Development Management - Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/0741/18 Recommendation – Approve

Site: Land at 10 John Street, Shoreham-By-Sea

Proposal: Demolition of existing garages and erection of pair of semi-detached three-storey dwellings to frontage facing John Street and one part single and part two-storey detached dwelling to rear with associated parking and landscaping.

Date of site visit: 7 June 2018

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

The application relates to an L-shaped site within the Shoreham Conservation Area located between John Street and Middle Street. It currently contains 16 lock-up type rented garages that are used for parking and storage purposes. Three garages front John Street with the remainder at the rear, accessed via a driveway which runs along the northern boundary of the site, adjacent to a chapel. To the south there are two houses, 6 and 8 John Street; No.8 is a tree storey building set back from the road, behind the front of the westernmost garage block.

The rear of the site is surrounded by development. To the north lies the Middle Street public car park while to the east there is a terrace of 2 storey dwellings, at the north end of which is the Royal Sovereign Pub. To the south there is a commercial yard/parking area.

Planning permission was granted in May 2017 for the demolition of all of the garages and the construction of 3no. dwellings (AWDM/0331/17). The approved plans show two dwellings will face John Street and will take the form of a pair of staggered, gable-fronted three storey semi-detached houses, each with a parking space in front. The third dwelling will be located at the rear of the chapel and will be a part two storey/part single storey building. It did not have a parking space.

The current application seeks permission for an amended scheme. The Design & Access Statement summarises the amendments as follows:

"Due to site constraints and high material costs the development needs to be more financially viable for the client group. Thusly, the total gross internal area (GIA) for the site has been increased from 333.3 sqm to 370 sqm and an additional carparking space has been provided for unit 3.

The GIA for units 1+2 have been increased by extending the kitchen/living/dining spaces in an easterly direction as well as raising the eaves/ridge levels marginally to provide improved 'loft'

accommodation. The width of these units have also increased slightly although they have not been moved closer to no. 6/8 John Street. In conjunction with this, the internal layouts have been improved and as a result the 'loft' spaces are of a better, more practical quality with improved daylighting via rooflights. These openable rooflights have been added to bolster the daylighting in the loft spaces which cannot be provided in its entirety by the narrow, 'slot' like windows. The increased floor area has allowed the provision of an extra bedroom while the master bedroom and ensuite have been moved to the first floor. This, in our opinion, is a more 'family-friendly' arrangement.

The GIA for unit 3 has been increased by extending the main body of the house in a northerly direction which makes use of the previous area of dead space between the house and the boundary wall. This has allowed the provision of an additional bedroom/ancillary common room on the ground floor. The master bedroom has also increased in size and has 2no. new rooflights. In addition, the fenestration on the first floor has been simplified and the timber slatting removed (frosted glass to be used instead) to provide a more elegant solution.

The additional parking space is assigned to unit 3 and will have a brick planter in front to provide relief from headlight glare for unit 2. Privacy is not considered to be an issue in this case as the accommodation facing the space in unit 2 is an ancillary living space – a study – and will therefore acts as a privacy 'buffer' for the rest of the house.

It is not felt that any of these changes will impact negatively on the surrounding properties. In fact, the increased eaves level on units 1+2 mean that they sit better elevationally between 6/8 and 16/18 John Street providing a better streetscape.

We have also taken the opportunity to revise our material choices as it was pointed out by neighbours that the previous black brick 'plinth' was too dark. We have addressed this by instead proposing a buff coloured brick for the plinth and white painted masonry for the main areas of brickwork – please refer to the drawings for more information. This methodology has been applied to all three units. We feel that the painted masonry will provide textural interest and this type of finish has precedent on John Street. As a result, the houses will feel lighter and more suited to a coastal location! In addition to this, other interesting detailing has been added such as areas of soldier coursing, 'plinth' specific stone cills and varying window reveal depths that will cause interesting shadowing effects."

