions, etc that would justify an alternative decision. The issues raised in the representations have been taken into consideration throughout this assessment. Many of those comments, however, relate to the principle, scale and impact of the form of development that has previously been approved and those matters were previously considered at that time. Where new issues have been raised in relation to the design changes proposed, or changes to the site or policy context under which the current application is assessed, etc these matters have been fully considered.

Since permission was previously granted for three dwellings there would appear to be no significant change to site conditions but the current scheme includes accommodation within the roof space and design changes that were not previously considered. These issues are discussed in the later sections of this report.

A key consideration is the changes in relation to the policy framework under which the current application is now to be considered. Recent changes to PPS3: Housing have reinforced earlier amendments and reconfigured the policy framework for assessing the principle of residential development in domestic gardens. Domestic gardens are no longer classified as brownfield (previously developed land), and, as such, the priority once enjoyed by residential development on garden land, no longer applies. Effectively, such new development (or garden-grabbing as referred to in the representations) now needs to demonstrate that there are persuasive reasons to allow the development in relation to national policy, the Development Plan and any other material considerations, which outweigh the loss, or impact of the loss, of the garden. It is important to note that this does not constitute a blanket ban on residential development in gardens and suitable forms of such development in appropriate locations will continue to be acceptable and necessary. Recent appeal decisions have confirmed this approach.

A number of factors need to be assessed in making the judgement of acceptability. First, in this particular case, the principle of residential development has been established by the recent planning permission (WB/08/0077/FULL) and the current application proposes a similar form of development in terms of type, layout and number of dwellings. However, Government policy has evolved since that time, and although the previous planning permission remains a material consideration which carries some weight, it is not determinative.

A prime issue in terms of current Government policy is the sustainability of the location. It is evident that the character of Ladydell Road is of suburban

family housing and enjoys good access to local facilities and public transport, being within walking distance of East Worthing Station. Another factor is how the dwelling type meets identified need. The Strategic Housing Market Assessment and Core Strategy indicate there is currently an unsatisfactory imbalance in terms of the housing offer within areas of Worthing. The town's housing stock is focussed towards smaller properties, typically 1-2 bedrooms (40%). Flats account for almost one third of the stock which is significantly higher than regional and national levels. The submitted Core Strategy, underpinned by the Strategic Housing Market Assessment, indicates in Policy 8 that, within suburban areas only limited infilling will be allowed, which will predominantly consist of family houses, whilst Policy 9 indicates that the existing housing stock will be retained unless the proposal results in a net increase in the family housing stock. The aim is to redress the balance between family houses and non-family, smaller accommodation to better meet housing need and to protect the character of residential suburbs where family houses prevail.

The proposal comprises one detached and two semi-detached four bedroom houses with gardens and as such the new dwellings would clearly qualify as 'houses' and meet an identified housing priority. In addition, how effectively the development would make use of the site is a consideration. National minimum densities have been removed in the recent changes to PPS3: Housing in preference for locally set standards. No local density policies have yet been prepared but, looking at the site and surrounding pattern of development, the proposal would represent a similar site coverage to neighbouring properties with adequate private amenity space.

A further issue is the importance of the proposal, numerically, in meeting local housing requirements. The South East Plan, and as a consequence its targets, has recently been rescinded but there is an expectation that a 5 year housing supply will still need to be maintained. In recent years, monitoring of dwelling completions indicate that annualised targets have been exceeded and the Core Strategy makes provision to meet housing targets without reliance on 'windfall' sites such as this. However, this situation will need to be reviewed to take account of the new Planning Policy Statement 3: Housing and carefully monitored. Indications are, nonetheless, that, historically, such small sites have not been significant in housing supply terms.

Impact on residential amenity

In terms of siting and footprint, the current scheme is identical to that of the approved scheme with the two semi-detached houses having similar front and rear building line to the existing bungalow and the detached house, which is on the north side of the plot, extending further forward and not as far back into the site, replacing the existing garage.

