Application Number: ADC/0485/08 Recommendation – APPROVE

Site: **26/27 East Street and 3-15 New Road, Shoreham-by-Sea**

Proposal: **Partial redevelopment and alterations to include conversion of upper floors of bank to 3 flats; replacement of garages to N. of bank with shop and maisonette; partial demolition of 7/9 New Road and extension and alteration to form cottage (retaining shopfront); partial demolition of 3 New Road and alteration into a two-bedroom house with rear garden; formation of two-bedroom maisonette over accessway; and demolition of 12 garages at rear and construction of terrace of 4 two-bedroom cottages and 12 parking spaces**



Revisions following the Deferral at the Committee meeting on 2 March 2009

Members will recall that, when this application was considered on 2 March 2009, it was concluded that the proposed infill building fronting East Street (in the gap where the existing garages would be demolished between Chantry House to the south and Church House to the north) was unsympathetic to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. Members deferred the application to allow further discussion with the applicant and to seek a revised design for both the roof and shopfront of this element of the scheme.

The infill building, as shown on the revised plans now submitted, changes the main roof design from a flat roof to a pitched roof with low eaves and a flat-roofed front dormer. It

appears as an extension to Church House to the north, with matching materials and design detailing. The link between this extension and Chantry House has a similar pitched roof set back and is lower than the main extension. A more traditional shopfront is now proposed at ground floor level.

All other aspects of the proposal were considered acceptable at the Committee meeting on 2 March and remain unchanged.

The Application

The site comprises a 'backland' area plus parts of dual frontages to East Street to the west and New Road to the south. It is located to the south east of St Mary's church. There is currently pedestrian access from East Street and vehicular access from New Road. The site area includes 'Chantry House' No.26/27 East Street (HSBC bank with residential unit above) and houses at No's 3, 5, 7 and 9 New Road, the latter including a butchers shop. The adjacent terraced houses to the east (No's 11,13 & 15 New Road) are within the applicant's ownership and the rear section of the gardens of these three houses are included within the site boundary of the proposed development to provide parking space.

Currently, within the site, there is a lean-to garage and shed building attached to the side of the dental surgery at listed Church House (No.29 East Street), to the north. There is also a block of 12 garages to the rear of No's 5-9 New Road. The applicant currently lets out the garaging and parking spaces. Some of the garages are used for domestic storage rather than for cars due to their limited size and many are vacant.

Permission is sought to demolish the existing garage buildings and to carry out alterations, additions and demolition work to existing frontage buildings to provide 11 dwellings in total plus a retail shop. These would comprise:-

(a) fronting East Street (in the gap where the garages would be demolished) a small retail shop (20sqm) with a two-bedroom maisonette above/rear.
(b) above the bank at 'Chantry House' 26/27 East Street, the existing first-floor flat would be subdivided into 3 flats.
(c) the cottage at No.3 New Road would be altered with the demolition of a side extension and replacement rear extension to retain it as a two-bedroom dwelling but with a rear garden.
(d) a new flat would be formed over the existing vehicular access in the gap between No's 3 & 5-9.
(e) The existing butcher's shop at No's 5-9 New Road would be converted into a one-bedroom house with demolition of the rear shop store and flat to create a rear courtyard. The shopfront would be retained.
(f) within the 'backland' part of the site, on the west side, a terrace of 4 two-bedroom houses (with rear gardens) would be erected, facing east.
(g) 12 parking spaces would be constructed to serve the development, with cycle and bin storage and landscaping. Vehicular access would be from New Road (as existing) with pedestrian access from both East Street and New Road. The majority of the parking spaces (8) would be on land currently forming the rear halves of the gardens of No's 11,13 & 15 New Road, the remainder (4) would be to the rear of No.3 New Rd.

Accompanying the application are a Design and Access Statement, Heritage Statement and Site Waste Management Plan. There is also a separate application for Conservation Area consent for demolition of existing buildings (ADC/0551/08).

Applications (ADC/0023/09 & ADC/0024/09) have been received for the redevelopment of the adjacent St Mary's Hall site, including demolishing the 1913 building (main hall with 2 empty groundfloor shops fronting New Road and entrance stairs off East St) but retaining the older early 19th century building on the corner (No.24/25 East St). It is proposed to erect 12 two-bedroom flats above groundfloor retail premises in a flat-roofed four-storey building of contemporary design with largely glazed facades. No parking would be provided.

