~~2012~~

DD : 18/1

Application No.: ADC/0712/07 Recommendation – Refuse Application

Site: 14 Adelaide Square, Shoreham-by-Sea, West Sussex

Proposal: Detached Two Bedroom House at Rear

The Application

The application site contains the western half of a semi-detached bungalow on a large triangular shaped lot, located at the south-west corner of Adelaide Square, within the built up area of Shoreham. The plot and existing house form part of a 44 dwelling estate developed by the Council in the early 1930's.

The applicant is now proposing to divide the property into two plots including the erection of a new detached two bedroom house at the rear of the property, with no parking or vehicular access but pedestrian access provided via an existing 1.5m wide footpath that connects Adelaide Square with Corby Crescent (and ultimately the Town Centre some 1km away in a south-westerly direction).

Directly to the south of the site are large industrial buildings that form the northwest corner of the Dolphin Industrial Estate. On the opposite side of the pathway to the west are the southern rear garden of No.12 Adelaide Square and the adjacent Middle Road allotments, whilst to the north and east of the site are semi-detached double storey houses similar to the existing building located on the parent plot.

Consultations and Representations

Director of Services: Council's Environmental Health Branch have raised significant issues that they consider to warrant investigation and resolution prior to any such application being approved on this site. They include:

- Potential contamination of the land from the adjoining industrial land use;
- Assessment of noise levels from the adjoining industrial activities and what impact they might have on the amenity of the new dwelling; &
- Given the severely limited access arrangements, details on how materials and plant will be moved to the site during construction, as well as what measures will be installed to ensure continuous, safe and unencumbered access for the school children who regularly use the adjoining footpath.

Due to the size and immediate proximity of the adjoining industrial building to the south, the Environmental Health Branch also raise concern with potential shadowing of the new dwelling, and the cumulative impact the industrial building and new dwelling will have on the thermal comfort of nearby dwellings.

County Transport Planning Services: Considering site accessibility by alternative modes of transportation to be somewhat limited, County Highways advise that in their consideration it is highly likely that those occupying or wanting to visit the new dwelling will own a vehicle and will therefore want/need to park within reasonable proximity.

Given that on-street parking along Adelaide Square is already at maximum capacity and causing problems with proper use of the associated pavement, County Highways therefore object to the proposal on the basis that it would interrupt the free-flow of traffic on the public highway and add to the hazards of highway users.

Sussex Fire & Rescue: Notwithstanding the access concerns identified above, Fire and Rescue Services are satisfied that the footpath will provide sufficient access to the new house in the event of an emergency, and that the distance from the dwelling to where a fire unit would sit in Adelaide Square is within the maximum fire hose limit their units currently have available.

Third Parties: Three representations have been received from the nearby tenants at No.'s 10, 16 & 18 Adelaide Square, all objecting to the proposal on grounds including:

- The non-provision of parking, and lack of available street parking;
- Noise and disturbance during erection of the dwelling;
- Inadequate access to the building site and limited area available for the parking of construction vehicles and storage of building materials;
- Impacts on privacy and access to light into the rear of the existing dwellings at No.'s 16 and 18 Adelaide Square.

Relevant Planning Policies and Guidance

Adopted West Sussex Structure Plans 2001-2016 (WSCC 2005):

LOC1, NE1-2, CH1, ERA1, DEV1, DEV4-5

Adopted Adur District Local Plan 1993-2006 (ADC 1996):

AG1, AH2, AH5 & Appendix 11 'Supplementary Planning Guidance' comprising: Development Control Standard No. 2 'Space Around New Dwellings & Flats'

Planning Policy Guidance No.3 – 'Housing' (DETR 2000)

Planning Assessment

Policies

Planning Policy Guidance No.3 encourages maximising the use of urban land for housing development at higher densities (without rigid application of

parking and amenity space standards), subject to emphasis being placed on the quality of design.

Structure Plan policies support the principle of PPG3 and give significant weight to making the best use of land through higher density development provided that the impact on the character of the area and environment is acceptable (LOC1, ERA1, CH1) and the development being of a high quality standard (DEV1).

Policy DEV4 states (amongst other things) that development should not be permitted unless the travel needs it generates are met. DEV5 states that "Development should not be permitted unless the level of parking is compatible with the need to avoid environmental or safety problems and the need to encourage walking, cycling and the use of passenger transport, where this is, or can be a realistic alternative".

