Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/1606/14 Recommendation – REFUSAL

Site: 96 Brighton Road, Shoreham

Proposal: Vehicular crossover

Date of site visit: 04.12.2014

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

The application property is located on the northerly side of Brighton Road and comprises a two storey mid-terrace property located in a row of terrace properties which face Shoreham Harbour. From their roadside elevations the terraces at this end of the road appear uniform in terms of appearance; most have maintained their small front gardens which are enclosed by low walling and 1.5 metre high decorative pillars which line the frontage of the sites with the pavement. The site is located outside any designated flood risk zones.

The proposal seeks planning permission to create drop the kerb and create a vehicular cross over to the front garden to allow for the parking of vehicles. The proposal would therefore also involve the removal of the easterly and southerly low walling and one of the front pillars next to the entrance to allow for a vehicle to be parked in front of the application building. The vehicular crossover would measure 3 metres wide. The hard standing would measure 4.55 metres wide and 4.3 metres in length from the front bay window to the southerly front boundary of the site with the pavement. The proposed hard standing would be constructed of permeable block paving to allow water to drain through the surface.

Consultations:

West Sussex County Council Highways originally requested further information from the Applicant in relation to the length of the proposed driveway. Subsequent to this information being submitted, the Highways Officer has made the following comments:

"There is insufficient depth within the front garden to form a parking space. The depth of the frontage from the bay window to the back of the footway is 4.3 metres, which is below the standard car parking bay depth of 4.8 metres, resulting in vehicles overhanging the footway to the detriment of pedestrian safety, especially for partially sighted pedestrians. This application could also set an undesirable precedent as other property owners in the terrace may want to do the same.

I would therefore recommend that the application is refused on highway safety grounds.

Reason for Refusal
The proposed vehicular access onto Brighton Road, Shoreham-by-Sea would result in vehicles parking at the front of the property overhanging the public footway to the detriment of pedestrian safety."

West Sussex Highways Officer has subsequently also confirmed that during their consultation it was appreciated that there were a number of properties further east to the site that do operate driveways without a turn on site being achievable, however, this is obviously not ideal and a turn on site would have been preferred. The Highways Officer therefore considers that it would be difficult to support another objection based on a lack of turn on site and subsequently, he has therefore confirmed that their objection remains based on a detriment to pedestrian safety due to an inadequate driveway length.

Representations:

None received.

Relevant Planning Policies

Adopted Adur District Local Plan 1993-2006 (ADC 1996) (saved policies): AG1, AH7 and Appendix 11 'Supplementary Planning Guidance' comprising: Development Control Standard No.3 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings' National Planning Policy Framework (CLG 2012).

Planning Assessment

Principle

There is no objection in principle to the proposed development which involves the creation of a vehicular crossover and hard standing to serve an existing dwelling. The main considerations in this assessment are the impact of the proposal on the visual amenities of the area and highway and pedestrian safety.

Visual amenity

The application site is located within a row of terrace properties which face Shoreham Harbour to the south. From Brighton Road the majority of the terraces at this westerly end of the row appear uniform in terms of appearance; most have maintained their small front gardens which are enclosed by low walling with 1.5 metre high decorative pillars which line the frontages of the sites with the pavement. The pillars at this westerly end of the row of terraces are the same height, predominantly painted white and have the same decorative feature on the top. The front garden walling and piers therefore remains an attractive characteristic of the terraces when viewed from Brighton Road. The front boundary treatment becomes more varied in appearance at the easterly end of terraces from No. 80 Brighton Road onwards where the building design changes to a pair of lower two storey

properties and then a mixture of two storey and single storey detached buildings.

The exception to this is No. 86 Brighton Road which has had the garden walling and one front pier removed and created a block paved hard standing to the front of the property. The kerb does not appear to have been dropped outside of this neighbouring property and no planning permission has been granted for a vehicular cross over to the site. The removal of this front pier and low walling around the front garden has disturbed the uniform character and appearance of this row of terraces which has been otherwise maintained. This proposed creation of a vehicular crossover, driveway and the associated removal of part of the front garden walling and entrance pier would similarly adversely impact the visual amenities of this row of terrace properties. There is also concern that granting planning permission for this proposal would set a precedent for other properties within the terrace to do so which would involve the eradication of the attractive uniform walled front gardens and front entrance piers and replacement with hard standings incorporating varied materials and finishes.

Pedestrian Safety

The terrace properties have projecting front bay window and relatively small front gardens. The proposed length of the hard standing would therefore only measure 4.3 metres from the end of the front bay window to the edge of the pavement to the south. The WSCC Highways Officer has commented that the average length of a car is 4.8 metres long and therefore any car parked on the hard standing to the front of the property would likely overhang the pedestrian footpath to the south. This would therefore cause any obstruction for pedestrians using the pavement, particularly those who are partially sighted or disabled. The proposal would therefore be detrimental to pedestrian safety.

Highway Safety

Brighton Road is a busy road which provides access along the coast to the city of Brighton. As the existing garden area to the front of the property is relatively small there would be no room for a car to manoeuvre or turn around on the site and this would involve the Applicants either reversing back onto the driveway to leave in a forward gear or reversing out onto Brighton Road to exit the site. It is also noted that parked cars are frequently parked along this side of the road and this would therefore cause further visibility issues for the driver when reversing out from the site.

The Case Officer has queried whether the usage of the proposed access could cause any hazard to highway safety and the County Council Highways Officer has subsequently confirmed that during their consultation it was appreciated that there were a number of properties further east to the site that do operate driveways without a turn on site being achievable, however, this is obviously not ideal and a turn on site would have been preferred. The Highways Officer therefore considers that it would be difficult to support an objection based on a lack of turn on site and subsequently, he has therefore confirmed that their objection remains based on a detriment to pedestrian safety due to an inadequate driveway length.

As the Highways Authority does not wish to raise any objection in relation to proposed vehicular crossover and the implications on highways safety then then it is considered that there is no adequate reason to justify refusal on this basis.

Conclusion

As the proposed vehicular cross over, hard standing and associated removal of the front pier and garden walling would have an adverse impact on the visual amenities of the row of terrace properties and would be hazardous to pedestrian safety it cannot be supported in planning terms, refusal is therefore recommended.

Recommendation

Refusal for the following reason:

Owing to the sub-standard depth of the hard-standing parking area the proposal would lead to the potential for vehicles to overhang the public footway to the detriment of pedestrian safety. In addition, the associated removal of the existing front wall and pier would have an adverse impact on the character and appearance of the row of terrace properties to the detriment of the streetcene. The proposal would therefore conflict with saved policy AG1 and AH7 of the adopted Adur Local Plan and the NPPF.

<u>Informative</u>

1. Proactive Statement – Refusal (discussed with Applicant – no way forward)

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

Case Officer: Rebecca Tier Date: 19th January 2015

Authorised by: Jo Morin Date: 19.01.2015