Application Number: AWDM/0026/12 **Recommendation – APPROVE**

Site: Car Park, Ship Street Shoreham by Sea BN43 5DU

Proposal: **Proposed residential development comprising 4 x three bedroom terraced town houses**

Applicant: Mr Bruce Williams Ward: Shoreham
Case Officer: Matthew Porter

Not to Scale Reproduced fro OS Mapping with the permission of HMSO © Crown Copyright Licence number LA100024321

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

This application seeks full planning permission for a terrace of 4 three-bedroom townhouses with integral garages. This application follows planning approval in August 2008 for 4 townhouses (ADC/0318/08 refers), in line with the Shoreham Renaissance Strategy (ADC 2006), to discontinue the use of the site as a public car park.

The site is presently redundant and enclosed by hoarding. It is bounded to the rear (west) and south side by a flint wall. Within this wall are two gates giving pedestrian access to the rear gardens of No. 14 Ship Street to the south and No. 14 West Street to the west. No. 14 Ship Street is a two-storey end of terrace house which abuts the southern boundary of the site and the back of the pavement. To the rear of the site are the back gardens of houses at Nos. 12, 14, and 16 West Street which are grade II Listed Buildings. To the north of the site is a 3-storey purpose-built flat building, White Lion Court, separated from the application site by a vehicular access way leading to a covered parking area to the rear of the flats.

The previous planning approval is for 4 no. 3-bedroom terrace houses with 4 car parking spaces at the rear of the site. Owing to the road alignment, the front building line is staggered with the two northernmost houses set 1 metre further back into the site than the other two units. The approved dwellings are 2-storeys in height with rooms in the roof served by front and rear dormers within a large pitched and gabled roof. Unusually, the entrances to the houses are at the rear, accessed via the rear parking area.

The impetus behind the current proposals has been to improve the layout and design quality of the approved scheme by introducing front doors within the front elevations, so that the dwellings ‘address’ the street; incorporating integral garaging accessed from the street (rather than from the rear) resulting in larger areas of private rear garden serving each of the dwellings; and to provide larger living spaces in compliance with the Council’s Internal Space Standards for New Homes. The scale of the latest proposal is comparable to the previously approved development. The proposed terrace is 1.5 metres wider at 19.2 metres (compared to 17.7 metres previously) and the footprint

extends deeper into the plot than the approved scheme, but the overall ridge height is some 1 metre lower.

Relevant Planning History

ADC/0318/08
4 three-bedroom townhouses with 4 parking spaces at rear (application for full permission with revised layout)
Granted Consent 07/08/2008

Consultations

West Sussex County Council:

*The **Archaeologist** recommends further information is required to assess the development impact. Information on depths of building and infrastructure excavations in relation to buried archaeological features proven to exist in connection with previously approved scheme ADC/0318/08.*

*The **Highway Authority** raised no objection to ADC/318/08. Although no on site turning would be available in connection with the latest proposal and visibility for exiting the undercroft parking would be restricted, no objection has been raised from a highway safety perspective. It is noted that there are already existing accesses, particularly on the east side of the street, that share this style of restricted-visibility access. With this is mind and considering the road is one-way it would be difficult to argue the proposed under-croft garage would be of detriment to highway safety. Latest accident records reveal no personal injury accidents along Ship Road or in vicinity of proposed access points.*

The plans show 'Green oak' bollards placed to separate the pedestrian entrances from the vehicle accesses. The bollards must not encroach on land designated as highway. No concerns are raised from a highway safety perspective providing these bollards are not placed in highway land and are no larger than 0.6 metres.

The site already has consent (ADC/0318/08) for a similar development with the same quantity of car parking provision as the proposed. However, the Highway Authority has introduced a new approach to parking within residential developments (in 2010) based on an assessment of parking demand. It is expected the development would create demand for 6 parking spaces and so the proposed 4 spaces would fall below this level. The applicant has submitted a car parking capacity survey which demonstrates that neighbouring dwellings in the area typically only have 1 parking space. Consideration should also be given to the sustainability of area and the availability of alternative methods of transport. The site is located in central Shoreham and is within walking distance of bus stops and Shoreham railway station. Consequently it is not considered that the failure to meet the latest car parking standards would be of detriment to highway safety.

The garages meet the recommend size, providing the scope for cycle parking if required, although specific provision for cycle parking is also included in the rear gardens. This should be secured by a condition of planning permission.

