Expires 27.9.07

Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: ADC/0448/07 **Recommendation - REFUSE**

Site: **185 Brighton Road Lancing West Sussex BN15 8JB**

Proposal: **Division of existing 4-bed chalet bungalow into two separate semi-detached dwellings (1 x 3 bed and 1 x 2 bed) including infill rear extension and roof extensions**

The Application

The application property is a detached hipped roof bungalow on the north side of the A259 Brighton Road. The application site is the corner plot on the west of the junction with Kings Road, set back from the Brighton Road by a 10m verge and pathway.

The property has been extended previously out to the east side with an attached flat roof garage (L/74/80) which was subsequently converted into a habitable room with the addition of another single storey extension with dummy pitch roof (L/105/87).

The proposal is for the extension of the original house with a part-hipped gable roof, the addition of a part-hipped gable roof above the existing side extensions, with front dormer and rooms in the roof, infill extension at the front, and subdivision of the property into two dwellings.

The property is surrounded by two-storey houses, to the west No.183 is located 1 metre away, and to the north is a house which fronts onto Kings Road. On the south side of Brighton Road are large detached houses well set back from the road.

Consultations and Representations

Third Parties

There have been no third party objections to the proposals.

Contributors

WSCC Highways – Feel that the applicant fails to show adequate access, parking and turning arrangements for both sites. As such, a highway objection is raised for the following reasons:

1. 1BR
2. 7AR
3. 8R

Environment Agency – Have assessed the application as having a low environmental risk and have no objections.

Environmental Health Officer – No comments.

Lancing Parish Council – No comments received.

Relevant Planning Policies and Guidance

Adopted West Sussex Structure Plan 2001-16 (WSCC 2005): LOC1, CH1, NE1-2, ERA1,DEV1, DEV3-5.
Adopted Adur District Local Plan 1993-2006 (ADC 1996): AG1, AH1-2, AH5, AT12 and Appendix II 'Suplementary Planning Guidance' comprising Development Control Standard No.2 'Space Around New dwellings and Flats'.
Adur Local Plan – Submission Core Strategy 2006-26(ADC 2007): H1, H3, STC2, T3-4, ENV4, ENV10.
PPS1 'Delivering Sustainable Development' (ODPM 2005)
PPS3 ' Housing' (DCLG 2006)
PPG13 'Transport' (DTLR 2001)

Planning Assessment

The application site is within the residential part of the built up area of Lancing. The proposal constitutes 'infilling' as provided for in both Structure and Local Plan policies. There is no objection in principle to infill development within the built-up area and, in order to meet the housing requirements of the approved Structure Plan and Local Plan, a significant proportion of housing development by way of 'unidentified' small infill sites is necessary.

Structure Plan policies give significant weight to making the best use of land through higher density development provided that the impact on the character of the area and environment is acceptable (LOC1, ERA1, CH1) and subject to policy DEV1 requiring high quality development. Policy DEV4 states (amongst other things) that development should not be permitted unless the travel needs it generates are met. DEV5 states that "Development should not be permitted unless the level of parking is compatible with the need to avoid environmental or safety problems and the need is to encourage walking, cycling and the use of passenger transport where this is or can be a realistic alternative".

Local Plan 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 guidance PPS3 encourages best use of urban land for housing at higher densities and without rigid application of parking and amenity space standards.

Policy H3 of the Submission Core Strategy sets a minimum density of 35 dwellings per hectare, but states that lower densities will be acceptable if they fit in with the unique character of the area. All new homes will need to be designed to 'lifetime homes' standards. Policy ENV4 states that all new development will be required, at the very least, to meet BREEAM standard 'Very Good' or equivalent.

Visual amenity.

The proposed infill extension to the front of the existing side extension would be in line with the existing front elevation of the building. The proposed roof addition over the infill and existing extensions would be sympathetic to the roof form of the original building and would help to integrate the extensions at the side more naturally into the original building. The proposed front dormer is modest in size and would not dominate the roof or appear overbearing in scale. The proposed alterations would serve to improve the balance of the building as a whole.

