

<b>APPLICATION NUMBER:</b>	LW/07/0374	<b>ITEM NUMBER:</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>APPLICANTS NAME(S):</b>	Messrs A & A Building Construction Ltd	<b>PARISH / WARD:</b>	Seaford / Seaford Central
<b>PROPOSAL:</b>	Planning Application for Demolition of bungalow & erection of a two storey block of six two bedroom flats		
<b>SITE ADDRESS:</b>	5 East Albany Road, Seaford, East Sussex, BN25 1TU		
<b>GRID REF:</b>	TQ 4894		

✖

## 1. SITE DESCRIPTION / PROPOSAL

1.1 The site comprises a detached bungalow located in East Albany Road, opposite the junction with Grove Road. The site is flanked by chalet-style single dwellings on either side.

1.2 It is proposed to demolish the existing bungalow. A two-storey chalet-style building would be erected, comprising six two-bedroom flats. Four would be on the ground floor and two would be within the roofspace, served by dormers at the front and rear and rooflights at the sides. Parking for six cars would be provided at the front of the building served by a single access off East Albany Road. The parking area would require a relatively substantial degree of excavation to give level access from East Albany Road, given that the site is at a higher level than the road.

## 2. RELEVANT POLICIES

**LDLP: – ST03** – Design, Form and Setting of Development

**LDLP: – T07** – Provision for Cyclists

## 3. PLANNING HISTORY

None.

## 4. REPRESENTATIONS FROM STANDARD CONSULTEES

**ESCC Highways** – Recommend refusal on grounds that the vehicle manoeuvring area within the car park is inadequate and that no cycle storage facilities are proposed.

**Main Town Or Parish Council** – Advise approval: The Committee felt that the proposals would be in keeping with the character of the area.

## 5. REPRESENTATIONS FROM LOCAL RESIDENTS

5.1 Five letters of objection received, the main planning grounds being overlooking to the sides and rear, loss of light to nearby properties, that the building would be out of keeping in the road, the proposal would constitute overdevelopment with excessive site coverage, noise and disturbance would be caused (from use of the parking area, side accesses to the rear flats and use of the front refuse stores from the multi-occupied building), parking would be inadequate and below standard and therefore extra traffic congestion would arise, provision for disabled residents would be inadequate, and plants and other vegetation on the site would be lost. One objector also comments that information submitted with the application is misleading in many respects.

5.2 The applicants agent has submitted a Design and Access Statement which, inter alia, submits that the development would be of a scale and design

which would be in keeping with its surroundings, would not generate significant traffic volumes (reference is made to technical data concerning this), that the principle of flats in the area has been accepted by 'Shortlands' opposite, and that there is a demand for two-bedroom flats in the area.

## **6. PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS**

6.1 The main planning issues arising from the application are considered to be the effect on the character of the area, the effect on the amenities of nearby residents and the effect on local traffic conditions.

### **Effect on character of area**

6.2 The character of the area is residential, comprising of predominantly detached dwellings, although there is a block of flats opposite the site called 'Shortlands'. The fact that the proposal is for flats is not considered to constitute grounds for refusal in itself, as flats 'per se' would not necessarily be damaging to the character of the area.

6.3 The design of the building would be generally in keeping with adjacent buildings in terms of the style, featuring a low eaves line and rooms in the roof served by dormers and rooflights. The plans indicate that the height would be broadly similar to the adjacent properties. Similarly, the hipped roof form at the sides would match adjacent properties. The main facing materials to be used would be brick and tile, with details agreed with the Council if permission is granted, and these could match other properties in the road.

6.4 The frontage of properties on this side of East Albany Road, however, are free of the type of parking arrangements which are proposed in this application, i.e. an excavated frontage, hard surfaced with parking spaces for six cars and with two binstores. It is considered that, in the context of this attractive road, this arrangement would be significantly detrimental to the street scene and character of the area. It is considered that this renders the application unacceptable.

### **Effect on the amenities of nearby residents**

6.5 There would be some overlooking from the upper floor dormers and from the side rooflights, but this would be of a degree which would generally be expected in an urban or suburban area and would not, it is considered, be significant for that reason. Kitchen and bathroom windows would be formed in both sides of the building at ground floor level but the outlook from these would tend to be straight onto the side boundary fences.

6.6 It is not considered that any undue overshadowing or loss of light would result to adjacent properties or their gardens, as the building would not be of such a scale or be so close to the side boundaries as to cause significant unneighbourliness in this respect.

6.7 Two of the ground floor flats, at the rear of the building, would be accessed from the back of the building, via the pathways at the side which lead from the front to the rear. Occupants and visitors to those flats would therefore have to pass adjacent to the neighbouring properties to gain access to and from those two flats. This would give rise to the potential for noise and disturbance to be generated, but it is not considered to be so significant as to justify refusal on that ground.

#### **Effect on local traffic conditions**

6.8 The Highway Authority raise no objection on grounds of traffic generation onto East Albany Road or the wider area.

6.9 The Highway Authority do, however, recommend refusal on the basis that the parking layout has insufficient turning/manoeuvring space and that no provision for cycle storage has been proposed. The application is considered to be unacceptable in these respects.

6.10 Overall, the proposal is considered to be unacceptable.

### **7. RECOMMENDATION**

That planning permission be refused.

#### **Reason(s) for Refusal:**

1. The proposed development would, by reason of the degree of excavation of the frontage, the location, size and prominence of the parking area and width of the access, be out of keeping with and detrimental to the street scene. The proposal would thereby be contrary to Policy ST3 of the Lewes District Local Plan.

2. The parking area would be deficient in vehicle turning/manoeuvring space. Also, no facilities are proposed for cycle storage. The proposal would therefore result in additional congestion on the public highway causing interference with the free flow and safety of traffic on the UC5439 East Albany Road. The proposal would also encourage non-car travel by future residents. The proposal would thereby be contrary to Policies ST3 (d) and T7 of the Lewes District Local Plan.

#### **This decision is based on the following submitted plans/documents:**

<u>PLAN TYPE</u>	<u>DATE RECEIVED</u>	<u>REFERENCE</u>
Design & Access Statement	22 March 2007	
General	22 March 2007	
Photographs	22 March 2007	
Location Plan	22 March 2007	

Block Plans	22 March 2007	
Proposed Elevations	22 March 2007	100307/04
Proposed Floor Plans	22 March 2007	100307/04