Although this development of 4 dwellings is above the Adur threshold for Total Access Demand (TAD) contributions, no contributions are sought in this instance owing to the previous use of the site as a car park.

Adur & Worthing Councils:

*The **Environmental Health** officer has no adverse environmental comments on this application other than requesting a precautionary condition concerning the possibility of contamination.*

Representations

5 letters/emails of objection have been received from residents of 'Ramshackle Cottage' (No. 14 West Street), 'Cobbles' (No. 16 West Street), No. 17 John Street, No. 2 St Johns Court, and No 3 Lakeside, Brighton Road, Lancing, raising the following concerns (which have been summarized):-

- *There is no justification for building houses. Shoreham is getting too built-up with buildings erected in any spare bit of ground. It is losing its charm. The development will block views of Ropetackle from an upstairs window that currently gives a feeling of space;*
- *The town is short of car parking and yet this car park was closed over a year ago. A car park is more vital to this area. The nearby Middle Street car park is often unavailable because it is full;*
- *The development of four houses would mean ten more cars into town centre and parked on highway in narrow streets exacerbating parking difficulties and congestion. This very narrow section of street suffers from on-street parking restricting access to existing parking spaces and limiting access for emergence vehicles. There should be double yellow line markings on both sides of road. Garages are often used for storage rather than parking, car ports are suggested instead. Garage should be large enough for vehicle, cycle and other storage;*
- *Restrictions on noise, dust, road-cleaning, traffic and hours of operation should be in place to limit the impact of construction works on neighbours;*
- *The terrace building is too high and will take away light from the rear of 17 John Street. Already overlooked by nearby flats.*
- *The dormer windows will overlook gardens and properties in West Street causing a severe loss of privacy; roof light windows would be more acceptable;*
- *Although the materials and elevation treatment complement with the area very well, the drawings play down the scale and massing of the mansard roof. Due consideration should be given to the proposed scale and massing of the development on adjacent period properties.*

Relevant Planning Policies and Guidance

South East Plan (GOSE 2009): SP3, SP4, CC1, CC3, CC4, CC6, CC7, CC9, H1, H2, H4, H5, H6, T4, NRM10, W1, W2, BE1, BE6, SCT1, SCT5,
Adur District Local Plan 1993-2006 (ADC 1996) (saved policies): AG1, AB1, AB3, AB4, AH2, AH5, AB15, AB25, AB26, AB27, and AT6 and Appendix II 'Supplementary Planning Guidance' comprising Development Control Standard No.2 "Space Around New Dwellings and Flats"
'A Strategy for Shoreham Renaissance' (ADC 2006)
Adur District Council Good Practice Guidance Note 'Internal Space Standards for New Homes' (2010)

Planning Assessment

Principle and density

The above policies encourage appropriate redevelopment and infilling of urban land to help meet the demand for housing.

The principle of the loss of the existing car park was established by the previous permission (now lapsed). Its disposal, as set out in the adopted Shoreham Renaissance Strategy, was endorsed by The Council's Policy and Strategy Committee in 2006.

The number of houses and their density were established by the previous approval. The proposed density is comparable to the small cottages and terraces built close to one another in the surrounding area.

The floor plans show each dwelling to have three bedrooms over three floors, so they would clearly be suitable for families with children. Although the size of the gardens (between 38 and 42 square metres in area) is below the Council's adopted standard of 65 square metres for a 3-bedroom terrace, a reasonable size of private garden would be provided that would be comparable to similar property types in the area and a considerable improvement on the communal garden area included as part of the earlier approved scheme.

Visual amenity, character and appearance, and Conservation Area and Listed Buildings

The character of the road is primarily residential but with some commercial and office buildings towards the High Street end. In parts the road has a 'mews' character insofar as it accommodates some parking and garaging to the rear of properties in John Street. Further residential development would enhance the character of the road as the present 'gap' in the street created by the redundant car park is anomalous and is of no historic importance.

The scale of the development is comparable to the previously approved design. It is lower in height than the previous scheme, but with a mansard roof design (instead of the previously approved pitched roof) accommodating front and rear dormers. The proposed terrace houses would be no taller than White Lion Court to the north and would be subservient in scale to St Johns Court (opposite). The terraced form respects

the traditional character of the adjacent houses to the south. It is notable that surrounding buildings are a mixture or two and three storey, with no uniform building height and varying roof shapes and pitches.

