expires 12/4

Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: ADC/0033/10 **Recommendation – Permit Application**

Site: **9 Riverside Shoreham-by-Sea West Sussex BN43 5RU**

Proposal: **Widening of access to provide parking for 2 cars**

The Application

The application relates to a detached dwelling on the north side of Riverside. Like its neighbours the end gable of the dwelling is white rendered and faces the road with the front elevation facing east. There is pedestrian access from Riverside located between two attractive planted areas adjacent to the footway, but no vehicular access. The front (side) garden contains a timber shed and is enclosed by a wooden fence and trellis.

It is proposed to form a vehicular access to the property via Riverside and to create 2no. parking spaces. The spaces will be provided on the easternmost planted area which is to be resurfaced in brick paviors. The parking spaces will encroach into the garden which will necessitate the removal of the existing fence and the resiting of the garden shed. A new 1.8m high brick wall is to be erected as a replacement boundary feature. A road sign on the pavement is also to be re-sited.

To the east of the site is a parking/storage area for caravans. To the south on the opposite side of the road lies the entrance to Collingwood Court.

Consultations and Representations

Consultations/Comments

West Sussex County Council - The Transport Planning Officer states that it does appear that there is some parking (both on-street and in the lay-by) in the visibility splay, but this doesn't look overly restrictive or different to other situations.

The plans submitted show an access width of 6m, which would be adequate given the arrangements shown (with two side by side spaces backing out onto the road). The works on the highway must be agreed with the WSCC Local Engineer and carried out under licence. He also requires the driveway area and car parking spaces to be constructed in a bound material and that suitable drainage methods are installed to prevent private surface water running onto the public highway.

If the LPA are minded to approve this application, a condition securing the modifications to the existing access should be included.

Third Parties

1 letter of support received from the occupier of 8 Riverside who considers the proposal to be an excellent idea.

Relevant Planning Policies and Guidance

Adopted Adur District Local Plan 1993-2006 (ADC 1996) (saved policies): AG1, AH7
Appendix 11 'Supplementary Planning Guidance' comprising Development Control Standard No.3 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings'
PPG13 'Transport' (DTLR 2001)
PPS3 'Housing' (DCLG 2006)
Manual For Streets (DCLG 2007)

Planning Assessment

Policies

Policy AG1 of the Local Plan states that development within the built-up area of the District will be permitted provided that it does not detract from the existing local urban environment.

Policy AH7 states that extensions and alterations should be designed so as not to result in an unacceptable degree of overlooking, a loss of natural light or an overbearing effect on neighbouring dwellings. They should be of sympathetic design and materials to the original dwelling and the area in general. The proportion of the garden area taken up by a proposal should not be excessive.

Manual for Streets is expected to be used predominantly for the design, construction, adoption and maintenance of new residential streets, but it is also applicable to existing residential streets subject to re-design. It is directed to all those with a part to play in the planning, design, approval or adoption of new residential streets and modifications to existing residential streets.

The level of parking provision and its location has a key influence on the form and quality of a development and the choices people make in how they travel. The way cars are parked is a key factor for many issues such as visual quality street activity, interaction between residents and safety. Parking can be provided on or off the street. Off street parking includes parking within a

curtilage (on plot) or in off street parking areas (off plot.) Reduced on street parking can remove road safety problems and allow pedestrians to cross with adequate visibility.

PPG13 states that LPAs should give priority to people over ease of traffic movement and provide more road space to pedestrians, cyclists and public transport in town centres, local neighbourhoods and other areas with a mixture of land uses.

The Government places great emphasis on people being able to travel safely whatever their chosen mode. The planning system has a substantial influence on the safety of pedestrians, cyclists and occupants of vehicles through the design and layout of footpaths, cycleways and roads.

Planning History

In 1999 permission was refused for a detached garage with vehicular access and front boundary wall (SU/190/08). On that occasion, the wall was to have run along the majority of the roadside boundary, enclosing the planted areas and abutting the pavement. The garage would have been flat roofed and prominent in the street. The application was refused on grounds that it would be obtrusive, incongruous and out of keeping; there was inadequate visibility and there was insufficient hardstanding in front of the garage to enable a vehicle to park safely in front of the garage and off the footway.

In 2001 an application for a 1.85m high front boundary wall was refused (SU/215/00). As with the 1998 application, the wall would have run along the majority of the roadside boundary, enclosing the planted areas and abutting the pavement. It was refused for the reason that its excessive height would be out of keeping in scale and appearance with its surroundings.

Access and Parking

The parking area will measure 6.2m wide and 5.3m deep. No garage is proposed and there would be no structures likely to restrict visibility. The County Transport Planning Officer has no highway objection to the proposal. There is some parking (both on-street and in the lay-by) in the visibility splay to the west, but it is not considered that it would be particularly detrimental to highway safety or different to other similar situations.

The widened access is to be 6m wide which is wider than would normally be expected. There is already an existing wide crossover to the east which would be extended to incorporate the proposed access and it is not considered that the impact of the extended crossover would be unduly harmful.

Visual amenity and character

The proposal will result in the loss of a planted area which currently enhances the area and softens views of the site from the road. Its loss and replacement with hardstanding and parked cars will have some impact on the visual

amenities of the locality, as will the erection of a 1.8m high brick wall. However, the westernmost planted area will remain which will help to soften the impact of the development. Furthermore, there are examples of brick walls in the vicinity of the site, including on the adjacent caravan park, opposite at Collingwood Court and further along Riverside.

Unlike the previously refused applications, the proposed wall will be set back in line with the side elevation of the dwelling rather than abutting the footway which will reduce its prominence in the street scene. It is not considered that the development will result in harm to the visual amenities of the locality.

Residential amenity

The proposal will have no impact on the amenities of neighbouring dwellings. It will result in some loss of garden area, but this will not be excessive and will not adversely affect the overall quality of amenity space available to the occupiers.

Recommendation

APPROVE for reason that :-

1PPii

Subject to

1. C1Ci
2. C9Ei (amended) The extended access of 6 metres width onto Riverside shall be designed.....before the parking spaces hereby approved are first brought into use. Thereafter, such visibility.....
3. C12Ai (amended) a schedule and samples of materials to be used for the wall and hardstanding has AH7
4. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans, date stamped received 15 February 2010:
   Location Plan/Site Plan; Proposed Ground Floor Plan; Proposed Elevation
   Reason– For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning

Case Officer [redacted]

Date 19/3/10

[redacted]