Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: ADC/0402/10 Recommendation – APPROVE

Site: 67 Manor Road, Lancing BN15 0HB

Proposal: 2 detached three-bedroom dwellings, detached garage and re-located access to Manor Road

The Application

The application relates to the site on the corner of Upper West Lane, opposite St. James the Less Church. The previous derelict dwelling was demolished under Conservation Area consent ADC/158/07.

The proposal seeks to renew the previous recently-lapsed permission ADC/0389/07 to redevelop the site with two detached 'cottage-style', three-bedroom dwellings, one with a detached garage and hardstanding to the front and the other with solely a hardstanding. The existing NE corner access to Manor Road would be closed and a new centrally located access onto Manor Road opened in the existing flint boundary wall.

The site is 51m deep and 26m wide along the frontage onto Manor Road (north) and 20m wide along the rear boundary (south), with an area of 0.11 hectare. There is a low flint wall fronting both Manor Road and Upper West Lane and a 2.4m high brick wall on the western side boundary with No.69.

The 2 proposed dwellings have three bedrooms in the upper roof space (one with en-suite) and living accommodation downstairs. The east side property would have dining room and lounge on the south side and kitchen at the front separated by the stairwell and downstairs w/c. The west side property would be able to accommodate a study at the front due to the larger footprint.

Consultations and Representations

West Sussex County Council: No objection subject to conditions regarding visibility, access design and cycle parking, and payment of a sustainable transport contribution (£3,780). Comment that the site layout does not show enough parking for the anticipated number of vehicles under the new standard. Previously, following the submission of a satisfactory Stage One Safety Audit and Designers Response, stated that the primary issue in respect of visibility is considered acceptable as the proposed access is an improvement compared to the existing access to be closed.

The Conservation architect previously commented that this is a significant location. The different vernacular buildings make a strong contribution to the Conservation Area. The volume and position of the proposed new dwellings is not controversial but he suggested that the eastern dwelling should have a 'catslide' roof and the dormers on the western dwelling should be hipped.

Adur District Conservation Advisory Group: No objections but query access to the site and the adjacent plot.

Lancing Parish Council: No objection.

Third Parties: 2 emails have been received from residents at 69 Manor Road and 4 Fircroft Avenue expressing concerns.

No.69, to the west, is concerned about west-facing windows overlooking her property, including patio and garden, and she asks for frosted glass.

No.4, opposite, comments that the details of the new houses need to match the old village and be in keeping. This is a very sensitive site next to the ancient church and in a very pretty part of the Conservation Area, with thatched cottages and much flintwork. The development needs house walls and garden walls with a considerable amount of flint.

Relevant Planning Policies and Guidance

Adopted Adur District Local Plan 1993-2006 (ADC 1996) (saved policies): AG1, AB1, AB3-4, AB11, AH2, AH5 and Appendix 11 'Supplementary Planning Guidance' comprising Development Control Standard No.2 'Space Around New Dwellings and Flats'.
Revised West Sussex Parking Standards and Transport Contributions Methodology (WSCC 2003 and 2010)
PPS1 'Delivering Sustainable Development' (ODPM 2005)
PPS3 ' Housing' (DCLG 2006, amended 2010)
PPS5 ' Planning for the Historic Environment' and Historic Environment Planning Practice Guide (DCLG 2010)
PPG13 'Transport' (DTLR 2001)

Planning Assessment

Policies

The previous permission lapsed less than 2 months before the submission of the present application. Whilst not strictly applicable, Circular 11/95 is relevant in that it states that unimplemented permissions should be renewed unless (a) there has been a material change in planning circumstances; (b) continued failure to commence the development would contribute unacceptably to uncertainty about the future pattern of development in the area; or (c) the application is premature. It is not considered that any of these reasons apply to the present case and, consequently, there must be a presumption in favour of granting permission again.

The site is located within the Conservation Area, close to the Grade II* listed church, in a residential part of the built-up area. There is a statutory duty to pay attention to the need to preserve or enhance Conservation Areas, as well as the setting of listed buildings. Local Plan policies require this and also that the design and construction materials are of a high standard.

