Development Management - Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/1837/15 Recommendation – Approve

Site: **Two storey side extension and roof conversion to extend 2 existing flats and provide covered cycle store and one parking space along with reorganisation of existing parking area to provide amenity area for flats**

Proposal: **Dovecote Mews, Chanctonbury Drive, Shoreham-By-Sea**

Date of site visit: 26 February 2016

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

This application is seeking permission for a development that was originally approved in 2008 (ADC/0274/08) for an extension to the existing flats at Dovecote Mews. The property comprises a part 2 storey/part single storey building originally built as a shop in 1981 with a 3 bedroom flat above. Permission was granted in 2000 to convert it into 5no. 1 bedroom flats (SU/153/00). There is a small parking area at the rear of the building with access from both Chanctonbury Drive and The Lynchetts.

Permission was refused and subsequently dismissed on appeal for a 2 storey extension on the south side of the building and rooms in the roof of the single storey element fronting Chanctonbury Drive, to form 2 x one bedroom flats, 2 x two bedroom flats and a two bedroom house (ADC/0276/06). In his decision letter, the Planning Inspector concluded that while “neither the character and appearance of the surrounding area nor the living conditions of the occupants of neighbouring dwellings would be compromised…the private amenity space proposed would not be sufficient, in my view, for the needs of the likely occupants of the enlarged units, an issue which would be exacerbated by the limitations of the proposed parking provision and uncertainties over possible means to resolve these.”

This application is for a similar proposal but has been amended from the appeal scheme in order to overcome the Inspector’s objections. The two storey side extension measures 3.7m by 6.75m and is to provide increased living accommodation for flat 4 on the first floor with a communal cycle store and covered parking bay for ground floor flat 2.

The single storey part is to be extended from a hip to a gable roof with a rear (south) facing dormer window, in order to increase accommodation for flat 1. The existing rear parking courtyard is to be largely removed and replaced with a grassed amenity area for all the flats. One parking space will remain within the courtyard, accessed from Chanctonbury Drive, with two further spaces provided on a small piece of overgrown land to the east of the building. The proposal will maintain 5 x 1 bedroom flats on the site.

Relevant site history

As above plus AWDM/0436/11 - Application for renewal of unimplemented permission ADC/0274/08 (for two-storey side extension and roof conversion to extend 2 existing flats and provide covered cycle store and one parking space along with reorganisation of existing parking to provide amenity area) – expired October 2014

Consultations

West Sussex County Council: The **Highway** Officer has no objection. This latest application is proposing the same parking layout as previously agreed, which will now provide a turn on site facility that was not previously available. This is an improvement on the existing situation. The planning application will also now provide for cycle storage for the flats. There are no changes to access arrangements other than a turn on site facility is now available. With this in mind the LHA are satisfied that safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved: therefore the proposed development accords with paragraph 32 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). Condition vehicle parking/turning and cycle parking.

Adur & Worthing Councils: The **Environmental Health** Officer advises that the only means of escape in the case of fire from the first floor bedroom of flat 1 is through another habitable room (i.e. the ground floor living room) and the bedroom is therefore an inner room. This is likely to be an actionable hazard under the Housing Act 2004 and therefore we would object.

Southern Water: Request informative advising applicant to contact them

Representations

4 letters of objection received from the owners/occupiers of 10, 19, 22, 23 Normanscourt :

- Increased noise and disturbance
- Loss of privacy
- Loss of light
- Overdevelopment
- Overbearing
- Limit use of parking space immediately adjacent to the development
- Party Wall Agreement required

Relevant Planning Policies

Adur District Local Plan 1993-2006 (ADC 1996) (saved policies): AG1, AG3, AH2-3, AH5 and Appendix 11 ‘Supplementary Planning Guidance’ comprising:- Development Control Standard No.2 ‘Space Around New Dwellings and Flats’
National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012)

Planning Assessment

Principle

The site is located within a residential part of the built-up area of Shoreham and there is no objection in principle to such development. The application is the resubmission of a previously approved scheme and, unless there has been a material change in circumstances on the site or in policy since 2008, permission would normally be expected to be granted.