In terms of visual amenity of the area the site is quite open to the SE with no adjacent neighbours and the proposed infill extension and roof addition would not appear too cramped. The proposed hip to part-hipped roof detail to the west side of the existing house would be approximately 1 metre from the flank wall of the neighbouring house and would impact on how the extended dwelling sits within the site and its relationship to the adjacent dwelling. Whilst it would feel more cramped it is considered that on balance it would not be so much worse that currently exists and therefore it does not warrant a reason for refusal.

Residential amenity.

The close proximity of the proposed roof extension on the west side of the original property would block an amount of light from the east facing window in the side of the adjacent house (No.183). This sill level is currently above the eaves of the existing property and the proposed extension would raise the height by 1.0m. The window is obscurely glazed and it is unknown what room the window serves. There has been no objection made by the occupier of No.183 and it is considered that although there will be a loss of light there would be no impact on the outlook.

The proposed extension would not have an effect on the privacy of the property to the north in Kings Road (No.1). The proposed roof light in the north side roof over the existing extension would serve a bathroom. There would be no other alterations to the rear of the property that would have an effect on the privacy or neighbouring properties.

The proposed subdivision would result in their being 1 three bedroom dwelling occupying the western half and a two-bedroom dwelling occupying the eastern half. The new two-bedroom dwelling would have the two bedrooms in

the roof space and whilst the footprint of these rooms are of a standard size it is considered that due to the slope of the ceiling the rooms themselves would have limited headroom over a large proportion of their area, and therefore not be of a standard that would create a pleasant place in which to live contrary to policy AH2 of the Local Plan.

The outside amenity space of the two dwellings would be small for the size of properties they would serve, but at 40 sqm and 50 sqm respectively for the west and east properties they are in line with some of the other properties to the west in Brighton Road and are therefore considered acceptable.

Highway safety.

The proposed extension and sub-division of the dwelling would result in a more intensive use and more of a demand for on on-site parking. Currently the dwelling has no front boundary, with the whole front garden area being hardstanding. The property is set back from the road by a large grass verge separating the corner plot from the busy A259 Brighton Road, it is currently served by one cross over point to the east side of the site, which is shown would serve the eastern half of the two properties. Currently the lack of boundary wall allows for the verge in front of the property to be used as a turning area free of the highway.

Given the location of the property and the lack of availability of on-street parking in and around the site, WSCC Highways felt in their pre-application advice that two parking spaces should be given for each of the proposed dwellings, with the provision for on-site turning if the accesses were to be onto the A259.

As existing the site hardstanding can be used by two cars parked sideways , but whether there would be onsite turning for these it is difficult to say. It is apparent from the site visit that access to the site is gained from using the access and crossover from No.183 which is located to the west.

The proposals allow for the recommended level of parking for the western property but only one space for the eastern new dwelling. These spaces all require alterations being made to the highway to allow for the turning which is required so that vehicles can safely leave in a forward gear which is considered to be unacceptable, and contrary to highway safety.

Recommendation

REFUSE for reason that :-

1. 1BR

   The increased use of the existing access to the public highway would add to the hazards of highway users to an unacceptable degree, contrary to the policies of the West Sussex Structure Plan (DEV4) and the Adur District Local Plan (AT12).

2. 7AR

   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 result in standing vehicles which would interrupt the free flow of traffic on the public highway and add to the hazards of highway users, contrary to the policies of the West Sussex Structure Plan (DEV4-5) and the Adur District Local Plan (AT12).

3. 8R

   The proposal would be detrimental to highway safety in that it does not provide for adequate facilities to enable vehicles to turn on the site and so enter and leave the highway in forward gear, contrary to the policies of the West Sussex Structure Plan (DEV4-5) and the Adur District Local Plan (AT12).

4. H16R – amended.

   Having regard to the limited size and type of property involved, the proposed new east side dwelling is unlikely to obtain a satisfactory standard of residential amenity for the occupiers, and a potential car parking problem incapable of solution within the limits of the site and the proposal would therefore be detrimental to the residential environment of the locality, contrary to the policies of the West Sussex Structure Plan (CH1,DEV1) and the Adur District Local Plan (AG1, AH9).

Case Officer: [signature]
Date: 04.09.07 CJ 4.9.07