The proposal constitutes redevelopment and infilling within the built-up area as provided for in Local Plan policies. In order to meet housing requirements, a significant proportion of housing development by way of 'unidentified' small infill sites such as this is necessary. 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 do not have an unneighbourly effect due to loss of privacy; daylight/sunlight; outlook or open space, incorporating adequate

standards of residential amenity for the new dwellings in terms of amenity space, daylight, outlook and privacy; access and parking provision meets the adopted standards; and they accord with the Council's DC Standard No.2 'Space Around New Dwellings and Flats'.

Government policy in PPS3 encourages best use of urban land for housing development, particularly affordable housing and a mixture of types to create a balanced community, at higher densities (although the requirement to avoid developments at less than 30 dwellings per hectare has now been deleted) 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 and sustainable use of land without compromising the quality of the environment. PPS1 states "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."
Similarly, PPS3 states that, in Conservation Areas and other local areas of special character, if proper attention is paid to achieving good design, new development opportunities can be taken without adverse impacts on their character and appearance. "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".

Visual amenity – Conservation Area

The main concern is the effect the proposed two dwellings would have on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and the setting of Grade II* St. James the Less church to the east.

Opposite the site is a pair of semi-detached thatch-roofed houses and to the west is a 1960s chalet bungalow with a detached double garage between it and Manor Road. The character of the area is very mixed in terms of the age, density and type of dwellings ranging from relatively modern houses and bungalows to the north at densities of up to about 38 dwellings per hectare (dph) to lower density older dwellings to the west, south of Manor Road, at typically 18dph. The existing bungalow on the site equates to a density of only 9dph. The proposed two dwellings would bring the density to 18dph, which is still much lower than the former minimum 30dph in PPS3. It is considered that this is appropriate as it helps preserve the character of the vicinity.

The proposed two dwellings are sited so that the easternmost is set back further from the front of the site ensuring that there is no visual interference with the view to the church. The subservient setting of the east side dwelling is further assisted by the irregular shape of the site, with it being set back 20.5m from Manor Road, with the west side dwelling further forward.

The proposed east side dwelling is different in style and character to the western one. It is lower in height, 6.3m as compared to 7.1m, and orientated so the gable end faces the Manor Road. This diminished scale fronting the road allows a greater perception of separation between the two dwellings (4.5m) and from the east side of the site (5m). The mass and scale of the proposed two dwelling are considered to be in scale with the surrounding buildings and would help to improve or enhance the Conservation Area as compared to the previous dwelling which was of poor quality design and construction.

The proposed east side dwelling would be prominent and is thus the more important in terms of its effect on the character of the Conservation Area. It is shown orientated so it faces Upper West Lane and the church on its opposite side (to the east). The west side dwelling would adjoin (one metre away) the very high west boundary wall and would be less visible, the most prominent feature being the proposed detached garage at the front. The east side dwelling would be modest and subservient in its scale, setting and design, whilst the western dwelling would sit comfortably in the space left to the boundary with No.69.

The design and materials of the two dwellings would, it is considered, improve and enhance the character of the Conservation Area. The east side property would be constructed with flint-faced walls and brick quoins, hand-made clay roof tiles and lead-clad dormer cheeks. The west dwelling would be more similar to bungalows in the area but would have hand-made clay roof tiles.

The low flint wall along Manor Road would only need to be slightly lowered in order to provide visibility splays as long as the ground level within the site, where the proposed driveway meets the new access, is raised to road level. Apart from this alteration, the existing boundary walls need to be retained and any damage caused to them made good, with any re-building to match. A condition can be imposed to deal with this.

As regards trees and shrubs on the site, there are a couple of bay trees and a holly. The latter, near the site entrance, has some merit but the bay trees are more like shrubs. The remaining trees are conifers (C.Leylandii along Manor Road), fruit trees and two large elders. None is considered worthy of a TPO.

Residential amenity – for proposed dwellings

The relationship between the two dwelling would require that the east facing window of bedroom 3 of the western property and the west facing dormer of bedroom 2 of the eastern property would be almost opposite each other, but an obscure glazing condition would prevent excessive overlooking and the other windows in the rooms concerned would provide outlook.

