Development Management – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/1385/16 Recommendation – APPROVE

Site: 39 South Street Lancing West Sussex

Proposal: Single storey extension to existing storage area to rear for existing carpet and flooring retail business.

Date of site visit: 1/11/16 (6 Ingleside Crescent) and 10/01/17 (39 South Street)

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Site, Surroundings and Proposal

The application relates to a semi- detached building which has been extended over time with various single storey rear additions. Prior to recent years since the site has been a flooring shop; planning records show that there was consent to change the use of the site from commercial car show room to domestic garaging, (L/28/01/TP.) This indicates its previous use as a commercial car show room. The current main commercial shopfront is accessed from South Street in close proximity to Lancing's main town centre. To the rear of the site there is access through the shop through the existing single storey rear addition to a small rear yard area, hard surfaced. There are walls on either side boundary and a retaining wall and fence to the rear boundary.

There is a timber merchant to the south with the adjacent rear yard used for the storage of materials. To the north the neighbouring building is divided into flats. To the east is the boundary with no. 6 Ingleside Crescent. There is a significant drop in ground level here with the site being significantly elevated above the adjacent residential property. The existing single storey extension at the application site is visible from the neighbouring garden. There is a retaining wall with fence above on the boundary.

Consent is sought to extend the existing premises further with an additional single storey extension. The applicant states that further storage is required at the site and this was apparent when carrying out the site visit as the shop floor was being used for storage of carpet rolls. The extension as originally proposed was an additional 4 metres from the existing flat roof addition the same height and width, at 3.3 metres high and 7.8 metres wide. Matching materials were proposed with uPVC shiplap cladding and corrugated PVC sheeting to the roof.

Following an objection from the occupiers of the bungalow to the rear of the site and a visit by the case officer it was considered that the proposals as originally submitted were unneighbourly and oppressive due to the scale of the building and its proximity to the boundary relative to the change in levels.

Amended plans were requested and received showing the roof of the extension altered to be limited to 2.2 metres high at the nearest point to the boundary and sloping up to maximum height of the existing extension. Clarification was also given as to the height of the existing boundary fence at the site. Due to variation in ground level the fence was at its lowest 1.9 metres increasing to 2.10 metres, (as checked on site by the case officer.) The plans showed the fence as 2 metres which in the circumstances is considered to be a correct representation.

Consultations: ***Adur and Worthing Councils: - Environmental Health: -*** Recommend that the Contaminated land full condition be attached to any consent granted.

Lancing Parish Council: - No objections

Representations: 1 letter of objection received from owners of 6 Ingleside Crescent. Original plans: - The impact on our property would be considerable and overwhelming as the structure would only be 3 away at its nearest point to the bungalow and from ground level it would power above us. The industrial materials used are detrimental and not in keeping with that of the area. The proposed structure would be an overdevelopment of the site and is too close to the party walls. Consideration should be given to more sympathetic construction materials to lessen the impact on the adjoining property. Photos are enclosed of unauthorised building work which took place at the side.

Amended Plans: - Concern regarding disposal of rainwater. The site is not level and how will this affect sight lines. Over development of the site, devalue property, the fencing should be replaced and increased in height, the cost of which could be shared.

Relevant Planning Policies

Saved Local Plan policies (ADC 1996): AG1, AE1. AE16
National Planning Policy Framework (CLG 2012)
Submission Adur Local Plan 2016 Policy 9 and 28
National Planning Practice Guidance
NPPF

The NPPF states that “The Government is committed to securing economic growth in order to create jobs and prosperity.”

Adur Local Plan 1996 Aim: -To protect and diversify the local economy and to promote the benefits of Adur District as a location for employers. An objective is to encourage retention of existing businesses and allow for their expansion. Also to meet the needs of existing businesses.

Small businesses provide an important contribution to local employment and services. There are many such businesses in the District located within primary residential areas. In such areas, it is considered important to have regard not only to the needs of such businesses, but also the amenity of nearby residents.

Policy AE16 – within the built up area the District Planning Authority will permit alterations or improvements of existing business premises which are required to improve the efficiency of the existing business, providing there are no significant adverse effects on the amenity of nearby residents.

The submission Adur Local Plan shows the site as being within a secondary shopping frontage which should promote and retain retail and commercial uses. Policies 9 and 28 support this. The loss of commercial uses within this area would be resisted and therefore the principle of this proposal to support such a business would be supported.

Planning Assessment

There is no objection in principle to the proposed extension which would provide a needed storage facility at a currently, apparently thriving local flooring business. When visiting the site it was clear that additional storage space was required with deliveries being stored within the shop floor area.

The main issues for consideration here are how the works will impact upon the residential amenities of the occupiers of the adjacent dwellings with regards to loss of light, loss of privacy and overbearing impact. Also how the proposal will impact upon the visual amenities of the locality.

Visual Amenity

The proposed extension is to the rear of the building yet due to the change in levels there may be glimpses of the extension visible to the side of no. 6 Ingleside Crescent within the street scene. Any views are not considered to be significant and the amended plans show a reduction in height of the extension. Any possible view would be insignificant and not detrimental in this case.

Residential Amenity

As stated above the main property to be affected in this case is the bungalow to the east due to the significant change in levels and shallow depth of this part of the garden area. There is however an additional garden area to the south of the bungalow which would be unaffected by the proposal as amended. The application site is a commercial property and with its history as a commercial car sales has been as such for some time. The nature of its current use being a carpet business does not give rise to noise or disturbance to significant detriment to neighbouring properties, bearing in mind that the land use here is known to have been commercial for some time, no recent change has occurred. The proposed extension to provide storage is not considered to result in any additional noise or disturbance, it would be making use of an external yard area which currently appears unused.

The structure itself as amended will result in an improved impact here with the roof significantly reduced in height at a distance of a minimum of 1.1 metres from the rear boundary. Although there may be some glimpses of the extension from the garden area below any views of the extension would not result in significant loss of light or overbearing impact that would warrant a refusal in this case. A condition is attached

to ensure that the fence or any replacement fence shall remain at a height of 2 metres to ensure that screening remains. No doors or windows are shown in the proposed structure with internal access to the storage space only. A condition is also attached to ensure that this remains the case.

To the north of the site the building has been converted into flats. There is a building to the rear of the site at no. 37 which is referred to as 37A. Due to the existing commercial nature of the site, the distance from the boundary of the site of this building and there being no windows in the side elevation of the extension it is not considered that the extension would have such a detrimental impact upon this adjacent, apparently residential building to warrant a refusal in this case. There is also a large evergreen shrub adjacent to the boundary at no. 37 that offers some screening.

Contaminated Land

The Environmental Health officer has recommended that the full contaminated land condition be attached. Due to the modest scale of this development and its location within the 10 metre buffer rather than land specifically identified as potentially contaminated, it is considered a more proportionate response to the risk posed in this case would be to attach an informative. This highlights the responsibilities of the developer and procedure should any potential contaminants be detected during construction.

Recommendation

APPROVE

1. Standard time limit
2. Materials to match existing extension.
3. No external openings internal access only
4. Fence shall remain in place at all times and shall be 2 metres in height measured from the adjacent ground level within the site.
5. The extension hereby permitted shall be used for the storage of carpets/flooring and ancillary materials in relation to the flooring retail unit currently trading at 39 South Street Lancing only. The extension shall not be used for any other use at any time.

Informative

1. Contaminated land.
3. Pro active

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

Case Officer: Hannah Barker Date: 6th February 2017

Authorised by: Jo Morin Date: 07.02.2017