Development Management - Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/0121/16 Recommendation – Refuse

Site: Land West Of 58 Dankton Gardens, Sompting

Proposal: Two storey detached 2 no. bedroom house

Date of site visit: 12 February 2016

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

The application relates a detached dwelling on the corner of Dankton Gardens and Dankton Lane. The area comprises the side garden of the property which is presently separated from the road by a closeboard fence and grass verge. It also sits on higher ground than the road.

It is proposed to construct a new detached 2 bedroom dwelling to the same height and depth as No.58. However, it will be narrower (5.5m wide compared with 6m for No.58) and will not have a garage. It will leave a distance of 5.5m to the road (Dankton Lane). The dwelling will be finished in brickwork on the ground floor with tile hanging at first floor to reflect the style of the existing dwelling.

Relevant site history

None

Consultations

West Sussex County Council: The ***Highway*** Officer has no objection subject to conditions relating to access, pedestrian visibility and cycle parking. Comments that the driveway is approximately 2.75 m wide which is sufficient in width for the parking of a car. It is stated that two car parking spaces will be provided in tandem with no turn on site. Considering the residential nature and lower speeds expected in this location the LHA would not object to not having a turn on site. Furthermore neighbouring properties use a similar arrangement and removing one or two vehicles off street means that these cars will not be parked on the highway, resulting in a narrowing of the available carriageway width.

There appears to be a street lighting column which may be positioned in conflict of the new access point. If so then the applicant should arrange for it to be relocated.

The corner of the junction includes an area of maintainable highway covered by hedging/vegetation. This should be cut back to provide maximum achievable visibility upon exiting the site. The applicant should demonstrate

pedestrian visibility splays of 2 m by 2 m either side of the access on to Dankton Gardens – this can be secured via condition.

Adur & Worthing Councils: The ***Environmental Health*** Officer has no objection

The ***Drainage Engineer*** requires full details of surface water disposal.

Southern Water: Applicant is advised to contact them

Sompting Parish Council: Objects. Increased use of the access (requiring vehicles to reverse in or out of the driveway) would add hazards to existing highway users (this could be used with slight change for a new access on to a main road). In the interests of road/pedestrian safety, add to the hazards of highway users. Need to preserve sight lines for access (inadequate visibility at access).

Representations

None received

Relevant Planning Policies

Adur District Local Plan 1993-2006 (ADC 1996) (saved policies): AG1, AH2 and Appendix 11 'Supplementary Planning Guidance' comprising: Development Control Standard No.2 'Space Around New Dwellings and Flats' National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012)

Planning Assessment

Principle

The site lies within the built up area where residential development is acceptable in principle. The relevant issues are the effects on the amenities of neighbouring residential occupiers and the effect on the character and appearance of the area.

Visual amenity

The proposed dwelling would be similar in appearance to existing dwellings in the street. However, it would be sited further west than any other building in the street and would be unduly prominent in the street scene, the existing character of which is partly formed by the relatively wide verge and the subsequent separation of built form from the lane. To the west of the site there is a field which lies within the Local Green Gap/Strategic Gap separating Sompting and Worthing. The site immediately abuts the boundary of this Gap and it is important to maintain a buffer between the countryside and built form.

The proposed dwelling, due to its elevated position and proximity to the road, would therefore be an overly prominent feature which would harm the character of the area.

Residential amenity

The proposed dwelling would not cause harm to the amenities of neighbouring residents. The rear windows would overlook the ends of the gardens of dwellings in Roman Walk to the north but these are already overlooked by the existing dwelling at 58 Dankton Gardens. It is also not considered that it would cause any loss of light or outlook to existing residents.

The proposed dwelling would have a floor area of around 80 square metres which meets the National Standards. Both the existing and proposed dwellings would have adequate external amenity space.

Accessibility and parking

The proposed dwelling would have 2 parking spaces on the driveway with no turn on site. The West Sussex Highway Officer is satisfied that there would be no risk to highway safety from this arrangement as lower speeds can be expected in this location. Furthermore neighbouring properties use a similar arrangement and removing one or two vehicles off street means that these cars will not be parked on the highway, resulting in a narrowing of the available carriageway width.

Recommendation

REFUSE for the reason:-

The proposed dwelling, by reason of its siting and proximity to the road, would form an unduly prominent feature which would be out of character with the pattern of development in the lane to the detriment of the character of the area. It would therefore conflict with saved policy AH2 of the Adur District Local Plan and the relevant paragraphs of the National Planning Policy Framework relating to good design and sustainable development.

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

The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by identifying matters of concern with the proposal and discussing those with the Applicant. However, the issues are so fundamental to the proposal that it has not been possible to negotiate a satisfactory way forward and due to the harm which has been clearly identified within the reason(s) for the refusal, approval has not been possible.

Case Officer: Peter Barnett Date: 22 March 2016

Authorised by: Gary Peck Date: 22 March 2016