The mansard roof form creates a graduated transition between the 2-storey dwelling adjoining to the south and the full 3-storey height of White Lion Court adjoining to the north. From the front the visual 'bulk' of the proposed mansard roof is lessened by being set behind a parapet wall. The staggered position of the proposed terrace is also transitional between the terraced houses to the south which are built hard up against the edge of the pavement compared to the set back position of White Lion Court.

The drawings show the use of good quality external materials and finishes which are consistent with the traditional character of surrounding development, comprising Sussex stock brickwork and stone copings at ground-floor, with the first-floor front elevation faced in knapped flint with brick quoins and courses. The main entrance doors and folding garage doors would be stained timber with black ironmongery; windows would be painted timber. The mansard roof would be covered using natural slate with reconstituted stone copings to the parapet and party walls. The dormer cheeks and roofs would be finished in lead.

In urban design terms the current proposal is considered an improvement compared to the previous scheme in that it incorporates front doors which address the street and under-croft or integral garaging and first-floor balconies which help create an 'active' frontage. It is therefore considered the proposed development will enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and the setting of nearby Listed Buildings (even numbers running from No. 6-16 West Street and St Johns Court opposite the application site).

Residential amenity – for proposed dwellings and affect on existing dwellings

Proposed dwellings

As part of the current proposal, each of the 3-bedroom dwellings would be provided with a private rear garden (approximately 8.5 metres deep) whereas the dwellings within the earlier approved scheme relied on a smaller area of rear communal garden space, not ideal for family-sized dwellings. The proposed layout also offers improved internal habitable living spaces.

Affect on existing dwellings

The main properties affected by the proposed development are the flats within White Lion Court to the north; the neighbouring house at No. 14 Ship Street to the south; and the houses to the rear, Nos. 12, 14, and 16 West Street.

There would be a distance of 1 metre between the northern side of No.14 Ship Street and the southern flank wall of the proposed terrace. The terrace would protrude further rearwards (west) than No. 14. At the point closest to No. 14 this rearward projection would be 2 metres at two-storey height plus a further 1.3m at single storey height (3.3 metres overall). The development would have an enclosing effect on the rear aspect of No.14 and result in some loss of daylight. However, the orientation of the development

combined with the narrow separation distance would be sufficient to avoid an unduly overbearing impact or unacceptable loss of daylight.

The development would be sited closer to the side of White Lion Court compared the earlier scheme. There would be a distance of 4.5 metres between the flank wall of the development and the side of White Lion Court comprising the width of the access leading to the rear parking area serving the flats. There is a window first-floor window in the flank of the flat building. Some loss of light to this window as a result of overshadowing would have resulted from the approved scheme. This effect will be enhanced owing to the closer proximity of the proposed building. On the other hand, the set-back position of the northern-most unit (plot 4) at 2-storey height would assist in relieving the impact on the front elevation of White Lion Court (which incorporates windows providing the main aspect to the flats).

The houses in West Street to the rear are a minimum distance of 21 metres from the rear of the proposed terraced houses. The Council's Development Control Standard states that there should be a distance of at least 22 metres between rear habitable windows to avoid unacceptable loss of privacy and overlooking. This marginal breach is considered acceptable in this close-knit urban environment where buildings are built close to one another and overlooking onto rear gardens is not untypical.

It is worthy of note that the previous approved scheme included first-floor rear balconies which arguably would have resulted in a more intensive degree of overlooking than would arise in this case.

For these reasons, there would not be an unacceptable impact on the residential amenities of immediate neighbours.

Accessibility and parking

Ship Street is a residential, one way 'D' classified road subject to a 30 mph speed restriction.

One car parking space per dwelling is proposed. Application of the West Sussex County Council Guidance on Parking in Residential Developments and the Parking Demand Calculator tool anticipate demand for 7 parking spaces. The proposed 4 spaces therefore fall below the assessment of anticipated parking demand.

A parking assessment and capacity survey has been undertaken by the applicant. The survey demonstrates that neighbouring dwellings in the area operate with similar single-space parking provision. The survey results show that on average there were 3 available parking spaces within Ship Street during a single day, and that additional parking was available in nearby North Street.

The Highway Authority has raised no objection to the amount or type of parking provision having regard to the highly sustainable location of this site.

It is clear therefore that the development would comply with spirit of the current WSCC guidance on parking, and that surrounding streets would have the capacity to

accommodate the small amount of additional on-street parking demand that may be generated by the development.

It is also material to the consideration of this application that permission was granted relatively recently for a similar development with the same amount of car parking provision as now proposed.