Relevant site history

As above

Consultations

West Sussex County Council: The **Highway Officer** has no objection subject to conditions requiring car and cycle parking and a construction management plan. Comments that, given the town centre context of the sites location, in highways terms the principle of three dwellings in this location would not be considered to give rise to any capacity concerns.

Two of the dwellings will be provided off street car parking, both of which would access St John Street utilizing the existing dropped crossing which would have served the garages. In essence no intensification of use would be occurring and no concerns would be raised to the continued use of the crossover for this purpose.

Consideration does need to be given to the loss of the garages and the potential this would have to displace parking to on street locations. However he is mindful that the garages seem to be a private concern so presumably the owner could allow the leases to expire resulting in the same potential parking displacement.

From experience of similar developments of garage provisions such as this, the garages are not typically large enough to accommodate larger modern vehicles; as such it is likely not all the garages will be used for private parking. This is confirmed within the Technical Note which details how the site is currently being used for parking of 7 vehicles, 2 of which are permanently stored vehicles unlikely to be displaced onto public roads.

Consideration needs to be given to the parking demand of the dwellings themselves, which the WSCC Car Parking Demand calculator anticipates would create the demand for 4 car parking spaces, two of these have been accommodated on site.

The Parking Survey Technical Note demonstrates that parking capacity greater than levels reasonably expected to be displaced on street is available within walking distance of the site. This is made up from unrestricted on street provision, restricted on street provisions and paid for parking provisions.

The Local Highways Authority are only in a position to object to a development citing on street car parking pressure if a highway safety issue is to be created. In urban environments such as this appropriate junction protection and parking restriction are in place to prohibit parking in unsafe locations.

On balance the Local Highways Authority does not feel that any objection citing on street car parking is one that could be substantiated. The LPA may wish to consider the amenity implications of the development in relation to parking pressures in the area.

The LHA does not consider that the proposal for three dwelling would have ‘severe’ impact on the operation of the highway network, therefore is not contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework (paragraph 32), and that there are no transport grounds to resist the proposal.

The County **Archaeologist** has no objection subject to a condition requiring an archaeological investigation.

Adur & Worthing Councils: The **Environmental Health** Officer has no objection but recommends a construction management plan to cover, among other things, dust control, noise, deliveries, material storage, waste removal etc; during the demolition and construction phase of the development. Storage for materials on site will be difficult once they start building the homes at the front.

The **Drainage Engineer** advises that the site lies in flood zone 1, is unaffected by surface water, flooding, has no history of flooding and is not served by surface water sewers.

He notes that this time around the applicants' submission does not include the RGP consultants' document, which set out how surface water was to be disposed of. The proposals are now contained in a single paragraph in section 3 10 of the Design and Access Statement, as copied in italics below.

All areas of hardstanding will utilise permeable brick pavers to reduce surface water run off.

Each of these hard surfaces areas has to be checked for infiltration

Rainwater from the roofs will be harvested in underground tanks. This could then be used for garden irrigation or for internal use, i.e. toilet flushing. This statement contains the word could. If the water is not used where exactly will it go?

At this point there is inadequate information backed by calculations and therefore he would like to raise a holding objection – until an infiltration test is undertaken and then full details of drainage provided. This requirement should not be reduced due to the sensitivity of the site, If site produced surface water is not adequately dealt with on-site off site flooding could occur.

Subsequent comments: OK to deal with this by condition. They didn't do the test for the first application, which was why i wanted it done this time - but a condition will do.

No work till test done or similar

Waste Services state that it looks like all of the units can have a standard collection but the bins will have to be collected from kerbside. This is especially relevant to unit 3 as it is set back from the road

Southern Water: Request informatives

ADCAG: No comments received

Representations

2 letters of objection received from the occupiers of 16, 21 John Street:

- Increased parking pressure
- Each house should have allocated off street parking
- Increased noise
- Increased pollution
- Land would be better used for parking

1 letter of support from 5 John Street:

- Support development but request that materials are approved before use
- Green flat roof will attract nesting seagulls

