Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/0445/16 **Recommendation – REFUSE**

Site: **14 Valley Road Sompting Lancing West Sussex**

Proposal: **Erection of detached bungalow in garden area to rear of Nos.12 and 14 Valley Road with new vehicular crossover from Mountview Road. Provision of parking space on frontage of existing dwelling.**

Date of site visit: 19.04.2016

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: Y – Amended Description

Site and Surroundings

The application site comprises a semi-detached bungalow (No.14 Valley Road) occupying a corner plot on the east side of the junction of Valley Road with Mountview Road, together with the northernmost part of the rear garden of the attached bungalow to the east, No.12 Valley Road. It is located within an established residential suburb made up originally of modest-sized bungalows, many of which have been substantially extended and altered over many years. No.14 has been enlarged by a flat-roofed extension and glazed lean-to on the north-west corner of the bungalow. No.12 has been enlarged by a modest rear conservatory.

The site and surrounding land slopes up steeply to the north and more gently down to the west. There is a large Cypress tree in the south-west corner of No.14 which is the subject of a Tree Preservation Order (162/10/76/S refers). At the time of the site visit the rear garden of No.14 had been cleared and a fence erected sub-dividing the rear part of the garden from the remainder of the plot.

Proposal

Permission is sought to erect a detached, hipped-roof 1-bedroom bungalow on the rearmost part of the gardens of No.12 and 14 fronting Mountview Road. The site would be roughly rectangular in shape, varying in width between 11.6 and 12.6 metres, and between 17.5 and 19.5 metres in depth. (owing to the angle of the road).

The proposed bungalow would have T-shaped footprint with a hipped and pitched roof 4.7m high with front and rear gable features. The front gable incorporates a bay window. The bungalow would have a brickwork plinth with render up to the eaves and a tiled roof. There would be a gap of 1.6m between the flank of the bungalow and the northern site boundary and a variable gap of 0.9m to 2m between the southern flank and the new boundary formed with the rear gardens of Nos: 12 and 14 Valley Road. It would be sited a minimum 6.6m into the site from the back edge of the footway. As amended

the submitted drawings show provision of a drive in front of the bungalow with space to park 1 vehicle and a new vehicular access formed off Mountview Road.

It is also proposed to form a new vehicle access off Valley Road with provision shown on the frontage of No.14 to provide that dwelling with 2 on-site parking spaces.

Relevant Planning History: None.

Consultations:

WSCC: The Highway Authority has raised no objection in principle, commenting:-

Summary
The proposal is for the erection of a detached one bedroom bungalow served by a new vehicle crossover (VCO) on to Mountview Road. Mountview Road is a 'D' classified road subject to a 30mph speed restriction in this location. In principle the Local Highway Authority (LHA) do not wish to raise any highways concerns as a result of the proposals, subject to advice and conditions set out below.

Access and Visibility
The new VCO is approximately 6.4m wide. This is the maximum width by WSCC standards that would be allowed. The applicant should supply a more detailed plan of the access and will need to obtain a licence from WSCC Highways for the works on to Mountview Road. This can be secured via condition.

The Local Highway Authority (LHA) has reviewed data supplied to WSCC by Sussex Police over a period of the last three years. There have been no recorded injury accidents at either the junction of Mountview Road with Valley Road or within the vicinity. There is no evidence to suggest that the junction is operating unsafely, or that a new VCO in this location would exacerbate an existing safety concern.

From an inspection of local mapping visibility on to Mountview Road appears to be satisfactory.

Parking and Turning
An off street parking area has been provided for two cars. The WSCC Car Parking Demand Calculator envisions that two spaces be provided for a development of this size and location therefore this meets with the parking provision requirement.

A turn on site would be preferred, however neighbouring properties have similar arrangements and balanced against this is the benefit of providing an opportunity to remove up to two vehicles that would otherwise be parked on the highway in a location where the existing practice is on-street parking by residents of adjoining properties which results in a noticeable narrowing of the existing available carriageway space. Furthermore, considering the low speed

and lightly trafficked nature of this 'D' classified road a highway safety concern would not be anticipated from the no turn on site arrangement.

Sustainability
The site is well suited to sustainable forms of transport. A street lit footway provides pedestrian links to nearby bus stops and retail and other amenities within 0.5 miles of the site. Lancing Train Station is 1.6 mile distant. The applicant should include provision for secure and covered cycle storage; this can be secured via condition.