Consultations and Representations

West Sussex County Council: The Transport Planning Officer has no objection, stating that, because on-site parking would be reduced, there should be no increase in intensity of traffic movement and the continued use of the existing vehicular access, notwithstanding its location on a bend in a road with a high level of on-street parking, should not be detrimental to highway safety. The site is extremely sustainably located. Parking provision is within the maximum standard but the impact of loss of existing garages on on-street parking should be considered. 10 cycle parking spaces are below standard and a condition should be imposed to deal with this requirement. Servicing for the retail unit would be from East Street and, due to its small floor area and resultant low number of servicing movements, there would only be a modest impact upon the public highway. A public footpath through the site would increase permeability and accessibility but WSCC is unlikely to wish to adopt it and it would be desirable to gate off the pedestrian access for security reasons. No sustainable transport contribution (TAD) is required in the light of the existing use of the site.

The Archaeological Officer states that this is an important location to provide data on the topography of medieval Shoreham. A standard condition should be attached requiring a written scheme of archaeological investigation prior to commencement of works.

The Conservation Architect supports the proposal, commenting that this is a successfully designed development of a largely "scrappy" town centre site. The townhouses are very appropriate. The resolution of the streetscape on East Street is good and, overall, from a conservation perspective, this is a successful proposal.

West Sussex Design Surgery: On the original application, commented that the proposed shop unit fronting East Street links into the neighbouring dental surgery and, whilst the simplicity of the design is commended, the single-storey design looks awkward and a two-storey design set back from the front of the dental surgery, would be more appropriate. The long-term viability of the proposed public seating area at the rear which lacks natural surveillance was questioned and the removal of the suggested public link through the site (to provide a possible future short-cut from Tarmount Lane) would be of benefit given the need to maximise footfall along the East Street shopping frontage.
On the New Road elevation, it was felt that infilling the gap is a good solution but that, because of the abrupt change in scale between the cottage at No.3 and the adjacent St Mary's Church hall building (and also with the redevelopment plans for that site), the cottage might be better demolished and replaced with a development more transitional in height, thereby binding the whole frontage together.
The proposed 4 new houses at the rear are clearly an acceptable approach to their overall context but it is felt a shame that they are not more adventurous.

Adur District Conservation Advisory Group: Comment that the proposed East Street elevation unacceptable because it is a 'brutal' design and is completely at odds with highly sympathetic New Road elevational treatment.

Adur District Council: The Waste Services Officer approves of the bin storage as it is in line with advice given to the applicant. The Environmental Health Officer has no adverse comment.

Environment Agency: No objection.

Third Parties: On the latest ***amended plans***, 2 letters have been received from the Chairman of the Trustees of Church House (29 East Street) and the Shoreham Society. The revised plans satisfy the concerns of the Trustees, commenting that the appearance of the sloping roof with a dormer window now nicely echoes the dormer window in the roof of the Church House and the pitched roof eliminates the danger of water penetration and blends happily with the other pitched roofs in East Street.
The Shoreham Society comment that the revised design is an improvement, although the treatment of the shop front is a bit unimaginative. The horizontal rustications are a very good idea on the new infill helping bind it in with Chantry House.

On the ***original application,*** 5 letters/email were received as follows:-
The resident of the flat at 16 New Road, on the opposite (south) side of the road, expressed concern about overlooking and loss of light to and view from her bedroom and kitchen windows due to the proposed development filling the gap (over the access way). She also had concern over pressure for on-street parking in New Road and raised the issues of loss of gardens and increased risk of flooding and run off as a result of more hardsurfacing.
The residents of 14 New Road were concerned over the traffic and parking in New Road as a result of the development both due to the loss of garaging and proposed new dwellings.
The Managing Trustee of the listed Church House, 29 East Street (to the north) stated that the stark modernism of the proposed shop unit is entirely out of keeping with the listed building and Conservation Area; a redesign is needed perhaps with a bow window. He also had concern over the openness of the raised frontage of 29 East Street that would result from removal of the existing forward projecting garage wall; a wrought iron fence should be required of the developer.
A resident elsewhere in Shoreham (1 Park Road) commented that the building fronting East Street is flat roofed and too high which will change the character of the historic area. However the development in New Road is more acceptable, making a cohesive townscape in New Road.
The Shoreham Society commented that the proposed shop front made no concession to the buildings either side nor the immediate area - something more sympathetic should not be too difficult to design. The residential unit attached to the shop could be increased in size.