Relevant Planning Policies

Adur Local Plan 2017 policies 1, 2, 3, 15, 16, 17, 18, 20, 28
'Supplementary Planning Guidance' comprising: Development Management Standard No.1 'Space Around New Dwellings and Flats'
West Sussex 'Guidance for Parking in New Residential Developments' and 'Residential Parking Demand Calculator' (WSCC 2010)
National Planning Policy Framework (July 2018)
Technical Housing Standards – nationally described space standard (DCLG 2015)

Planning Assessment

Principle

The proposal comprises increasing the housing stock on non-allocated land within the built up area and can be supported in principle. The relevant issues are the effects on the amenities of neighbouring residential occupiers and consideration as to whether the development will preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

Visual amenity

The front dwellings are three storeys high and gable-fronted. They have been staggered and are set back behind the front elevation of the chapel to the north but forward of 8 John Street to the south. The ridge and eaves heights will now slightly exceed those of 8 John Street and 16 John Street further north. However, the buildings will be set back from the street and will not appear unduly dominant in the street scene. Other dwellings in the street tend to be hip roofed but gable features can be found on the chapel and St Johns Court opposite, as well as on other buildings in the area.

There is a mixture of render, flint and brickwork visible in the street. The final details of materials can be reserved by condition but at this stage the applicant has amended the scheme to include buff coloured brick for the plinth and white painted masonry for the main areas of brickwork. Rooflights are confirmed as being flush fitting conservation-style windows.

The front units previously included a low boundary wall along the frontage but length of wall has been reduced as a result of the provision of the extra parking space. Nevertheless, the wall that remains will give the edge of the site some definition where it abuts the pavement.

The rear unit will be largely screened from public view but the upper floor will be visible above the boundary wall with the public car park. The modest scale of Unit 3 will ensure that it is not overbearing and is appropriate to its backland setting. It has been brought closer to the boundary wall with the car park to the north and there was some concern that inadequate space would be available for future maintenance. The applicant has responded by advising that upon demolition of the garages the wall will need a level of work to allow it to stand independently. After any remedial work is carried out unit 3 will be built up against it as per the existing garages. The unit 3 external wall will be structurally independent but there will be lead flashing to cover the gap between the boundary wall and unit 3 thus maintenance from the site side of the wall will not be required.

Residential amenity – existing occupiers

The front dwellings have been set back from the street and staggered to ensure that the closest dwelling to 8 John Street (Unit 2) does not project too far forward of that dwelling's principal windows, thereby avoiding a loss of light or outlook for those occupiers.

At the rear, Units 1 and 2 have been extended at ground floor by an additional 1m. Unit 2 will now project 3.6m beyond the rear of 8 John Street. There is an existing 3.5m high flint and brick wall on the boundary which already overshadows the existing ground floor rear window at No.8. The upper floor windows are a sufficient distance from the boundary to not be adversely affected by the proposal, which is sited to the north and will not therefore result in loss of sunlight.

The site backs on to a terrace of dwellings in Middle Street and the two dwellings at the southern end both have two storey outrigger extensions. The separation distance between the rear of these dwellings and Unit 2 will be 20.3m at first and second floor levels. The separation distance to Unit 1 will be 23.6m. Both of these distances are unchanged from the previous application.

So, Unit 2 will therefore continue to fall short of the Council's standard of 22m, (although being a three storey dwelling a distance of 28m would normally be sought). In order to overcome any possible loss of privacy, the second floor of both Units 1 and 2 had previously been reconfigured to include a bathroom at the rear rather than a bedroom, thereby enabling an obscure glazed window to be installed. The current application has altered the internal layout and the second floor now includes a bedroom where fully obscured glazing would not be appropriate. The plans show narrow obscure glazed rear windows up to a height of 1.7m above the floor level. While this protects the privacy of the occupiers in Middle Street, the light and outlook for the bedrooms in the new dwelling has the potential to be limited and substandard. To overcome such concerns, the plans also show a rooflight to each room which will allow more light and outlook for future occupiers and which, on balance, is considered to be acceptable.