Local Plan Policy AH2 relates to new residential development (by way of infilling and redevelopment) and states that new dwellings should be designed so that:

- Their appearance, character and scale create a pleasant place in which to live, and are in keeping with and enhance the existing local environment with particular attention being paid to architectural form, height, materials, density, layout of buildings and hardsurfaced areas;
- They respect existing natural features of the site including landform and trees;
- They do not have an unneighbourly effect on existing dwellings by reason of unacceptable loss of privacy, daylight / sunlight, outlook or open amenity space;
- They incorporate adequate standards of residential amenity for the new dwellings(s) in terms of open amenity space, daylight, outlook and privacy;
- Access and parking provision meet adopted standards; &
- They comply with Council's adopted development standards (in this instance Development Control Standard No.2 – 'Space Around New Dwellings and Flats').

Visual Amenity, Character & Appearance

Whilst the general shape of the building is similar to the rest of the houses within the Adelaide Square estate, the proposal involves a number of significant differences that are considered inconsistent with the established homogenous building character of the estate. These include:

- Use of full gable roof ends as opposed to hipped roof ends;
- Building materials that appear to involve face brick and horizontal cladding walls (as opposed to pebble dash) and a clay tile roof; &

- The configuration of the first floor windows involved pitched elements rather than retaining a clean uninterrupted roof line.

Given the limited association the structure may have with the rest of the estate however, refusal solely on this basis is expected to be difficult to sustain.

Residential Amenity – Privacy

Despite the concerns expressed by No.'s 16 & 18 Adelaide Square, due to the minimal use of first floor windows, and the proposed use of obscure glazing on the rear (eastern) elevation, the proposal is not expected to have an unreasonably adverse impact on the privacy of adjoining dwellings.

The only property that is expected to be impacted upon is a small portion of the rear garden of No.12 overlooked by the two first floor windows at the front of the dwelling. Due to the orientation of the proposed dwelling and the arrangement of the adjoining plot however, any impact is expected to be limited to within acceptable levels.

Residential Amenity – Daylighting

Again, despite the concerns expressed by No.'s 16 and 18 Adelaide Square, due to the distance between the proposed and existing dwellings, it is unlikely that the proposal will have a significant impact on access to daylight for those existing structures, or considered to be overbearing to nearby development.

Notwithstanding the above, the concerns expressed by Council's Environmental Health Branch that the new dwelling itself would have extremely limited access to light, due to the immediate proximity of the extremely large industrial building sited as close as 3m from its southern elevation, are considered to be valid a suitable reason for refusal in this instance.

Amenity Space

Despite the odd arrangement of the plots, the amenity area set aside for both the new and existing dwelling appear to meet and/or exceed the $85m^2$ and $100m^2$ minimum requirements for each respective dwelling arranged in accordance with Council's development standards.

Vehicular Access & Parking

The key issue to this proposal is the limited access to the site, and in particular the lack of any vehicle parking proposed in the application and the lack of any spare capacity in the nearby road system to cater for any additional resident or visitor on-street parking. The concerns expressed by County Highways regarding potential impact any intensification of development may have on the safe function of the adjoining road and

pavement network are therefore shared, and refusal to the application recommended on this basis.

Recommendation

Refusal for the following reasons:-

1. B2R (out of character with surrounding development)
2. H14R (unsuitable backland development – amended as below)

   The erection of a dwelling on this 'backland' site to the rear of existing dwellings and without adequate road frontage constitutes a substandard layout of development contrary to the policies of the West Sussex Structure Plan (CH1, DEV1) and the Adur District Local Plan (AG1, AH2).
3. The proposal does not include provision on the site for the parking of vehicles to the standard required by the Local Planning Authority and the proposal would be likely to result in further demand for on-street car parking where demand is already high which is likely to interrupt the free-flow of traffic on a public highway and add to the hazards of highway users (including pedestrians), contrary to the policies of the West Sussex Structure Plan (DEV4-5).
4. The proposed dwelling would have an unacceptable level of amenity in that it would have insufficient access to daylight due to the size and orientation of the adjoining industrial unit, contrary to the policies of the West Sussex Structure Plan (CH1, DEV1) and the Adur District Local Plan (AG1, AH2).

Case Officer: ...J. Reynolds..... Date: 7/1/07