Relevant Planning Policies and Guidance

Adopted West Sussex Structure Plan 2001-2016 (WSCC 2005) (saved policies): LOC1, CH4-5, NE1, ERA1, DEV1, DEV2, DEV4-5.
Adopted Adur District Local Plan 1993-2006 (ADC 1996) (saved policies): AG1, AB3-6, AB11, AB20, AB23, AB25-27, AS1, AH2, AH5 and Appendix 11 'Supplementary Planning

Guidance' comprising Development Control Standard No. 2 'Space Around New Dwellings and Flats' and Development Control Standard No 4. 'Flat Conversions.'
Revised West Sussex Parking Standards and Transport Contributions Methodology (WSCC 2003 and ADC 2004)
'A Strategy for Shoreham Renaissance' (ADC 1996)
PPS1 'Delivering Sustainable Development' (ODPM 2005)
PPS3 'Housing' (DCLG 2006)
PPS6 'Planning for Town Centres' (ODPM 2005)
PPG13 'Transport' (DTLR 2001)
PPG15 'Planning and the Historic Environment' (DoE 1994) and Circulars 01/01 and 09/05
PPG16 'Archaeology and Planning' (DoE 1990)

Planning Assessment

Policies

The site is in the heart of the town centre and Conservation Area. It adjoins the Grade II listed Church House (No.29 East St) to the north and lies partially opposite the Grade I listed church of St Mary de Haura. There is a statutory duty to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the setting of listed buildings and also to pay special attention to the need to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of Conservation Areas (as reflected in policies AB4 and CH4-5). Local Plan policy AB3 states that permission will not be granted for development generating a level of traffic or other activity likely to adversely affect the character of a Conservation Area.

In the Local Plan, the frontage to East Street (No.26/27 East St) is included within the area identified for mainly shopping use under policy AS1 (with office use under AE5 and AE6 also applying) but the 'backland' area and New Road frontage are not identified for any particular use or development. AS1 states that permission will be granted for the development of land within the areas shown as subject to this policy for shopping and food and drink purposes provided that there will be no loss of residential accommodation at upper floor level, there will be no loss of amenity to nearby residents, access to the public highway is acceptable, and the development is of a scale and design appropriate to the locality.

The above policies encourage redevelopment and infilling to help meet the demand for dwellings suitable for small families, single persons, the elderly, 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) and also in allocating sites in Local Plans, that account should be taken of 'the need to protect and enhance the qualities and characteristics of settlements which local communities value" (para d)

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 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 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; respect for the natural features of the site, including trees, no unneighbourly effect on existing dwellings by loss of privacy, light, outlook or open amenity space; adequate access and parking arrangements and accordance with adopted standards (in this case the Council's DC Standard No. 2 'Space Around New Dwellings and Flats' 1996.)

Government policy in PPS3, in order to achieve a wide choice of high quality homes, improve affordability and create sustainable, inclusive, mixed communities, generally encourages the maximisation of the use of previously developed land for housing development at higher densities (avoiding developments at less than 30 dwellings per hectare) and without rigid application of parking and amenity space standards. However, it is also states that "Design which is inappropriate in its context, or which fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions, should not be accepted" (para 13).
It states "Careful attention to design is particularly important where the chosen local strategy involves intensification of the existing urban fabric. More intensive development is not always appropriate. However, when well designed and built in the right location, it can enhance the character and quality of an area. Successful intensification need not mean high rise development or low quality accommodation.
Similarly, in Conservation Areas and other local areas of special character where, if proper attention is paid to achieving good design, new development opportunities can be taken without adverse impacts on their character and appearance" (para 49).
"The density of existing development should not dictate that of new housing by stifling change or requiring replication of existing style or form. If done well, imaginative design and layout of new development can lead to a more efficient use of land without compromising the quality of the local environment" (para 50).

