Expires 18/10/08

Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: ADC/0442/08 **Recommendation – Permit Application**

Site: **68a Old Shoreham Road Lancing West Sussex BN15 0QZ**

Proposal: **Conversion of integral garage to lounge (with door replaced by wall with window) (retrospective)**

The Application

The application site is a detached chalet bungalow located on the south side of Old Shoreham Road (A27), Lancing. The property was originally built as a garage to No.68 in 1992 and converted into a two bedroom dwelling under SU/76/96/TP. This approval was granted following amendments to a previous application SU/40/96/TP for a similar conversion which was refused on the grounds of being un-neighbourly development, causing detriment to highway safety due to the increased use of an existing access point to the A27, and providing inadequate parking and turning facilities. The approved revision included a single access point onto a side/slip road, a new attached garage for No.68 and an integral garage to the new dwelling, No.68a.
This application seeks permission to convert the integral garage to No.68a into a lounge with a window to the front. It follows a similar application ADC/0630/07 which was refused on the grounds that:

> *The proposal does not include adequate provision on the site for the parking of vehicles in a satisfactory manner to the standard required by the Local Planning Authority and the proposal would be likely to increase the pressure for on-street parking in an area where insufficient space is available, with resultant detriment to highway safety and obstruction of the flow of traffic, contrary to the policy of the West Sussex Structure Plan (DEV4-5).*

This re-submission (now retrospective) is again for the conversion of the integral garage to No.68a but now includes more precise details of the proposed parking arrangement within the shared hardstanding to No's 68 and 68a. It shows space for four vehicles, two of which have indicated on-site turning circles.

Consultations and Representations

Consultations/Comments

County Planning Officer (Highways)	No objection is raised. The hardstanding is incapable of holding 4

vehicles however 3 spaces is considered acceptable in this instance. The casual use of the lay-by for parking will not impact on highway safety. There are no apparent visibility issues at this junction.

Third Parties

Lancing Parish Council raise no objection.

Contributors

No representations have been received.

Relevant Planning Policies and Guidance

Adopted West Sussex Structure Plan 2001-2016 (WSCC 2005) (saved policies): LOC1, DEV1, DEV4-5
Adopted Adur District Local Plan 1993-2006 (ADC 1996) (saved policies) AG1, AH7 and Appendix 11 'Supplementary Planning Guidance' comprising: Development Control Standard No.3 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings'
PPG13 'Transport' (DTLR 2001)

Planning Assessment

Policies
Structure Plan policies seek to protect, and where possible, enhance the character and distinctiveness of an area, requiring high standards of design, layout and construction (DEV1). Development should not be permitted unless the level of parking is compatible with the need to avoid environmental or safety problems (DEV4-5). PPG13 requires local authorities to set maximum parking standards, designed to be used as part of a package of measures to promote sustainable transport choices. It also states that local authorities should use their discretion in setting the levels of parking appropriate for small developments so as to reflect local circumstances.

Visual Amenity
The new window in the front elevation of No.68a does not detract from the appearance of the building or the streetscene.

Parking and Access
The key concern is with regard to the level of parking provision that will be resultant of this conversion. The original application (SU/40/96/TP: Refused) provided for a new garage to No.68 and three hardstanding spaces to the

front. Under the adopted parking standards of the time it was required that five parking should be provided, two for the conversion, three for the original house. As the available hardstanding space was only capable of holding three vehicles the revised application included an integral garage into No.68a to attain the requisite spaces.
In the intervening years the garage to No.68 has been converted into a separate room. The proposed conversion of No.68a's garage under ADC/0630/07 was calculated to leave only the three hardstanding spaces to serve a two bedroom bungalow and four bedroom house. The Council's parking standards still state that a maximum of five spaces should be provided for these dwellings however recent PPG13 guidance now allows for an element of flexibility dependant upon the nuances of the site.

This re-submission of ADC/0630/07 now includes more detailed parking arrangements. It shows four parking bays fronting No.68a, all of which are the minimum 2.4m by 4.8m (as outlined in DC Standard No.1: Car Parking Standards). The turning circle for two of these spaces is also indicated. It is clear from the site visit that this is an optimistic setup that exaggerates the reality of the site in that only 3 spaces are viable given the tightness of the hardstanding. Should all four spaces be occupied then it is clear that there will be great difficulty in manoeuvring any of the vehicles. County Highways have been consulted for their opinion on the viability of 4 spaces on the hardstanding, and the impact any overspill parking in the lay-by will have on safe access to and from the A27. It is their opinion that only three spaces are viable on-site whilst no objection is raised to overspill parking in the lay-by resultant of this application. There is no notable visibility issue at the point of access onto the A27 and so no objection is raised on this ground by the highway authority.
It is therefore considered that, whilst 3 spaces on-site is the maximum realistically possible, any overspill of parking in the lay-by will not create highway safety concerns. For this reason it is not considered reasonable to uphold the previous reason for refusal.

Recommendation

APPROVE for reason that :-

The development has not detracted from the existing local environment and has taken place without resulting in unacceptable detriment to the amenities of neighbouring properties and without detraction from highway safety. It consequently does not conflict with the relevant policies of the ADLP (AG1, AH7) and the WSSP 2001-2016 (LOC1, DEV1, DEV4-5).

Subject to:

made within one month of the date of this permission

1. Notwithstanding the details shown in the application, provision for the parking of three vehicles on-site shall be ~~retained~~ in accordance with revised details to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and such provision shall thereafter be used only for the parking of vehicles incidental to the use of the premises concerned.
   Reason: To ensure adequate provision for parking clear of the highway and to comply with policy DEV4-5 of the WSSP.

Case Officer:.....

Date: 11/11/08

PB 12/11/08