Like the previously approved scheme, the two semi detached houses are set off the southern boundary by between 1 and 1.2 metres to allow rear garden access. The development sits forward of No. 25 by 1.8 metres, as does the existing bungalow but at a separation distance of approximately 3.5 metres

and being due north of the neighbouring house, and it was considered in the previous application that no significant harm will occur.

The property to the north of the site, No. 29, is another semi detached house which is set off the shared boundary by approximately 1 metre. The existing bungalow's garage is closest to this property but is set off the boundary by 3 metres. The proposed detached house in this position brings development within 1.2 metres of the boundary. No. 29 has a ground floor bathroom window in the flank elevation and has added a small rear extension. The proposed house extends approximately 2 metre beyond the rear wall of the ground floor of No.29. The first floor was curtailed in length and a cat slide roof proposed in this position so that the first floor bedroom closest to the boundary is no deeper than the rear ground floor extension at No. 29. This form of development and relationship was considered acceptable in the previous application with a fully hipped roof form. The current application proposed a revised roof design to the detached dwelling in the form of a half-hipped roof to create additional accommodation within the roofspace. Following concerns raised over the visual impact of this element in terms of its bulk and proportioning, revised plans were received to delete this element from the proposal, reverting back to a fully hipped roof form.

In terms of the other changes proposed in the current scheme, as originally submitted the additional bedroom to each of the semi detached dwellings was facilitated by a revised roof design. Whilst the difference in overall ridge height with this scheme compared with the previous scheme appears relatively modest (approximately 100mm increase for the detached dwelling), the previous hipped roof design was replaced with a barn hip roof design. It should be noted at this point that the applicant's Flood Risk Assessment indicates that floor levels would be set 300mm above the exterior ground level, and although the agent has verbally indicated that any adjustment can be accommodated within the confines of the floor-to-ceiling heights proposed, this is not clearly identified on the submitted drawings and, could potentially result in the building being 300mm higher than shown on the drawings, but in view of the relationship with neighbouring properties, this potential adjustment to the height would not pose any significant threat to residential amenity.

In terms of the amenity impact of the roof form revision, the design of the roof as originally proposed in the current scheme would place additional bulk closer to the boundaries with neighbours and results in a less satisfactory relationship compared with the previous scheme. However, the design of the two semi detached houses has also been amended to revert to a fully hipped roof form but keeping two dormer windows to the front roof slope and two roof light windows the rear.

To the rear of the site is No. 26 Alverstone Road which has its flank wall parallel with the rear garden boundary of the application site. No.26 Alverstone Road has a rear garden access along its side wall. In the side wall at first floor level there is a bathroom window and narrow secondary bedroom window, the ground floor includes a garage. The nearest proposed house would be 11.5 metres off the rear garden boundary. The new houses would directly face the flank of No. 26 Alverstone Road and in part its rear garden.

This relationship with No. 26 Alverstone Road is unaltered when comparing the current scheme against the approved dwellings, other than in relation to the roof accommodation with two new rooflight windows facing towards No.26. However, at this separation and with a garage in the rear garden at No. 26 it is not considered that undue overlooking would occur. The side bedroom window is a secondary bedroom window and has for many years overlooked the site and, as was the case previously, it is not considered therefore that a refusal of planning permission bases on overlooking grounds to this window could be justified.

As was the case with the previous permission, in each of the three houses there are windows proposed which would face north and south over the adjoining houses. However, these serve the bathrooms and landing/stairs and can be obscure glazed to avoid overlooking.

Design and impact on the character of the surrounding area

The existing bungalow on the site is an unusual property in the street. Otherwise the street is largely made up of typical 30s semi detached and terraced houses with the adjoining house to the south being detached. The proposal to erect semi detached and a detached house was established under the previous approval and would not be out of character in the streetscene.