Principle of Development

The adopted Local Plan does not identify the site for development but the regeneration document 'A Strategy for Shoreham Renaissance' (March 2006) identifies the area between East Street, New Road and Tarmount Lane as a 'Key Opportunity Area'. It states "Comprehensive redevelopment of this area could create the opportunity for a new route linking Brunswick Road with New Road"). However, the purpose of such a route has since been questioned and it became evident, with the 3 different ownerships, that comprehensive redevelopment is unlikely to be achievable. This is recognised in the May 2008 indicative Planning Brief for the adjacent Council-owned Tarmount Lane site (recently put on the market for sale).

Whilst redevelopment to a comprehensive overall plan seems desirable, and there is some concern as to the inter-relationship of the present proposals with the redevelopment proposals submitted for the adjacent St Mary's Hall site, it is not considered an essential pre-requisite. Moreover, there is no adopted planning policy or supplementary planning document in existence that makes it a requirement. Consequently, refusal of individual applications on the basis of piecemeal development potentially prejudicing a comprehensive overall plan would be difficult to substantiate. However, it has to be borne in mind that permitting a scheme for the first site to be submitted may potentially reduce the amount of development acceptable on the adjacent sites.

In principle, so far as the present application is concerned, the proposed redevelopment of the 'backland' area (currently parking and garages) for residential purposes and the reconfiguration of the frontages to increase the number of residential units accords with Structure and Local Plan policies and PPS6. In order to meet the housing requirements of the Structure Plan, it is necessary that a significant proportion of new residential development takes place by way of unidentified small sites such as this.

The proposed small shop unit in East Street is appropriate being within the existing commercial street and identified for such use under policy AS1. It would contribute to the viability and vitality of the shopping area. It would also offset the loss of the existing butcher's shop in New Road which, whilst regrettable, would not warrant refusal as this site does not fall within the shopping area identified in the Local Plan but in a predominantly residential street.

Density, Character and Visual Amenity

It is not considered that the existing garage buildings, etc proposed for demolition have any architectural merit and their removal and redevelopment of the site would enable a visual improvement.

As stated above, the site is within the historic heart of Shoreham within the Conservation Area and adjacent to No.29 Church Street a Grade II listed building to the north and opposite the Grade I listed church of St Mary de Haura and the effects on their setting must be considered. No.26/27 is also a relatively significant building of townscape merit. In principle, the overall scale and form of the development is considered acceptable in this case. However, the combination of contemporary and traditional design, with a simplistic modern flat-roofed design facing East Street, has given rise to mixed comments; the newly-created West Sussex Design Surgery and the County Conservation architect being supportive but the Adur District Conservation Advisory Group and members of the public feeling it is out of place and visually damaging to the historic streetscene.

The East Street elevation as originally submitted showed a single-storey flat-roofed shop projecting forward of the proposed flat-roofed two-storey building in the gap created by demolition of the garages/shed to the south of listed No.29. The shop was shown in line with the front wall of No.29 to which it would be attached. A maisonette was proposed at first-floor level, set back 2.2 metres from the front of the shop and linking the side of listed No.29 with the existing bank building (No.26/27) to the south with a pedestrian access below through to the rear of the site.
Following advice from the West Sussex Design Surgery, this elevation was amended to a two-storey flat-roofed elevation fronting East Street, with the maisonette no longer set back but directly above the shop, sharing the same front wall (set back from the front of No.29 by 0.3m). The pedestrian access through to the rear of the site included gates to give

security for what is now to be a private access only for the residents of the site. This component of the development was considered by officers and the West Sussex Design Surgery to provide a simple and clean contemporary solution for a relatively small infill site. It did not vie for attention with the larger historic buildings either side and did not attempt to replicate the existing designs but rather, through the use of traditional materials, was considered sympathetic.
However, the Committee did not accept this advice and the plans have now been amended to show a traditional pitched roof to match Church House.
The revised scheme presents a more traditional, pastiche, design approach to this site. It replicates the existing design features at the adjacent Chantry House and Church House buildings. The windows, roof pitch and materials all are to match the scale and appearance of the existing buildings. The shopfront window is now fitted with glazing bars and a fascia board has been added. The overall amended design is considered appropriate in this case, being in keeping with the scale, form and design details of the adjacent buildings. It provides a sympathetic addition of subordinate proportions.