The separation distance at first floor level in respect of Unit 2 and Middle Street properties, while slightly closer than would normally be expected, is considered to be acceptable in a tight urban location such as this. It is also sufficient to prevent any harmful loss of light to the rear of those dwellings in Middle Street.

The rear dwelling is a smaller unit and is more closely located to the boundaries with neighbouring buildings. It is proposed to be extended closer to the boundary wall to the north and two rooflights have been introduced to the western roofslope serving the master bedroom facing towards the rear of 16 John Street which have the potential to cause a loss of privacy, with just 13.5m between properties. However, the rooflights have been amended to have cills 1.7m above finished floor level, which should help to preserve privacy. A condition is also proposed to ensure that they are obscure glazed.

Residential amenity – proposed occupiers

The proposed front dwellings will have a floor area of 137sqm which comfortably exceeds the 99sqm required by the National Space Standards for a 7 person 4 bed 3 storey dwelling. Internally, individual room sizes meet the necessary standards. Externally, the rear amenity space for both units is reduced to 62 and 65 sqm respectively. At the same time the size of the dwellings has increased from 3 to 4 bedrooms, resulting in a significant shortfall from the 100sqm required in the Council's SPG. However, given the tight urban location, it is considered that the level of amenity space to be provided is acceptable and it will not result in a substandard living environment for the future occupiers.

The rear dwelling will have a floor area of 96 sqm which exceeds the 84sqm required by the National Standards for a 4 person, 3 bed 2 storey dwelling. Individual rooms meet the necessary minimum standards. External amenity space measures 49sqm which falls short of the Council's SPG but, as with the larger dwellings, it is considered to be adequate for the location.

The rear dwelling will be located close to the rear wall and roof terrace of The Royal Sovereign Pub. However, the terrace is not for patrons use and the house has been designed to ensure that no adverse overlooking occurs.

Bin and cycle storage is shown for all dwellings.

Parking and access

The development will result in the loss of 16 garages of which only 7 are currently in use for storing/parking cars. The loss of these garages will lead to increased parking on local roads. The proposed dwellings will each be served by 1 parking space on the frontage. The southernmost parking space will have limited visibility because of a structure on the boundary; however cars using the existing garage currently experience the same problem. The Highway Authority acknowledge that this is not an ideal situation but confirm that they would not be able to give this significant weight to resist the application.

West Sussex Highways has also advised that parking capacity exists in the vicinity of the site, made up from unrestricted on street provision, restricted on street provisions and paid for parking provisions (including the public car park to the north of the site). Furthermore, the site lies within a sustainable town centre location, close to public transport, and there is a reasonable expectation that parking demand would be less than in a more remote location.

On balance the Highway Authority has not objected to the proposal as they do not feel that any objection on the grounds of increased on street car parking is one that could be substantiated. There may be some implications arising from increased parking pressures in the area but this is more a matter of convenience rather than a loss of amenity or increased harm to highway safety.

Recommendation

APPROVE

Subject to Conditions:-

1. Approved Plans
2. Standard 3 year time limit
3. Materials to be agreed, including windows, doors, external materials
4. Car parking
5. Cycle parking to be provided as shown
6. Construction Management Plan
7. Removal of PD rights Classes A-E
8. Surface water drainage
9. Obscure glaze side and 2nd floor rear windows Units 1 and 2
10. Obscure glaze south side windows Unit 3
11. Rooflights in Unit 3 to be obscure glazed and have cill level 1.7m above finished floor level
12. Bin store to be provided as shown and used at all times, except on collection days
13. Archaeological investigation

Is recommendation contrary to letter(s) of representation? N

The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by identifying matters of concern within the application (as originally submitted) and negotiating, with the Applicant, acceptable amendments to the proposal to address those concerns. As a result, the Local Planning Authority has been able to grant planning permission for an acceptable proposal, in accordance with the presumption in favour of sustainable development, as set out within the National Planning Policy Framework.

Southern Water x 2

Case Officer: Peter Barnett Date: 30 July 2018

Authorised by: Gary Peck Date: 6 August 2018