Conclusion
In conclusion the LHA do not wish to raise any highways concerns as a result of the proposals. It is not anticipated that the single dwelling would significantly increase traffic movements on the nearby highway network or cause any highway safety concerns.

If the Local Planning Authority is minded to approve it is recommended that conditions relating to the provision of the new access, car parking and cycle parking are imposed."

Following re-consultation on the revised parking layout the Highway Authority has provided the following further comments:-

"The proposed VCO for the new dwelling is to provide off street parking for one vehicle. It is now approximately 3.5m wide which is sufficient to provide access for a single car. The LHA are satisfied with this arrangement, the applicant should apply for a licence from WSCC Highways for the works on to the public highway.

A new VCO is also proposed for the existing dwelling, with access on to Valley Road. The Block Plan demonstrates that this is approximately 4.9m wide and will provide off street parking for two cars. Although a turn on site would be preferable there is clearly insufficient space to achieve this with both new VCO's. There have been no recorded injury accidents within the past three years within the vicinity of the site and thus no evidence to suggest that this manoeuvre would exacerbate an existing safety concern. Furthermore, neighbouring properties appear to share a similar arrangement with no evidence of highway safety issue.

The LHA does not consider that the proposal 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."

Southern Water: A formal application for connection to the public sewerage system is required by Southern Water and an informative to this effect is requested. Initial investigations indicate that there are no public surface water sewers in the area to service this development. Alternative means of draining surface water from this development are required. This should not involve disposal to a public foul sewer. The applicant is advised to discuss the matter further with Southern Water.

Sompting Parish Council: Object. The Parish Council consider the proposed development to be out of character and scale with neighbouring properties, and have an unneighbourly impact.

Adur and Worthing Councils:

The Council's Engineer has raised a holding objection commenting that the applicant has indicated the intention to use 'pervious tarmac' for the car parking areas, but has given no indication of how surface water is to be dealt with, there being little room to accommodate a soakaway.

Representations:

The resident of 12 Valley Road supports the application stating that nobody envisaged when these properties were built that people would have 2 or 3 cars per household. It's the same everywhere. We have got to try to accommodate others. Many people park in Valley Road that live in Mountview Road – live and let live. The Government want to build more houses.

Objections have been received from the occupiers of 1, 6, 8, 10 Mountview Road, commenting:-

- The proposed dwelling would add to parking problems in Mountview Road. At present neighbours co-operate and only park on one side of the road. The proposed dwelling and driveway will result in less space available to park on this side of the road and the resulting added congestion will make it difficult for people to get in and out of their driveways or pass each other in the road due to its narrow width; this leads to reversing and turning in the road. There have already been several minor collisions. It is not right that a bungalow that has no parking provision of its own can build a new dwelling in the rear garden.
- Concerned that if permitted, the bungalow would soon be enlarged upwards with dormers, which would appear overdeveloped and result in overlooking of No.6 and 8; it already gets very busy which makes
- It is unclear why an additional dwelling is required here; is it acceptable for developers to buy, sell and overdevelop areas where existing residents are left to deal with the aftermath;
- Don't foresee any loss of light to No.1 providing the 5m gap shown on the plan is adhered to, and no large outbuildings, trees or extensions etc. are allowed in the garden.
- Viewed from the patio and kitchen window, the existing view of sheep grazing would be replaced with a brick wall and roof;
- Surprised to see the existing boundary hedge between the site and No.1 Mountview Road retained. The former owner of the application property struggles to maintain the hedge. A new boundary fence would be preferred.

The applicant has responded:-

The bungalow is designed to be in-keeping with the rest of properties and of similar size facing the same direction but without the box extension on the roof. I can't see why one bungalow looking the same as the rest would be unneighbourly.

I can't see any problem with parking. I have taken photos for the last 2 weeks every evening between 6pm to 8pm and there has been no cars parked anywhere near the corner. I'm just trying to build an affordable house as there is a housing shortage and to fit in nicely with the area. Otherwise I will be building under permitted development a big garage, bigger than the house planned for like the nice one backing onto Valley Road from the house in Mountview Road. I do not need planning for a driveway so would put in a double drive instead of a single."

Following notification of the amended plans, the residents of 1, 8 Mountview Road have re-stated their objections, commenting:-

- The amended plan will not make any difference to the parking problem as it is negated by the kerb space that will disappear.
- Don't pretend this is about affordable housing, it's about making money. The only comments in support of this application are from those that benefit financially
- It is quite right to say that these bungalows were not built with the idea that occupiers may have 2 or 3 cars. That is why the gardens are used to provide for parking – not to build bungalows on, making matters worse.