Since 2008 the NPPF has been published but this gives greater encouragement to sustainable development.

Visual Amenity and Character

The proposed 2 storey extension would project as far as the southern boundary of the site, beyond which is a large car park. The Inspector did not consider that this element was contrary to the aims of Policy AH7 as the relative isolation of the site meant that the extension would not appear cramped in the wider context or out of character with the area.

The provision of an amenity area at the rear of the building will improve the appearance of this area, which is currently a tarmac hardstanding. The introduction of grass and paving will provide a small outdoor space for the occupants of the flats measuring approximately 30sqm. While this is below the standard referred to in the Council's SPG, it is an improvement on what currently exists and no objection is raised to this part of the application. The area is considered to be acceptable for one bedroom flats and overcomes objections to the appeal scheme which proposed a small amenity area on the land to the east, separated from the building by a parking area and wall. This was also considered to be unacceptable since three of the flats were to have two bedrooms and be likely to be occupied by small families. As there is to be no change to the size of the existing units, the provision of a small amenity area as proposed, immediately adjacent to the flats, is now acceptable.

The loss of the area of vegetation to the east of the building and its use for parking 2 cars is not considered to detract from the visual amenities of the street at this point. The current piece of ground is unsightly and has little amenity value. New planting is to be provided around the spaces to help soften their appearance and it is considered that the benefits to be gained in terms of the provision of usable parking and turning spaces, outweighs any objection to the loss of the vegetation.

Residential amenity

Neither the proposed 2 storey extension nor the alterations to the single storey part of the building would, in the opinion of the Inspector, cause significant harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of the properties in Downsway to the east (Normanscourt). He acknowledged that new windows on the eastern elevation of the two storey extension and the dormer on the southern roofslope of the single storey building would result in some overlooking of the back gardens of those properties in Downsway. However, he concluded that "the distances involved and the existing window layout of

the appeal property cause me to consider that there would be only minimal, additional material harm" to residential amenity.

The formation of a parking area on the north side of the rear garden of 23 Normanscourt is not considered to result in serious disturbance or a loss of enjoyment of the garden for the occupiers of that property. It is screened from the garden by a boundary fence and the level of usage is not considered to be significant. Noise from the traffic using Chanctonbury Drive is likely to cause greater disturbance at a more regular frequency.

The objection raised by Environmental Health regarding the internal layout is noted. However, it is considered that the matter of means of escape will be dealt with under the Building Regulations. The layout is unchanged from that previously approved.

Parking and Access

There are currently five parking spaces associated with the existing building. However, these are not marked out and this leads to an informal and unsatisfactory parking arrangement. The application as previously approved was to provide four spaces only (one as part of the new extension on the southern boundary and three to the east of the building) together with on site turning. A secure cycle store is also to be provided as part of the development.

The Highway Authority is satisfied with the parking and turning provision, which is an improvement on the existing arrangement, and has raised no objection to the application.

The issue of access to neighbouring parking spaces is a civil matter and not a relevant planning consideration.

Conclusion

It is considered that the current application, as in 2008, overcomes the Inspector's concerns with the 2006 scheme and will result in a development which will not harm the character of the area or residential amenity and will provide an improved amenity and parking area for residents.

Recommendation

APPROVE

Subject to Conditions:-

1. Standard 3 year time limit
2. Parking, turning and cycle spaces to be provided
3. Temporary parking and storage of materials
4. Landscaping
5. Materials to match existing dwelling
6. Permission relates to approved plans

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

The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by assessing the proposal against all material considerations, including planning policies and any representations that may have been received and subsequently determining to grant planning permission in accordance with the presumption in favour of sustainable development, as set out within the National Planning Policy Framework.

Case Officer: Peter Barnett Date: 4 March 2016

Authorised by: Gary Peck Date: 4 March 2016