Expiry 4/10/07
~~P.C 6/9/07~~

Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: ADC/0419/07 **Recommendation – Refuse Application**

Site: **1 Broad Reach Shoreham-By-Sea West Sussex BN43 5EY**

Proposal: **Variation of condition 35 of planning permission SU/216/02 to allow the existing live-work unit to be occupied as separate office and residential units at No. 1 Broad Reach Ropetackle**

The Application

The application site is one of nine live-work units within the Ropetackle development in Shoreham town centre. It is located on a corner plot where there is limited parking and double yellow lines.

Condition 35 of the planning permission ADC.216.02 for the Ropetackle development states:

"The accommodation within the 'live-work units' denoted on the plans as work areas or offices shall be used solely for purposes within Use Class B1 'business' of the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987 and the associated residential accommodation shall be occupied solely by persons (including their dependents) working on the same premises.

Reason: In the interests of residential amenity and to maintain a 'mixed' use development in accordance with the requirements of the Planning Brief and policies AG1 of the Adur District Local Plan and G1 of the West Sussex Structure Plan."

The application seeks to vary the condition to allow the work unit at No. 1 Broad Reach to be occupied separately from the residential accommodation.

Consultations and Representations

Third Parties: **-** None received.

WSCC Transport Planning Services: - Objection. Concern is expressed that if the development changes are allowed, demand for parking in and around the development would increase leading to a situation where parking provision may not be adequate leading to indiscriminate parking in the locality. This, in turn, would lead to conditions that would inconvenience other highway users. As such, a highway objection is raised.

Environmental Health Officer:- No adverse comments

Relevant Planning Policies and Guidance

Adopted West Sussex Structure Plan 2001-2016 (WSCC 2005): DEV1, LOC1, NE1, NE5.
Adopted Adur District Local Plan 1993-2006 (ADC 1996): AG1, AH7
PPS1 'Delivering Sustainable Development'
PPG13 'Transport'

Planning Assessment

Visual Amenity and Character

The proposal would have no material impact on the appearance of the building. There is potential for the proposal to result in increased traffic and parking, which could be detrimental to the character and amenity of the vicinity, particularly in terms of cumulative impact if this were to set a precedent for the other live-work units to sublet.

Residential Amenity

It is unlikely that the residential amenity of adjacent properties would be significantly affected. There could, however, be some impact on the amenity of the residential unit above due to a separate occupier being in the unit below and using the same entrance door.

Highways and Parking

The live-work units were intended to provide a mixed use within Ropetackle so that it would have an element of employment provision. The site is in a sustainable town centre location and part of the sustainability of the scheme is that the live-work units should enable a reduction in traffic movements as the occupier of the residential unit would work below and not need to commute elsewhere. The separate occupation of the work unit with staff not living in Ropetackle would increase the number of vehicle movements. Due to the sustainable location of Ropetackle, it only has limited parking provision to encourage alternative modes of transport to be used. The proposal would be likely to increase indiscriminate parking in the development, to the detriment of the amenity and safety of the area. This would be exacerbated if this case was to set a precedent and the other live-work units followed suit. WSCC Highways object to the proposal.

Conclusion

It is concluded that this proposal would be likely to lead to an increase in vehicle movements on the site and therefore to increased demand for parking and indiscriminate parking that would adversely impact on the amenity of Ropetackle, particularly if there were a cumulative impact from other live-work units following the precedent that this would set. It is therefore recommended that the application is refused.

Recommendation

REFUSE on grounds that: -

1. 7BR (inadequate parking provision) ~~make it difficult to resist~~
2. ~~The proposal, if permitted, would set a precedent for similar proposals, which the Council would then have difficulty in resisting, resulting in the cumulative impact of increased parking demand and indiscriminate parking, to the detriment of the character, appearance and safety of the vicinity~~ effect of which would be to [illegible]

BIOR

Case Officer...[signature].....Date..11/9/07.....

.. of the locality to the detriment of the residential amenities and environment of the area, contrary ...
.. WSSP(CH1, DEV) and ADLP(AG1, AE15)

[signature]
11/9