The properties themselves would have gardens which exceed the Council's minimum standards, the gardens being 218 sqm and 264sqm, for east and west respectively.

Residential amenity – effect on neighbouring dwellings

The main concern is with regard to the effects on the amenities of the existing bungalows at No.69 to the west and 'Faber' to the south in Upper West Lane but it is not considered that the effects would be unacceptable.

The side elevation of the western property would not have a significant adverse effect on the amount of light available to or outlook from No.69 which is sited away from the common boundary. The proposed 2 west side windows are small; the groundfloor one would face the tall boundary wall and the first-floor one can be required to be obscure-glazed as it is only a secondary window to a bedroom. The three rear dormers would only have oblique views towards the rear garden of No.69.

The south-facing ground and firstfloor windows in both new dwellings would face the side of the bungalow 'Faber' in Upper West Lane. However, the distance involved is

21.5m for the east dwelling and 25m for the other. It is considered that there would not be loss of privacy or an overbearing effect.

Access and Parking

WSCC are satisfied with the proposed access arrangements which they consider would be an improvement on the existing corner access, albeit that more traffic would result from 2 dwellings than the existing one.

The main concern is that visibility to the east is below standard. The designer's response to the Safety Audit includes:-

- The raising of the ground height of the site in front of the dwellings to allow the vehicles to stand at rest at the access with horizontal sight lines in both directions;
- Removal of front boundary landscaping (two small trees, one holly and one conifer) to increase visibility with only low level new planting;
- Although the visibility splay to the east is only 40m to the kerb line, a car approaching 55m-60m away would be visible. It is recommended that the 'SLOW' sign be painted on a red background to the east side of the apex of the bend in the road and an existing sign stating 'concealed entrance' renewed.

Each dwelling would have 2 parking spaces, plus adequate on-site turning space. The sustainable transport contribution was paid on 25 July 2008 under the section 106 related to the previous application ADC/0389/07, so a further payment cannot now be required.

Recommendation

APPROVE for reason that:-

The proposed development is within the built-up area and would help to meet the need for additional housing without detracting from the existing local urban environment. It would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Conservation Area and can take place without resulting in unacceptable detriment to the amenities of neighbouring properties and without detraction from highway safety. The proposal would consequently not conflict with the relevant policies of the Adur District Local Plan (AG1, AB1, AB3-4, AB11, AH2, AH5), PPS3 and PPS5.

Subject to:-

1. C1Ci
2. C12Ai .....and roof**s** of the proposed building**s** has..... R. AB3 & AH2
3. C7Ci .....until details of all walls and fences, including lowering the height of the existing roadside wall, infilling the existing access gap with a matching flint wall and the retention and making good of the existing east and west side boundary walls, have been.....The buildings shall not be occupied until.... R. In the interests of amenity and highway safety, having regard to.....AB4..
4. C9Kii The building**s** hereby...access to the site has been stopped up (as referred to under condition 03 above) including any necessary.....in accordance.....
5. C9Ciii
6. C8Bv .....until the parking spaces, garage and access facilities shown on...
7. C11Aii

8. The proposed flint walling (including the boundary walls and the walls of the proposed house on plot 1) shall conform with a sample panel which shall be erected on site and approved by the LPA in writing before work to flint walling is commenced. R. To preserve the character of the Conservation Area and comply with policy AB3 of the ADLP.
9. C14Dii
10. C18Ai .....details of the floor levels of the proposed buildings and the raising of ground level adjoining new access shall be..... R. In the interests of amenity and highway safety having regard to policies AG1 and AH2 of the ADLP.
11. C18Ci The first-floor window in the west side elevation of the western house (Plot 2) shall at..... R. .....AH2..
12. C18Ei .....modification), no additional first-floor windows shall be formed in either of the 2 dwellings. R. To prevent overlooking and harm to the appearance of the dwellings having regard to policies AH2 and AB3 of the ADLP.
13. C1Ei The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plan:-
Drawing No. 638/01 dated 17 October 2010 and date stamp received 19 October 2010.

……..

Case Officer: Keith Morgan Date: 20 July 2011