Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: **Recommendation – APPROVE**
AWDM/1656/16

Site: **78c Brighton Road, Lancing**

Proposal: **The installation of roller shutter garage door to provide storage at ground floor. (Variation of conditions 3 and 5 of previously approved L/44/04/TP to allow the parking facilities to be used as storage)**

Neighbours checked: Y
Additional neighbour notifications: N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

The proposal is for the installation of a roller shutter garage door and to use the space behind as domestic storage.

The application property is an end of terrace two-and-half storey townhouse in an outer suburb of Lancing, residential in character.

Relevant Planning History
L/44/04/TP
Demolition of existing dwelling and erection of 3 'townhouses' (three storeys high with garages on ground floor (resubmission of L/40/03/TP)
Approved Conditionally 04-05-2004

Consultations (summarised)

Environment Agency: No objection

Lancing Parish Council: Not received

West Sussex County Council Highway Authority*: The previously approved parking provision had been designed so that a vehicle could park clear of the public highway using the ground floor car port provision. After assessing the photographic evidence provided this is only possible with the rear of the vehicle protruding outside the line of the built structure. Critically the area of hardstanding (circa 1.0 metres in extent) abutting the northern elevation of the building is not considered to be publically maintained highway. Based on the evidence provided The Local Highways Authority would have to consider that 78C, Brighton Road will not be provided an off street car parking provision. Given the sustainable nature of the site and existing highway markings prohibiting unsafe parking the highways authority would not be able to substantiate this would result in a 'severe' highway safety issue. It is not intended that a vehicle would park in the resultant space, though I would note a small city vehicle may be able to. Such a vehicle would have appropriate space to wait clear of Brighton Road*

while the door is opened. In conclusion the LHA does not consider that the proposal would have 'severe' impact on the operation of the highway network, therefore is not contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework (paragraph 32), and that there are no transport grounds to resist the proposal.

Adur & Worthing Councils Engineers 1st Consultation: *The site lies in Flood zone 3 and will have had open parking as part of the approval for construction. The other two garage areas in the block serving 78A and 78B are both currently open, whilst several in South Bank Court are provided with doors. The reason for the door would be security for storage and from that point of view I would have no issues, but there is a risk that "behind closed doors" other works could take place to allow habitation of the ground floor. Looking closely at the site the property is not constructed as the plan provided shows, I don't think that change of use is likely as the roller needs to be opened for access to the front door, which is not separated as shown on the plan. Provided it is not possible to close just the garage area off securely then I have no objections.*

Adur & Worthing Councils Engineers 2nd Consultation: *The site lies in Flood zone 3 and will have had open parking as part of the approval for construction. The other two garage areas in the block serving 78A and 78B, are both currently open, whilst several in South Bank Court are provided with doors. Providing you condition it such that the closed off space is used only for storage and not accommodation I have no issues with the proposal.*

Representations
None

Relevant Planning Policies and Guidance
National Planning Policy Framework
Saved Adur Local Plan policies: AG1, AH7
Adur Local Plan 2016 (Submission) Policies: 1, 15, 29, 37

Planning Assessment

Principle

Upgrading of residential accommodation is acceptable in principle.

Visual amenity

The town houses were intentionally designed with open undercrofts for parking. Having one of the three town houses with its undercroft closed off would unbalance its appearance somewhat but the overall architectural integrity of the terrace would not be significantly undermined.

The garage door is itself of sympathetic design to the rest of the terrace.

Residential amenity

The enclosure of the undercroft would not have adverse impact on the living conditions of neighbours. The transfer of noise if this space were put to domestic storage would be domestic in nature.

Flood Risk

The site lies in Zone 3a. This is the highest category of flood risk. However, the under-croft offers no potential capacity for water storage in the event of flooding and enclosure of it would not impinge flood water flow (its sides and rear of it already provides a barrier).

Its Zone 3 location meant residential habitable space was not provided in the terrace at ground floor. This will still be the case as the enclosure space would be used for only storage. No greater human health would be put at risk by this proposal.

Parking and Vehicular access

The town houses were intentionally designed with parking at ground floor because there is no space to provide it otherwise on the site. However, as the Highway Authority notes, a typically sized vehicle cannot entirely fit within the undercroft parking space.

As the Highway Authority also notes, there is capacity for parking on-street to accommodate the parking demand displaced by the loss of the parking undercroft.

Accordingly, the Highway Authority does not believe the proposal to result in a highway safety concern. The Local Planning Authority agrees.

Recommendation

APPROVE

Subject to the following conditions:-

1. Approved Plans
2. Standard time limit
3. Incidental domestic storage at ground floor only

Informative

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.

Is recommendation contrary to any representations? N/A

Case Officer signed: Matthew Porter Date: 6 January 2017

Authorised and signed by: Peter Barnett Date: 6 January 2017