

<b>App.No:</b> 150760	<b>Decision Due Date:</b> 22 September 2015	<b>Ward:</b> St Anthony's
<b>Officer:</b> Anna Clare	<b>Site visit date:</b> <b>18 September 2015</b>	<b>Type:</b> Planning Permission
<b>Site Notice(s) Expiry date:</b> 23 August 2015		
<b>Neighbour Con Expiry:</b> 21 September 2015		
<b>Press Notice(s):</b> N/A		
<b>Over 8/13 week reason:</b> To bring to Planning Committee		
<b>Location:</b> 1 Baillie Avenue, Eastbourne, BN22 8NY.		
<b>Proposal:</b> Erection of a two storey building to provide 2no. studio flats on and adjacent to 1 Baillie Avenue.		
<b>Applicant:</b> The Owner and/or Occupier		
<b>Recommendation:</b> Refused		

**Executive Summary:**

The application proposes an extension to the existing dwelling house to provide two self-contained studio flats, with off street parking. The type of accommodation is considered out of keeping with the surrounding area, and the site has been previously developed to the rear. The addition of two more units is considered over development of the site, and the accommodation provided given the small floorspace is considered to provide sub-standard accommodation therefore it is recommending the application is refused.

**Relevant Planning Policies:**

National Planning Policy Framework 2012

1. Building a strong, competitive economy
2. Ensuring the vitality of town centres
6. Delivering a wide choice of high quality homes
7. Requiring good design

Core Strategy Local Plan 2013 Policies

B2 Creating Sustainable Neighbourhoods  
C6 Roselands and Bridgemere Neighbourhood Policy  
D5 Housing  
D10A Design

Eastbourne Borough Plan Saved Policies 2007

UHT1 Design of New Development  
UHT4 Visual Amenity  
HO2 Predominantly Residential Areas  
HO20 Residential Amenity

**Site Description:**

The application property is a North Western facing, semi-detached single private dwelling situated on the junction of Roselands Avenue and Baillie Avenue. Occupying a corner plot, which is currently screened along its Northern Boundary by mature hedging, the property has an existing carriage cross over from Roselands Avenue providing vehicular access to off-street parking to the rear of the property, providing 2 spaces.

The site has been previously sub-divided with the rear currently under development by planning permission granted 13 August 2015 for the provision of 4 self-contained flats.

**Relevant Planning History:**

141562

Proposed two storey side extension measuring 3070mm in width to provide a store at ground floor and two bedrooms at first floor level.

Householder

Approved conditionally

09/02/2015

150671

Proposed development to rear of 1-2 Baillie Avenue to provide 4no.self-contained flats with parking to front

Planning Permission

Approved conditionally

13/08/2015

**Proposed development:**

The application proposes the erection of a two storey side extension to the existing dwelling measuring 5.8m in length set marginally back from the front elevation of the property by 0.2m, 3670mm in width, to provide two self-contained studio flats each measuring around 18m<sup>2</sup> in area.

**Consultations:**

External:

East Sussex County Council Highways

The level of car and cycle parking proposed for the development is acceptable.

It is noted that on street parking in the vicinity of the site is already well used and there is a concern about reducing the space available through

construction of a driveway. The layout currently proposed would lead to the loss of 2 spaces on street. With an alteration to the position of the vehicle crossover this could be reduced to 1. The spaces in the site should be positioned up against the north east boundary. This would allow the driveway to link to the driveway of the adjoining property. The current crossover could then be reinstated as footway. This would also move the driveway and therefore reversing vehicles further away from the junction.

With regard to loss of on street parking through creation of a driveway a number of factors must be considered. Firstly the land owner could install driveways without the need for planning consent, as any house owner in an unclassified road could. The number of spaces involved is also low.

It is noted also that there are concerns about the safety of the nearby junction of Roseland's Avenue & Baillie Avenue. Although there is on street parking around this junction it is marked with a give way line.

Ultimately any planning permission should be considered against paragraph 32 of the National Planning Policy Framework on highway impacts. This states that '*Development should only be prevented on or refused on transport grounds where the residual cumulative impacts of development are severe*'. Although there are concerns about reducing on street parking provision in the vicinity they are not considered to significant enough to have a severe impact on the highway network.