The proposed New Road elevation is more of a replication of a traditional design, providing a continuation of the terraced properties with vehicular and pedestrian access underneath through to the rear of the site. The existing side extension but not the main cottage at No.3 New Road would be demolished along with the flat-roofed additions at the rear of the butchers shop (No's 5-9). The shopfront of the butchers shop is to be retained and integrated into the new development. It is considered that, despite the loss of the retail use, it is important to retain the shopfront, which is a particularly unspoilt example of its period, because of its contribution to the character of the street, giving it a sense of place.

The proposed terraced building will be stepped down in ridge height from the existing row of terraces to the east and will increase in ridge height from No.3 providing a gradual link between the two building heights. Sash windows are proposed at first floor in a uniform style to match No.3, and the plans revised to include an additional window to the western end of the proposed terrace to break up an expanse of otherwise blank wall.
The West Sussex Design Surgery, whilst welcoming the infilling of the gap, felt that, because of the abrupt change in scale between the cottage at No.3 and the adjacent St Mary's Church hall building (and the redevelopment plans for that site), the cottage might be better demolished and replaced with a development more transitional in height, thereby binding the whole frontage together. However, the cottage at No.3 is a long-established and attractive feature of the street, giving it a sense of place, and it is considered that the proposals for No.3 as submitted in this application are to be preferred.

The terrace of 4 new dwellings in the centre of the 'backland' site would not be visible from the street other than glimpsed from New Road through the archway. These are two-storey houses of traditional design.

As stated above, the traditional materials and finishes are proposed to match the existing buildings on site and in the local area. Painted render is proposed for external walls, tiles and/or natural slate for pitched roofs and lead or zinc for flat roofs. A condition is recommended to be imposed requiring samples to be submitted for approval of the details of materials and finishes prior to commencement of works.

Residential Amenity

The main effect of the proposed development will be on the houses and flats in New Road both opposite and adjacent to the site. Although the properties adjacent to the site on the

north side of New Road, No's 11, 13 & 15 are within the applicant's ownership, consideration needs to be given to the impact on the current and future occupiers of these dwellings. The main issue in relation to these 3 existing dwellings is the reduction in depth of their rear gardens to provide parking space to serve the new development. No.15 would be left with the shortest garden depth at approximately 7 metres (area 30sqm), and the other 2 houses would be left with gardens 9m deep (area 38sqm) and 11m deep (45sqm). Whilst the smallest ones are well below the Council's usual minimum standard of 11m depth and 50sqm area, it is considered the adopted standards relate to suburban settings rather than town centre sites and that it is appropriate to relax them to this degree (eg. as previously accepted on appeal in Ham Rd). Compromises have to be made in higher density areas close to facilities and occupiers will still have a reasonable amount of rear garden space for their needs. Suitable boundary treatment and planting (details of which will need to be submitted and approved prior to commencement of works) will ensure that there is appropriate screening from the parking area to the rear.

No.16 New Road, on the opposite (south) side of the road, faces onto the proposed infill building at a minimum distance of 9 metres. An objection has been received from the resident concerned stating that there will be overlooking to the kitchen and bedroom window of her flat. However, the majority of existing houses (including many converted to flats) already face each other across this relatively narrow street, which is typical of a densely built-up town centre. The distance in those cases is marginally greater at about 10m-11m. The Council has no minimum standards for distances between the front of dwellings which face each other. It is not considered that the effect on privacy for No.16 would warrant refusal.

Concern was expressed about the effect on the front of the Dental surgery to the north of the proposed shop in East Street but the plans were revised to show a wall (about 1m high) as a barrier along the side boundary. Details of this boundary treatment need to be reserved by condition to ensure this is of an appropriate height and finish to protect the adjacent surgery while also preserving or enhancing the character and appearance of the listed building and Conservation Area.

