Rep 3/12

Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: ADC/0495/08 Recommendation – APPROVE

Site: **6 The Meadway, Shoreham-by-Sea BN43 5RP**

Proposal: **Detached four-bedroom chalet-style dwellinghouse with integral garage (instead of three-bedroom chalet bungalow previously permitted)**

The Application

The application site (27m deep and 11m wide) is situated on the north side of the road, 50m east of Ferry Road. The derelict bungalow previously on the site has been demolished. On the west side is a detached bungalow No.4 'Casablanca', with a low roof (built 1918). To the east, No.8 is a large detached recently-built colonial-style chalet dwelling. On the opposite side of the road (south) are chalet bungalows (gables facing the road) at No's 1-5 and a cleared site (No's 7 and 9).

Planning permission was previously granted in outline in 2004 (SU/96/04), with details approved in 2005 (SU/33/05), for the redevelopment of the site with a new chalet-style dwelling. This permission is valid until June 2009.

The current application seeks permission to amend the design of the proposed new dwelling. The principal external change would be an increase in the eaves height from 2.4m to 3.6m, with the ridge height remaining at approx 7.3m. The main structure of the dwelling would be reduced from 12.5m to 11.7m, with the width remaining at 9m, but the garage projection at the front would be increased from 1m to 1.5m. The east side dormer (serving the main bathroom and en-suite) is still proposed. The materials would be stock bricks for the walls (up to window head height) with coloured boarding above and a plain-tiled roof.

The groundfloor layout would be very similar to the existing approval, with the main entrance door in the west side, but, on the first floor, there would now be 4 bedrooms instead of 3, made possible by the increased headroom.

Consultations and Representations

West Sussex County Council: No objection subject to provision of pedestrian visibility splays for the new access, 4 covered cycle spaces and a section 106 Obligation requiring a sustainable transport contribution of £760 (owing to the increase in number of bedrooms).

Third Parties: A letter has been received from the neighbour at No.4 The Meadway expressing great concern about the additional height of the walls. He comments that his bungalow is only 2.5m high to eaves, with a 4m ridge height, and the proposed house would be overpowering and blot out light to 3

of his rooms (sittingroom, diningroom and main bedroom) and hallway which have east side-facing windows.

Relevant Planning Policies and Guidance

Adopted West Sussex Structure Plan 2001-2016 (WSCC 2005) (saved policies): LOC1, NE1, CH1, ERA1, DEV1, DEV4-5.
Adopted Adur District Local Plan 1993-2006 (ADC 1996) (saved policies): AG1, AH2 and Appendix 11 'Supplementary Planning Guidance' comprising:
Dev Control Standard No. 2 'Space Around New Dwellings and Flats'
Revised West Sussex Parking Standards and Transport Contributions Methodology (WSCC 2003 and ADC 2004)
PPS1 'Delivering Sustainable Development' (ODPM 2005)
PPS3 'Housing' (DCLG 2006)

Planning Assessment

The principle of the redevelopment of this site is established by the existing permission SU/33/05, so the relevant planning considerations, in effect, only relate to the differences between the two designs.

Policies

Structure Plan policy DEV1, entitled high quality development, states that development should not be permitted unless the construction, layout, scale, appearance and landscaping are of high quality taking into account the need to, amongst other things, have regard to context including site characteristics, townscape/streetscape, views into and out of the site and building styles/materials.
Policy DEV4 states (amongst other things) that development should not be permitted unless the travel needs it generates are met; it achieves safe and convenient access by a choice of means of travel; it encourages and enables an increase in walking and cycling. A transport contributions methodology is mentioned.

Local Plan policy AH2 states that new dwellings should be designed so that their appearance, character and scale create a pleasant place in which to live and are in keeping with and enhance the existing local environment with particular attention being paid to architectural form, height, materials, density, layout of buildings and hardsurfaced areas; they do not have an unneighbourly effect due to loss of privacy; daylight/sunlight; outlook or open space, incorporating adequate standards of residential amenity for the new dwellings in terms of amenity space, daylight, outlook and privacy; access and parking provision meets the adopted standards; and they accord with the Council's DC Standard No.2 'Space around New Dwellings and Flats'

Visual Amenity

The Meadway consists of a variety of building types and sizes. The original prewar bungalows have gradually been replaced mainly with chalet

bungalows (including plots 1,3,5,8,13,15,16,18) but there are also some full two-storey buildings (eg. house at No.14 and Ferrymead Court flats on corner with Ferry Road).