In terms of the siting, this has not altered from the previous permission and the houses appear on plan, to be well spaced on the plot and an acceptable distance off each boundary, the detached house being set some 1.95 metres from the nearest semi. The staggered front building line is characteristic of this side of Ladydell Road. In the previous scheme, the difference in ground levels led to lower eaves and ridge heights than the house to the south and comparable eaves and ridge heights to No. 29 to the south. Although the current scheme shows a limited increase to ridge heights, it is the impact arising from the design change to form a part hipped of that causes the greatest impact. The roof design as originally proposed as part of this scheme alters the proportioning of the buildings, resulting in greater mass and giving a more 'top heavy' appearance to that previously approved. In relation to the proportions of the detached dwelling, due to its narrower width this roof form appears particularly bulky resulting in an excessively cramped appearance and at odds with the roof design of immediate neighbouring properties. The staggered building line emphasises the extent and bulk of the roof with the proposed semi-detached houses sited nearly 2 metres forward of No. 25 to the south. This siting, in combination with the spacing to the side of No. 25 would make the extended gable highly visible in the streetscene and appear overbearing in relation to neighbouring properties.

In relation to the development at No.40 Ladydell Road opposite the site, there was concern over the design and roof form of this development in terms of its scale and top heavy appearance. However at appeal, the Inspector noted the mixture of roof forms nearby and considered the part-hipped form acceptable in that particular context. In that case, specific reference was made to the ridge line of the new houses being lower than neighbours and spacing

between the new houses and neighbouring properties (4.5 metres). In the current case, the width of the semi detached dwellings is greater than that approved at No. 40 with an extended ridge line and section of flat roof set behind the ridge lines. This additional bulk unbalances the proportions of the building and would appear as an incongruous feature within the streetscene. The roof design to the detached dwelling in particular is poor, appearing disproportionate to the rest of the building. Whilst it may be difficult to argue against the introduction of a part hipped as a feature of the streetscene in principle due to the Inspectors previous decision at No.40, in the particular circumstances of this site the impact is worsened by the staggering of the development forward of neighbouring dwelling to the south, and in particular the proportions of the roof form in relation to the narrower form of the detached dwelling. The dormer windows proposed, with pitched roofs, also give a more cluttered appearance to the building in combination with the pitched roofs of the bay windows.

The applicant has submitted amended plans to address these concerns which, as noted in the previous section of the report, revert to a fully hipped roof for the detached dwelling, and reverting to a fully hipped roof for the pair of semi detached houses but with the inclusion of two flat-roofed dormer windows on the front roof slope, rather than the pitched roof dormers previously proposed, and roof light windows to the rear roof slope to allow for a fourth bedroom for each of the semis. The dormer windows proposed are relatively modest and their inclusion would not be out of character and would be similar to those approved at No. 40 Ladydell Road. It should be noted that although the applicant has indicated that there is scope to accommodate the floor level requirements outlined in the Flood Risk Assessment and required by the Environment Agency within the proposed buildings as submitted, there may be some resultant variation from the drawings when implemented. However, these changes, if any, are expected to be relatively modest and having regard to the variation in eaves and ridge levels of the proposed development and of existing surrounding development a minor change in levels is unlikely to be out of character.

The current application, as originally proposed, included a driveway to the frontage of each new dwelling including two new vehicular accesses and utilising the existing crossover for the detached dwelling whereas the previous approval included only driveway access for the detached dwelling. In design terms alone this is generally a retrograde step from the previous approval with reduced scope for soft landscaping in front garden areas and further loss of the flint boundary wall to the frontage but does provide parking for each of the proposed dwellings. In practice, however, visibility splays would be required to each of the separate entrances, reducing the enclosure to the site. In the case of No.40 the Inspector considered that planted front gardens behind boundary walls are 'a distinctive and unifying element in the character of the street and are important to the overall nature of the street scene'. The applicant has provided amended plans to address this concern by forming a shared access for the two semi detached properties and reducing the amount of hard surfacing for the detached dwelling, still utilising the existing access for parking for this dwelling. This would allow for a greater amount of garden area to the site frontage and the remaining boundary wall would still provide

enclosure, contributing to the landscape quality of the street. The parking and access issues are discussed further in the following section of this report.

Parking and access

There is an existing vehicle access on the north side of the frontage. The revised plans show this to be retained and used as the access to parking for the detached house. In addition it is proposed to open up a new access point within the flint wall to provide a shared access and individual parking spaces for each of the two semi detached houses, although no visibility splays have been shown. Outside the site there are on site parking bays within the controlled parking zone which would be affected by the new access.