The applicant has responded further:

"I am still confused by the parking issue, there is about 150ft of [on-street] parking, more there than along the rest of the road as there are houses on both sides all the way up and don't see any problems there. There would be parking spaces provided in the front garden.

A garage will be an option if the [proposed] bungalow is rejected."

Relevant Planning Policies

Saved Local Plan policies (ADC 1996): AG1, AH2
DC Standard No.2 Space Around new Dwellings and Flats
Proposed Submission Adur Local Plan (2014): 1, 2, 15, 21,
Good Practice Guide – Internal Space Standards for New Homes
National Planning Policy Framework (CLG 2012)
National Planning Practice Guidance

Planning Assessment

The Development Plan comprises the saved policies of the adopted Adur Local Plan (1996) although the emerging Proposed Submission Adur Local Plan (2016) can be afforded some (albeit limited) weight. This aside, the Government has accorded the National Planning Policy Framework considerable status as a material consideration which can outweigh the Development Plan's provisions where such plan policies are out of date; or silent on the relevant matter or at variance.

The Council's own Conformity Assessment of the saved Local Plan policies indicates broad compliance with the National Planning Policy Framework,

where relevant policies exist. It is recognised that the Local Plan does not demonstrate a 5 year supply of deliverable housing land against Objectively Assessed Need as required in the National Planning Policy Framework and allied Practice Guidance. Although this will be addressed in due course by the emerging Local Plan, paragraph 14 of the NPPF states that in such circumstances unless the proposal is at variance with specific policies in the Framework which indicate development should be restricted, it should be approved unless the harm caused significantly and demonstrably outweighs the benefits when assessed against the NPPF overall.

The proposed development would make a minor contribution to meeting housing targets including OAN under the para 14/49 tests of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Saved policy AH2 allows for new residential development by way of infilling or redevelopment within the built-up area, subject to its appearance, character and scale providing a pleasant place in which to live, in-keeping with and enhancing the local environment with particular attention paid to architectural form, height, materials, density and layout of buildings and hard surfaces areas; it respecting existing natural features and land form; it not having an unneighbourly effect on existing dwellings and providing adequate standards of residential amenity for new dwelling; and providing the access arrangements to the public highway and on-site parking arrangements are acceptable.

The key considerations are the living conditions of existing and future occupiers, design and the effects on the character and appearance of the area, and highway safety and parking considerations.

Design and Effect on Character and Appearance

The importance of good design is emphasised throughout the NPPF in order to establish a strong sense of place by responding to local character and history, reflecting the identity of local surroundings to promote and reinforce local distinctiveness (paragraphs 58-60). This is also reflected in the emerging Local Plan, and Policy 15 which requires new development to be of a high architectural quality and respect and enhance the character of the site and the prevailing character of the area, making a positive contribution to the sense of place and distinctiveness of an area with particular attention (amongst other things) being paid to the architectural form, height, materials, density, scale, orientation, landscaping and layout of the development.

The surrounding roads are characterised by pairs of semi-detached bungalows interspersed with some detached bungalows. Although a large proportion of the original bungalows have been extended and altered over a period of many years, there nevertheless is a strong underlying sense of uniformity in the plot sizes and the overall grain of development.

The proposed bungalow would occupy a significantly smaller plot, approximately half the depth of those prevailing, with only a very shallow rear garden. The garden depth of the existing bungalows, Nos 12 and 14 would also be roughly halved. A similar scenario exists on the east side of this ‘block’ where the rear gardens of 2 and 4 Valley Road were historically sub-

divided and a detached bungalow ‘Ellison’ erected fronting Sedbury Road (c.1962). The latter is anomalous within the wider pattern of development.

The bungalows on either side of Mountview Road do not sit parallel to the edge of the carriageway, with the siting of each pair gradually staggered westwards from north to south following the angle of the road. The proposed bungalow would follow this alignment and staggered siting, having a minimum set-back of 6.5m from the back edge of the pavement, positioned forward of No.1 Mountview Road to the north, but no so far forward in Mountview Road as the original flank of No.14 Valley Road. Similarly, owing to the falling ground levels, the proposed bungalow would be sited on lower ground compared to No.1, but with its main ridge relatively higher than No.12/14.