Also needing to be considered are the residential amenities of the future occupiers of the proposed residential units. The 4 new terraced houses provide acceptable internal living space of 66 sq metres. An open plan living area and WC is at ground floor with two bedrooms and a bathroom at first floor. Access to each dwelling is from the east with parking, vehicular and pedestrian access conveniently located. Two have rear gardens with a minimum depth of 7.5m, each having an area of 34 sq metres. The others have rear gardens 8.8m deep with areas of 45sqm and 55sqm. Whilst the smallest are well below the Council's usual minimum standard of 11m depth and 50sqm area, it is considered the standards can be relaxed to this degree within this town centre site.

There is concern as to the inter-relationship of these proposed 4 new houses with the redevelopment plans for 12 flats on the St Mary's Hall site (application ADC/0023/09). The submitted plans for that site show rear north-facing bedroom windows in 5 of the proposed flats (at first, second and third floor levels) facing the side of the rear garden of the southernmost of the proposed houses at a distance of only about 4.5m from the boundary (as compared to 6.5m with the existing hall). Some of these north-facing windows, plus the east-facing bedroom windows of 3 other flats, would enable oblique views (over the 2.1m high boundary wall) of the rear groundfloor windows of the nearest proposed house at a distance of only 10m-12m.

However, the windows shown in the proposed flats are smaller than the existing windows in the church hall and, as to height, despite the additional storey, the new rear façade is shown only 1.8m taller than the existing hall (11.5m as compared to 9.7m). The proposals for the St Mary's Hall site would, if permitted in addition to the proposed 4 new houses on the present site, result in a more overbearing effect and lower standard of privacy than normally expected between dwellings. It is not considered that this amounts to sufficient justification for refusal although it would have been preferable for the two schemes to have been prepared jointly.

The proposed maisonette linked to the retail unit on East Street provides a dwelling of an acceptable standard with a ground floor living area with two bedrooms and two bathrooms at first floor, totalling 65 square metres. A rear garden of 27 sq metres is shown (cf. the Council's minimum standard of 20sqm per flat). There is an internal link to the shop unit.

The existing flat above the bank is to be divided into 3 flats over two floors, 2 flats having two bedrooms and the other flat one-bedroom. Each flat has room sizes and floorspace in excess of the Council's Development Control Standards and provides spacious well designed living accommodation with the two-bedroom flats having areas of 75sqm & 85sqm and the one-bedroom flat 65sqm (as compared to the Council's minimum standards of 57sqm and 45sqm respectively). One of the two-bedroom flats has access to a rear terrace. There is also ground floor communal amenity space (35sqm) provided to the rear of the flats.

The distance between the rear of the converted building and the rear of the proposed new terrace is mainly 10m-12m, which is well below the Council's minimum standard of 22m. However, the layout of the flats and houses and positioning of the rear windows have been designed so as to minimise overlooking between windows of principal rooms. Screening will be required to reduce overlooking of the rear gardens of the proposed new terraced houses and this can be secured through condition.

In New Road, the existing cottage at No.3 New Road is to be altered and improved. It would still have two bedrooms (total internal floor area of 71sqm) but the rear projection would be shorter than at present and it would be provided with rear garden (33sqm). There is some concern that the adjacent proposals (12 flats) for the redevelopment of the St Mary's Hall site could result in a more overbearing effect on the rear of this cottage, particularly on its proposed rear garden, than the existing St Mary's Hall building - as the proposed new building would have a 9m high flat roof adjacent to the side boundary plus a single-storey rear projection 3.6m high (as compared to the existing sloping roof which reduces down from 10m to 5m high at the rear, finishing 2.3m short of the rear boundary). However, the taller part of the new building would not project so far rearwards of the proposed rear wall of the cottage (4.5m as compared to 6.5m) so the overall effect on daylighting should not be too different.

At No.5/9, the existing butcher's shopfront is to be retained and the premises converted to a one-bedroom house. The ground floor will comprise of a study, kitchen, living room and wet room with bedroom and bathroom on the first floor. The total floor area is 69sqm. The entrance to the flat will be the original shop entrance. There is a small triangular-shaped courtyard garden area (14sqm) proposed to the rear of this unit.
Between No.3 & No.5/9, the proposed new first floor 'link' above the vehicular and pedestrian access to the site provides a two-bedroom flat with a groundfloor entrance hall (72sqm floor area). There is an enclosed 'yard' (10sqm) accessed from the entrance hall providing external amenity space.