Most of the kerb along the site frontage is already lowered, being a reflection of the former use of the site. A narrow pedestrian footway is also present. It is proposed to demarcate and separate the pedestrian entrance from the entrances to the respective undercroft garages by siting 'Green oak' bollards on the site boundary. This would discourage pavement parking.

The garages are generously sized (6 metres deep by 3 metres wide) in accordance with national guidance set out in 'Manual for Streets'. Provision has been made for cycle storage (2 spaces per dwelling).

Contaminated land

The site is not identified as contaminated so an informative would suffice to raise the applicant's awareness of this risk.

Archaeology

Archaeological features were proven to exist on the site in June 2011 following an exploratory archaeological investigation. The County Archaeologist requires further information regarding the nature and base excavation levels of intended foundations for the new houses, and of major infrastructure (e.g. deep soakaways), and their relationship to the archaeological deposits.

The application submission makes no reference to the proven archaeological deposits on the site; nor are any details of proposed foundations provided. Adur and Worthing Councils' Building Control section have ascertained that the top surface of the natural, geological clay, coinciding with the upper level of the archaeological features, would be the minimum required base level for new house foundations. The scope was discussed with the applicant (Bramber Construction Ltd) for excavations for new foundations to reach 1 metre deep, but no deeper, so conserving the archaeological features intact.

In the event of approval, it is strongly recommended that a planning condition is imposed ensuring a satisfactory solution is secured concerning excavation levels prior to the commencement of any site works which ensures that the development is compatible with safeguarding the archeological deposits on the site.

Recommendation

APPROVE for the reason:

The proposed development is within the built-up area and would help meet the need for additional housing without detracting from the character or appearance of the Conservation Area or the setting of nearby Listed Buildings. It can take place without resulting in unacceptable detriment to the amenities of neighbouring residential occupiers and without detraction from highway safety. The loss of the former car park is contrary to saved policy AT6 but has been compensated for by improved provision elsewhere in the town centre at Pond Road. The proposed development does not materially conflict with the relevant policies of the Adur District Local Plan (AG1, AB1, AB3-4, AH2, AH5) and the South East Plan (SP3, SP4, CC1, CC3, CC4, CC6, CC7, CC9, H1, H2, H4, H5, H6, T4, NRM10, W1, W2, BE1, BE6, SCT1, SCT5)

Subject to Conditions:-

1. Standard 3 year time limit
2. Permission relates to approved plans
3. No development unless excavation levels of intended foundations and major infrastructure agreed
4. No development unless schedule and samples of materials and finishes for external walls and roof agreed
5. No development unless schedule of permeable material and/or a permeable construction of hard landscaping agreed
6. No development unless architectural details of balustrade and hand rail and all windows agreed
7. No development unless sample flint panel agreed on site
8. No development unless Construction Method Statement agreed including no work on Sundays or on Public Holidays. On all other days such work shall only be implemented between the hours of 8am and 6pm.
9. No occupation unless car parking spaces and access facilities, including bollards, provided on site. Land not used for any other purpose.
10. No occupation unless cycle storage provision provided on site. Land not used for any other purpose.
11. No occupation unless boundary treatments provided on site and retained.
12. No occupation unless soft and hard landscaping provided on site.
13. No extension or any incidental building over 5 cubic metres
14. No cables, wires, aerials, pipework (except rainwater downpipes as shown on the approved plans), meter boxes or flues shall be fixed or fitted externally to any elevation of the building facing a highway.
15. No external radio or TV aerial/dish unless agreed in writing
16. No windows or other openings in north and south elevations of terrace
17. The flat roof area of southernmost house shall not be used as a roof terrace or external amenity space
18. No walls or fences forward of the front elevation of any dwellinghouse facing the highway

Informatives

If during development, any visible contaminated or odorous material, (for example asbestos containing material, stained soil, petrol/diesel/solvent odour, underground tanks or associated pipework) not previously identified, is found to be present at the site, then no further development (unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority) shall be carried out until it has been investigated by the developer. The Local Planning Authority must be informed immediately of the nature and degree of the contamination present and a method statement detailing how the unsuspected contamination shall be dealt with must be prepared and submitted to the Local Planning Authority for approval in writing before being implemented

The applicant is advised to contact the Coastal Team, Community Development and Big Society, Communities and Infrastructure Directorate, Centenary House, Durrington Lane, Durrington, Worthing, West Sussex BN13 2QB, Phone: 01243 642105 to obtain a license for the site access works.