In terms of architectural composition the proposed detached bungalow would respond to the characteristics of existing development in terms of its hipped roof form, gables and bay window feature but at a more diminutive scale that would set it apart from surrounding properties. This aside, space around dwellings is also an important factor which contributes to character, identity and appearance and in this respect the uncharacteristically small plot size, and reduced garden areas of 12/14 would be wholly out of keeping with the pattern of existing development. The concerns raised by the Council’s Engineer regarding surface water drainage and the lack of available space to accommodate a soakway further highlights the abnormally small size of the plot.

Residential Amenity – Living Conditions of Future Occupiers

The proposed bungalow would have a GIA of 50.1 sqm. The Council’s Good Practice Guide – Internal Space Standard for New Dwellings does not set a standard for 1-bedroom dwellings, but requires 1-bedroom flats to have a minimum internal area of 51 sqm. This compares to a minimum gross internal floor area of 50sqm for a 1-storey, 1-bedroom, 2-person property set out in the Government’s new Technical Space Standard. Although the rooms are shown to be of a regular shape with adequate levels of natural daylight, their dimensions are nevertheless small. It is clear that circulation space within all the rooms would be extremely tight and no separate provision is shown for storage.

The Council’s SPG ‘Space Around New Dwellings and Flats’ requires 2-storey dwellings to have a rear depth of 11m which is derived from the minimum distance needed between the rear of dwellings to safeguard against adverse overlooking (22m). There is no minimum garden area requirement for 1-bedroom dwellings. [Although a 2-bedroom terrace dwelling requires a minimum of 50sqm.] The supporting text states that the size and type of amenity space required relates to the size of the dwelling and also the character of the area. In this case, the proposed dwelling will have a rear garden varying in depth between 3.8 and 5m. Not only would the east-facing rooms have a restricted outlook, the amount of useable space would be limited and entirely overlooked by windows in the south side of No.1 Mountview Road on higher ground.

Residential Amenity – Effect on amenities of Existing Residents

The properties most affected are 10, 12 and 14 Valley Road and 1 Mountview Road.

1 Mountview Road adjoins to the north. It has been enlarged by a single-storey rear extension. There are 2 windows in the south side of the original bungalow facing toward the site. The site boundary is formed by a scrappy conifer hedge and beyond to the east, panel fencing with trellis on top in places. The proposed bungalow would be sited some 4m forward (west) of No.1 and some 3.8m to the south of the flank wall of the latter. It would have an enclosing effect on views from the front bay window of No.1, but having regard to the modest scale of the proposed bungalow, together with its hipped form and falling ground levels, it is considered the effect would not be overly dominant or intrusive as to result in unacceptable harm.

Taking into account the extensions added to 12 and 14 Valley Road, both properties would be left with rear gardens approximately 9m deep. The 'bulk' of the proposed bungalow on higher ground would have an impact on the rear outlook from the existing properties (more-so No.12) but not to a seriously harmful extent.

The proposed bungalow would be well-separated from the bungalow at No.10 Valley Road, but windows in the rear elevation would face toward its rear garden at a relatively short distance. Views into the garden would in part be screened by the bulk of a detached outbuilding situated in the garden of that property. However, the bedroom window in the proposed bungalow would face the rearmost part of the garden of No.10 at a distance of only 5m. Whilst this distance is not ideal, the retention of the small trees and shrubs growing in the garden of No.12 would help to safeguard against the most severe effects of overlooking. Similarly, the rear part of the garden of No.10 would suffer a degree of over-shadowing in the afternoons and evening, but that part of the garden closest to the bungalow (likely to be the most well-used) would not be affected.

The preserved cypress tree is not plotted on the submitted block plan, but is located in the south-west corner of No.14 Valley Road. It is unlikely that the formation of the 2 parking spaces shown on the frontage of No.14 would severely affect its roots, although safeguarding measures could be imposed in the event of permission, in addition to details of permeable surfacing.

Highway Safety and Parking

Notwithstanding the comments of third parties, the Highway Authority has not raised any highway safety concern about the amount of parking provision or its layout on the respective frontages of the proposed new dwelling and No.14.

The site is within a sustainable location, within walking distance of bus services into Lancing and Worthing. Cycle storage provision could be secured by condition.

Recommendation

REFUSE

The proposed development would constitute an unduly constrained and cramped form of development providing a poor quality of accommodation on an uncharacteristically small plot with limited rear garden depth that would be out of keeping with the pattern of surrounding development and harmful to local character contrary to saved policy AH2 of the Adur Local Plan and the NPPF.

Informative

Refusal following discussion

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

Case Officer: Jo Morin Date: 23.06.2016

Authorised by: Gary Peck Date: 24 June 2016