### **Neighbour Representations:**

Objections have been received from the following neighbouring properties;

18 Roseland's Avenue  
20 Roseland's Avenue  
24 Roseland's Avenue  
Petition signed by 42 local residents

Covering the following points;

- Over development
- Site is already developed to the rear
- Demand for on street parking
- Type of property (studio flats) is not in keeping with the area which is mainly single family dwellings
- Creating crossover reduces on street parking
- Detrimental to road safety adjacent to corner

### **Appraisal:**

#### Principle of development:

There is no objection in principle to the erection of a side extension or the provision of additional residential units in this location, providing there would be no significant impact on the amenity of the surrounding properties and the

design was appropriate for the setting in accordance with relevant sections of the NPPF 2012, policies of the Core Strategy Local Plan 2012 and saved policies of the Borough Plan 2007.

The rear of 1 and 2 Baillie Avenue was previously subdivided and has recently been developed with a block of 4 self-contained flats, with off-street parking to the front with access onto Roseland's Avenue. This application proposes a further two units on the site with three off-street parking spaces with access from Roseland's Avenue. The remaining corner plot is fairly large and would leave a reasonable sized garden to the rear for the remaining dwelling house. However the further two units is considered to be over development of the corner site.

#### Impact of proposed development on amenity of adjoining occupiers and surrounding area:

Policy HO20 of the Eastbourne Local Plan requires new development proposals and extensions to existing buildings to respect residential amenity. Policy B2 of the Core Strategy seeks to protect the residential and environmental amenity of existing and future residents. Given the semi-detached nature of the property and as it is a corner plot it is not considered the extension would have a significant impact in terms of loss of light or outlook to surrounding residential properties.

The National Planning Policy Framework promotes a presumption in favour of sustainable development unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits.

The type of development, two small studio flats, is not considered in keeping with the surrounding residential uses which are a mixture of self-contained flats and houses. The type of development, an additional two residential units, to this plot results in an over-development of the site which would be detrimental to the surrounding area.

#### Amenity of future occupiers

The proposed studio flats are each approximately 18.5m<sup>2</sup> in floor area, including a separate shower room. This is considered small for residential accommodation. Whilst we do not have adopted policy in relation to sizes of residential accommodation the Nationally Described Space Standards set a floor area of 39m<sup>2</sup> for a 1 bed 1 person flat. Although this application proposes studios which are not covered by these space standards as nationally there is a move away from studio flats this is approximately half the suggested floor space for a 1 person flat. It is considered that the studios would provide substandard accommodation due to the small size which is considered contrary to policy B2 of the Core Strategy 2012 which states that proposals should protect the residential amenity of existing and future residents.

Design issues:

Planning permission was previously approved in February 2015 for the erection of a two storey extension to the property to provide a store at ground floor and two bedrooms at first floor similar in size to the extension the subject of this application. The previously approved extension was approximately half the width of the original dwelling which in design terms is appropriate. This proposal is wider by approximately a further 0.5m however there is no objection in principle to the size of the extension if it was to be used in conjunction with the existing dwelling house.

The extension is set back marginally from the front elevation and will be constructed in materials to match the host building, therefore it is not considered that a ground for refusal on design could be justified.

Impacts on trees:

None.

Impacts on highway network or access:

The majority of the objections are in relation to the impact on the demand for on-street parking by the creation of two additional units. The application proposes parking to the rear, one space for the remaining dwelling, and one for each studio flat. This is considered sufficient for the level of proposed development. However there would be an impact on on-street parking as the extension to the existing drop curb would mean the loss of on street parking in an area of high demand. However it is not considered the proposal would have a significant impact on the demand for on-street parking to warrant a refusal of the application on these grounds.

Ultimately any planning permission should be considered against paragraph 32 of the National Planning Policy Framework on highway impacts. This states that '*Development should only be prevented on or refused on transport grounds where the residual cumulative impacts of development are severe*'. Although there are concerns about reducing on street parking provision in the vicinity they are not considered to significant enough to have a severe impact on the highway network.

Planning obligations:

Given the proposal is for flats there would be no requirement for a Community Infrastructure Levy Charge. Also given the number of units proposed there would be no requirement for an affordable housing contribution.

Sustainable development implications:

None.

Other matters:

None.

**Human Rights Implications:**

The impacts of the proposal have been assessed as part of the application process. Consultation with the community has been undertaken and the impact on local people is set out above. The human rights considerations have been taken into account fully in balancing the planning issues; and furthermore the proposals will not result in any breach of the Equalities Act 2010.

**Recommendation:**

Refuse

The provision of two additional residential units to this corner plot is considered to constitute over development which would be detrimental to the surrounding residential area and the small size of the proposed units is considered to provide substandard accommodation for future occupiers contrary to Policy B2 of the Core Strategy Local Plan 2013.