DELEGATED APPLICATIONS

ASSESSMENT SHEET

APPLICATION NO./ADDRESS:

WB/08/0506/FULL 73 Reigate Road

DATE OF SITE VISIT: NEIGHBOURS CHECKED: Y

27 May 2008

ADDITIONAL NEIGHBOUR NOTIFICATIONS (LIST ADDRESSES):

None.

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS:

The proposal concerns a semi-detached dwelling with a hipped roof, bay front, pitched roof porch and simple timber detailing at first floor level, which is finished in painted render. The street is residential and the west side is characterised by semi-detached homes which follow an established building line and have similar form and design.

The adjoining properties, Nos. 71 and 75 Reigate Road, have existing off-street parking and vehicular accesses.

There is no planning history for No. 75, but No. 71 was approved in 2005 (WB/04/01345/FULL refers).

Permission is sought to create a 3.0m wide vehicular crossover centred on the front garden and to lay hardstanding for the parking of two vehicles. Planted borders are proposed on either side of the parking area and, although only a site plan has been submitted, the drawings indicate 1m sections of boundary wall to remain on each side of the crossover.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY:

None.

DESIGN AND ACCESS STATEMENT

None.

RELEVANT PLANNING POLICIES:

Saved Policies BE1 and H16 of the Worthing Local Plan 2003; Saved Policies CH1 and DEV1 of the Saved West Sussex Structure Plan 2001-2016; Parking Standards & Transport Contributions - Supplementary Planning Guidance:

2005; PPS1 - Delivering Sustainable Development (2005); and PPS25: Development and flood risk (2006).

REPRESENTATIONS AND RELEVANT CONSULTATION RESPONSES:

The **Principal Engineer**, having commented on similar proposals recently (see 07/1251/FULL - GFF 22 Eton Road; 08/0053 = FFF 25 Valencia Road for examples), would not wish to raise an objection subject to satisfactory drainage of surface water, preferably natural drainage.

The **Highway Authority** raises no objection. Comments of the **Highway Authority** at the time of determining the neighbour's crossover, WB/04/01345/FULL, were as follows:-

> *Adequate visibility is achievable, but 1m x 1m pedestrian splays are required on each side. In order to achieve these splays, the access should be 3m wide and centrally located.*
>
> *A number of other accesses already exist in Reigate Road without the benefit of turning.*
>
> *Therefore, no highway objection. Impose:*
>
> *WC6A Access*
>
> *WC6F Drainage*
>
> *WC6G (1) Pedestrian Splays (1m x 1m)*
>
> *WI14A Pavement Crossing*

HUMAN RIGHTS:

Article 8 (Right to Respect of a Private and Family Life) and Article 1 of the First Protocol (Protection of Property) of the Human Rights Act 1998 are relevant to this application. It is accepted that the proposal, if approved, would have some impact on the neighbouring properties. However, it is considered that on balance, existing residential quality of life would not be significantly adversely affected as a result of the proposal. Accordingly it is considered that it is acceptable with regard to Article 8 and Article 1.

PLANNING ASSESSMENT:

The low front boundary walls to the semi-detached properties would have originally added much to the character and appearance of the area, and given home owners defensible space by clearly marking the boundaries between private and public space.

Long stretches of these walls have now been lost in parts of Reigate Road - invariably to facilitate off-street parking, which in itself seeks to privatise public parking spaces in that on-street parking is reduced as a result.

Nos. 69 and 71 Reigate Road now have almost entirely open frontages with very short remaining sections of fence or boundary wall. There is no doubt that such development has a negative impact upon visual amenity and the setting of these semi-detached dwellings. The crossover to No. 71 was granted conditional consent in 2005 (WB/04/01345/FULL).

Retaining a slightly longer stretch of crenellated boundary wall is the access and off-street parking area for No. 75 Reigate Road, for which there is no planning history.

In view of the precedents set nearby and in the absence of a highway objection, the principle of creating a crossover and off-street parking is acceptable but the proposal should be seen as an opportunity to carry out a higher standard of development than previously carried out at adjoining properties.

The block paving proposed should be porous to allow for natural drainage and the planted beds are welcome as they would soften the otherwise hard edged appearance of the forecourt and help retain some greenery and an appearance more usually associated with front gardens to ensure at least some of the intrinsic character of this street is preserved.

A condition should be imposed requiring sections of crenellated front boundary wall to be retained on either side of the proposed vehicular access.

Having regard to existing highway conditions, it is noted that the increase in the amount of off-street parking facilities to houses in the area has resulted in a significant reduction of on-street parking availability.

PPS25: Development and flood risk

The following are relevant excerpts from national planning policy statement 25 which are relevant to the proposal. PPS25 seeks in part to ensure increases in flood risk usually brought about by new development is reduced through design and incorporation of sustainable (urban) drainage systems [SUDS] and that new development uses opportunities to reduce the causes and impacts of flooding by making the most of green infrastructure, e.g. planting, to increase flood storage capacity and promote natural drainage.

Excerpts from Annex F:-

Drainage Systems

F2.

> *Undeveloped sites generally rely on natural drainage to convey or absorb rainfall, the water either soaking into the ground or flowing across the surface into watercourses, providing a natural flow of environmental and ecological benefit. Sites currently or previously used for agricultural purposes may additionally have systems of*

underground drainage pipes as well as open ditches and watercourses.

The Effect of Development

F3.

The effect of development is generally to reduce the permeability of at least part of the site. This markedly changes the site's response to rainfall.Without specific measures, the volume of water that runs off the site and the peak run-off flow rate is likely to increase. Inadequate surface water drainage arrangements in new development can threaten the development itself and increase the risk of flooding to others.

F4.

To satisfactorily manage flood risk in new development, appropriate surface water drainage arrangements are required, to manage surface water and the impact of the natural water cycle on people and property.

F5.

The effective disposal of surface water from development is a material planning consideration in determining proposals for the development and use of land. It will always be much more effective to manage surface water flooding at and from new development early in the land acquisition and design process rather than to resolve problems after development.

RECOMMENDATION:

~~Refuse.~~ Approve.

1. C1ARev.
2. Retain boundary wall on either side of access.
3. 1m x 1m pedestrian splays.
4. Access.
5. Porous hard surfacing materials/drainage.
6. C8A - Landscaping (i.e. details of planted borders).

Informative WI14A.

REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION:

The proposal accords with the Development Plan.

IS RECOMMENDATION CONTRARY TO LETTER (S) OF REPRESENTATION? No.

DELEGATED

Case Officer sign..... [redacted] ....Date....4/7/08.....

Authorising sign..... [redacted] ..Date....7/7/08.....





27/5/08