Communal refuse storage is proposed for the dwellings with individual bicycle storage.

Access, Parking and Sustainability

The site is in a highly sustainable location, being in close proximity to town centre facilities and amenities, with very good public transport links by bus and train. The applicant currently lets out the existing garaging and parking spaces but some of the garages are used for domestic storage rather than for parking cars, due to their limited size, and many are vacant.
The existing garages would be lost, to which there is no objection, and 12 car parking spaces are to be provided, one per dwelling unit plus a visitor's space. The Highways Authority has no objection to this level of parking provision neither do they have any objection to the use of the existing access onto New Road. They state there is no TAD requirement in this case because no material increase in traffic generation is expected. Additional cycle spaces are required and these can be secured through a condition. The communal bin storage is accessible from New Road and the siting and amount of storage provided is acceptable.

The site is intended to form a private development with no public right of way. As originally proposed, the scheme showed access through the site for the public with a small seating area, potentially enabling a future link to the Tarmount Lane site to the north (as set out in the document 'A Strategy for Shoreham Renaissance' March 2006 which states "Comprehensive redevelopment of this area could create the opportunity for a new route linking Brunswick Road with New Road"). However, comprehensive redevelopment now seems improbable with the likelihood that these sites will be developed independently of each other, the Council having prepared a separate Planning Brief for the Tarmount Lane site recently offered for sale. This Brief does not contain a requirement to provide for a pedestrian link through the site and it could give rise to issues of security as well as future maintenance (WSCC being unlikely to adopt it). It would also potentially reduce public footfall along East Street which would be disadvantageous to the shops on that frontage. Amended plans have therefore been submitted to show no public path or areas within the site, with proposed entrance gates from East Street. No gates are depicted on the vehicular and pedestrian access from New Road where the existing barrier would have to be removed to construct the building above.

Archaeology

As the proposal includes an element of new build there is potential for the excavations for foundations and services to cut into medieval features and deposits. Therefore a safeguarding condition is recommended as advised by WSCC to secure the implementation of a programme of archaeological work in accordance with a written scheme of investigation.

Recommendation

APPROVE for reason that:-

The proposed development is within the built-up area and would help meet the need for additional housing and retail provision without detracting from the local environment. It would enhance the setting of the adjacent listed building and the appearance of the Conservation Area. It can take place without resulting in unacceptable detriment to the

2 PP's Granted

amenities of neighbouring properties and without detraction from highway safety. It would consequently not conflict with the relevant policies of the Adur District Local Plan (AG1, AB3-6, AB11, AB23, AB25-27, AS1, AH2, AH5) and the West Sussex Structure Plan 2001-16 (LOC1, CH4-5, NE1, ERA1, DEV1, DEV2, DEV4-5).

Subject to: -

1. C1Ci (Standard time limit)
2. C7Cii (Details of walls/fences to be approved and implemented, including proposed wall at side of frontage of No.29 East Street and at rear of No's 11, 13 & 15 New Road) (amended)
3. C8Biv (Parking spaces, cycle spaces and access facilities to be constructed and retained) (amended)
4. C9N (Temporary provision for contractors' vehicles, materials, etc on the site)
5. C11Ai (Landscaping scheme including existing trees to be approved and implemented and replacement of those that die)
6. C12Aii (External materials for walls, windows, doors and roofs of buildings to be approved, including design details of front elevation of East Street infill building) (amended)
7. C14A3 (Permission relates to amended plans received on 2 January 2009 and 11 & 13 March 2009)
8. C14Dii (Archaeological investigation to be agreed and carried out at developer's expense)
9. C14Gi (No external lighting or floodlighting without approval)
10. C14H (Existing buildings shown on plan for demolition to be demolished prior to commencement of new building work) (amended)
11. C16B (Retail unit restricted to use within Class A1 shops)
12. C18B (Removal of 'permitted development rights' for extensions and alterations to dwellinghouses and any incidental buildings exceeding 5 cubic metres in volume) (amended)
13. C18K (Provision for waste storage)

.....