The proposed dwelling is midway between a chalet bungalow and a house. Its eaves height would be similar to the new dwelling at No.8. It would be taller than the low bungalow at No.4 but, taking account of the relatively wide space in between (3.9m-5.1m), it is considered that it would fit reasonably well into the streetscene.

Residential Amenity

As stated earlier, the neighbouring dwellings either side are, to the west, No.4, a low-profile bungalow, and, to the east, No.8, a larger recently-built chalet-style dwelling. To the rear (north) is the side of an end-of-terrace house in Cheal Close.

No.4 has a glazed side entrance porch and 3 windows in its east-facing side elevation. The central one is the sole window to its diningroom and the rearward one is the second window to the main bedroom, the main window of which faces north onto the rear garden. The forwardmost side window serves the livingroom but this room also has glazing into the front south-facing glazed loggia.
No.4 is positioned at a slightly oblique angle to the side boundary, being 2.9m away at the front corner and 4.1m away at the rear corner. The proposed dwelling is to be 1 metre from the side boundary, thus giving a gap of 3.9m-5.1m between the side walls of the two dwellings.

Whilst the ridge height of the proposed dwelling remains the same as previously approved, the proposed increase in the height of the facing side wall from 2.4m to 3.6m would have an effect on the bungalow at No.4 by increasing the apparent bulk of the proposed dwelling. Nevertheless, this eaves height is still less than that of a conventional house (5m). Taking account of the fact that it is only the diningroom and entrance hall that have a solely east-facing aspect, and the wider than typical gap between the buildings, it is considered that the degree of loss of light to No.4 as a result of the proposed 1.2m increase in wall height would not be such as to warrant refusal. Nevetheless, it is considered that use of a light colour for the boarding would be desirable, to give more light reflection.

As to the effect on No.8, to the east, which is at a more pronounced oblique angle to the side boundary, this larger dwelling has its front corner much closer to the boundary. However, there is only one side window (in the rearward part of the groundfloor where it is angled further away from the boundary). It would not be adversely affected.

The end-of terrace house in Cheal Close to the rear has a firstfloor window in its side gable. The intervening distance is less than the normal standard but no worse than previously approved.

The size of the rear garden remains similar to that previously approved (8.9m deep with an area of 103sqm). This compares to the minimum standard of 100sqm for a 4-bed dwelling, with a depth 11m.
The application states that front boundary walls will not exceed 0.6m high and that 1.8 close-boarded fences will be erected on boundaries rearward of the building line. There are existing concrete block side boundary walls on the sides of the front part of the application site (presumably to be demolished) and fencing on the east boundary (rearward part) and rear boundary (also with 4m high shrubs).

Access and Parking

A new vehicular access will be provided to access the single integral garage and front parking area, providing space for 2 cars. The garage is unlikely to be large enough for 4 cycles, unless only a small car is parked in it.
Under the adopted Transport Contributions Methodology, the increased size of the dwelling requires a section 106 Obligation undertaking to pay £760 to sustainable transport improvements in the area.

Recommendation

(A) Subject to completion of a section 106 Obligation undertaking to pay £760 to sustainable transport improvements in the area by no later than 3 December 2008, APPROVE for reason that:- → le c'd 21/11/08

The proposed development is within the built up area and would help meet the need for sustainable housing without detracting from the existing local urban environment. It can take place without resulting in unacceptable detriment to the amenities of neighbouring properties and without detraction from highway safety. It would consequently not conflict with the relevant policies of the Adur District Local Plan (AG1, AH2) and the West Sussex Structure Plan (LOC1, NE1, CH1, ERA1, DEV1, DEV4-5)

Subject to:-

1. C1Ci
2. C7Ci R.....AH2.....DEV1
3. C8Biii
4. C9Ai
5. C9F
6. C9N
7. C12Ai .....Authority. The details submitted under this condition shall include a light colour for the proposed boarding on the upper part of the walls.
8. C18Cii The glazing in the east and west side elevations....
9. C18Ei ...formed in the side walls or roof slopes of the building.....
10. C18A
11. C18B .....

(B) If, by 3 December 2008, the above-mentioned section 106 Obligation has not been completed, REFUSE for the reason that:-

1. There is no evidence that the necessary contributions would be made to improvements to sustainable transport to offset the effects of the travel demands generated by the proposed dwelling as required by the West Sussex Transport Contributions Methodology and policies DEV4-5 of the West Sussex Structure Plan.

.....

Planning Services Manager:... Date:..6/11/08

Development Control Committee Chairman..... Date:...10/11/08