With the previous application, revised plans were approved showing no parking for the pair of semis and using the existing access for the detached house as the preference at that time was not to lose the 2 on street parking spaces which would be affected by creating a new access. The applicants were unwilling to have a single access serving the three properties and this approach would have resulted in a greater area of hard surfacing and less soft landscaping.

There are several new factors to be considered when determining the current application: (i) the recent changes to the County's parking standards must now be considered, which have regard to the expected demand for parking; (ii) that the current scheme is a revision that changes the two semi detached houses from 3-bed units to 4-bed units and so parking demand is potentially greater; and (iii) a parking survey was undertaken for the development at 40 Ladydell Road, opposite the site, that demonstrated spare on street parking capacity of at least one third of the 18 spaces within the adjacent Controlled Parking Zone (with the exception of a short period during school pick up period). These factors hold material weight and have led to the current approach to try to balance the expectation of parking and providing an appropriate landscaped setting for the development following the pattern of surrounding development. Therefore, in the absence from any objection from the Highway Authority, the revision to allow a new access and on site parking for the two semi detached dwellings and a reduced area of hard surfacing for the detached dwelling is considered acceptable.

7. CONCLUSION

The provision of three houses on this site was previously considered acceptable, not causing any significant harm to any neighbour, the streetscene, or the highway network, but since then national policy has evolved and Planning Policy Statement 3: Housing no longer lends priority to development in garden land, reducing the support where there are no persuasive reasons to allow the development and where it would result in significant harm to the character of an area. The current revised proposal has addressed concerns raised over the roof design and relationship with neighbouring properties by reverting back to a fully hipped roof but with the inclusion of dormer windows and roof lights for the semi detached houses. The proposal would make efficient use of this site, helping to satisfy a need

for family housing and enjoying an acceptable level of accessibility. It is considered that the design changes are in keeping with the character of the area and would not be to the detriment of neighbours.

8. HUMAN RIGHTS:

Article 8 (Right to Respect of a Private and Family Life) and Article 1 of the First Protocol (Protection of Property) of the Human Rights Act 1998 are relevant to this application. It is accepted that the proposal, if approved, would have some impact on the neighbouring properties. However, it is considered that on balance, existing residential quality of life would not be significantly adversely affected as a result of the proposal. Accordingly it is considered that it is acceptable with regard to Article 8 and Article 1.

9. RECOMMENDATION

Grant planning permission subject to the following conditions:

1. Time limit (5 years)
2. Contamination Precaution
3. Level 3 Sustainable Homes Code
4. Development to be carried out in accordance with FRA
5. C9B (Samples of materials to be agreed)
6. C8A (Agree/provide landscaping scheme)
7. Drainage details
8. Parking to be agreed and provided prior to occupation
9. Visibility to be provided to access, details to be agreed
10. C4B (Walls and fences to be agreed before dwellings occupied)
11. C5K (Provide secure cycle parking)
12. C12H (Refuse storage to be agreed)
13. C7E (Dust suppression)
14. C7G (Limitation on hours of construction)
15. C6K (Park/unloading area during construction)
16. C6L (Materials/plant area during construction)
17. Flint wall to be protected and retained, other than the new entrances as approved.
18. First floor side windows to be obscure glazing and non-opening up to 1.7m
19. No extensions/alterations to dwelling without consent
20. Architectural details to reflect adjoining properties – details to be agreed.
21. Development to accord with approved plans.

Informative – Highways licence

REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION:

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. It would consequently not conflict with the relevant 'saved' policies of the Worthing Local Plan (BE1, H18, TR9, RES7, RES12), Submission Core

Strategy Policies (7, 8, 9), Planning Policy Statement 1: Delivering Sustainable Development and Climate Change Supplement, Planning Policy Statement 3: Housing, and Planning Policy Guidance 13: Transport.

IS RECOMMENDATION CONTRARY TO LETTER(S) OF REPRESENTATION? Y

DELEGATED

Case Officer sign..... Date 15/10/10

Authorising Officer sign..... Date 15.10.10