

<b>APPLICATION NUMBER:</b>	LW/07/1081	<b>ITEM NUMBER:</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>APPLICANTS NAME(S):</b>	Mr C Morely	<b>PARISH / WARD:</b>	Peacehaven / Peacehaven North
<b>PROPOSAL:</b>	Planning Application for Convert single dwelling into two self contained flats		
<b>SITE ADDRESS:</b>	20 Rosemary Close, Peacehaven, East Sussex, BN10 8BY		
<b>GRID REF:</b>	TQ 4102		

x

## **1. SITE DESCRIPTION / PROPOSAL**

1.1 The application property is located on a corner plot in Rosemary Close, Peacehaven. The site comprises a two storey, seven bedroom detached dwelling with an adjoining single garage.

1.2 The application is a revision to LW/07/0782 which proposed conversion of the application property into three self contained flats. Permission was refused on two grounds, the first was because the proposal would constitute an over-intensive use of the site out of keeping with the character of the area which has predominantly single dwellings. It was considered that the proposed three flats would generate an excessive amount of activity and comings and goings, pressure for parking and noise disturbance. The other reason related to inadequate parking.

1.3 The main difference between the current application and the previous scheme is the omission of one flat on the ground floor. The current scheme now proposes sub division of the dwelling into two (three bed) flats instead of three flats (two ground floor one bed flats and one three bed first floor flat). The current scheme proposes the same amount of parking and cycle storage as in the previous application. This includes two independent parking spaces and cycle storage for three bicycles. The parking spaces are proposed in the existing garage and small rear garden entered from the spur of Rosemary Close.

## **2. RELEVANT POLICIES**

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

## **3. PLANNING HISTORY**

**LW/07/0782 - Conversion of single dwelling into three self-contained flats - Refused**

## **4. REPRESENTATIONS FROM STANDARD CONSULTEES**

**Main Town Or Parish Council – Recommends refusal.** There is a lack of parking in an area that already suffers from acute parking problems. There is concern that emergency vehicles would be unable to gain access to the Close. Granting planning permission to this site would set an unacceptable residential precedent. Councillors asked that this application be considered by the Planning Committee.

**ESCC Highways – Recommends a condition relating to the provision of car and cycle parking areas.**

**Transco – None received at the time of writing this report**

**Seaboard Power Networks Plc** – None received at the time of writing this report

## **5. REPRESENTATIONS FROM LOCAL RESIDENTS**

5.1 Three letters of objection have been received from the occupiers of neighbouring properties. One of the letters includes signatures from the occupiers of four other properties in Rosemary Close. Their concerns have been summarised as follows:

- this is a small residential road and the proposal would exacerbate the existing parking problem.
- opening up the rear garden to provide an additional parking space would be prejudicial to highway and pedestrian safety. It would also reduce the amount of on street parking.
- the proposal would result in the intensification of the level of activity and number of people residing at the property which would increase the number of parking spaces required.
- an increase in the number of comings and goings by vehicular movements would increase the likelihood of an accident occurring due to emergency vehicles not being able to safely access the road.
- it would set a precedent which would then be difficult for the Council to resist and cumulatively would have an adverse effect on the character of the Close.
- noise and disturbance would result from the additional vehicular movements.

## **6. PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS**

6.1 The main issues for consideration are whether the proposal respects the amenities of adjoining properties in terms of noise and privacy and whether the development would result in detriment to the character or amenities of the area through increased traffic levels, congestion or hazards all under Local Plan Policy ST3.

### **Impact on adjoining properties**

6.2 In terms of the impact on the adjoining properties in relation to noise and privacy it is considered that the proposed sub division of the dwelling into two flats would not have an adverse affect on the neighbouring properties. The existing property has seven bedrooms and the proposed conversion would result in a reduction in number of bedrooms at the property down to six. In addition, the proposal does not involve the need for any additional windows or external alterations at first floor.

6.3 Two parking spaces are proposed, one in the existing garage and one in the small rear garden entered from the spur road. In terms of noise, it is not

considered that this would unduly affect the amenities of the adjoining properties. There would be no change in circumstances to the impact on No. 19 which adjoins the site to the south. There is currently a vehicular access via a gated entrance to the proposed space in the rear garden and a 2m high brick wall exists along the boundary between the application site and 21 Rosemary Close. Any use of this space would not therefore be unduly harmful to the occupiers of 21 Rosemary Close.

### **Impact on character of the area**

6.4 Under the previous proposal (LW/07/0782) the officer report commented that the first floor flat shown was reasonable, but the division of the ground floor showed sub-standard units with cramped accommodation out of keeping with the character of the area, which would then be likely to set a precedent if replicated in the cul de sac. It was considered that this would cumulatively result in an intensification and level of activity detrimental to the area. The parking was short of the required number in an area which already exhibits street parking problems.

6.5 Now that the accommodation has been reduced under the current scheme from three to two flats, the proposal is no longer considered to be cramped and the Highways Authority no longer object on parking grounds. As such the proposal is considered acceptable.

## **7. RECOMMENDATION**

That permission be granted.

### **The application is subject to the following condition:**

1. The development shall not be occupied until car and cycle parking areas have been provided in accordance with the approved plan and the areas shall thereafter be retained for that use.

Reason: To ensure the safety of persons and vehicles entering and leaving the access and proceeding along the highway and in the interests of the visual amenities of the locality in accordance with Policy ST3 of the Lewes District Local Plan.

2. The development hereby approved shall not be brought into use until the attached Highway Authority Technical requirements have been carried out, unless otherwise agreed by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of local highway conditions having regard to Policy ST3 of the Lewes District Local Plan and PPG13 of National Policy Guidance.

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

<u>PLAN TYPE</u>	<u>DATE RECEIVED</u>	<u>REFERENCE</u>
Design & Access Statement	17 August 2007	
Photographs	17 August 2007	
Location Plan	17 August 2007	
Existing Floor Plans	17 August 2007	RCP.01
Existing Elevations	17 August 2007	RCP.02
Proposed Floor Plans	17 August 2007	RCP.05
Proposed Floor Plans	17 August 2007	RCP.06

**Summary of reasons for decision and any relevant development plan policies/proposal:**

It is considered that the proposal meets the aims and objectives of Local Plan Policy and respects the character of the location, complying with Policy ST3 of the Lewes District Local Plan.