WEST SUSSEX COUNTY COUNCIL CONSULTATION

TO:	Horsham District Council FAO: Shazia Penne
FROM:	WSCC – Highways Authority
DATE:	25 April 2024
LOCATION:	3 Foxholes Rudgwick West Sussex RH12 3DX
SUBJECT:	DC/24/0026 Erection of a two story side extension, conversion of existing garage on ground floor to a self-contained annexe. First floor providing additional habitable space to main house. Extension of existing conservatory footprint across entire rear elevation with a flat roof. Amended plans received.
DATE OF SITE VISIT:	n/a
RECOMMENDATION:	Advice

This application has been dealt with in accordance with the Development Control Scheme protocol for small scale proposals.

I refer to your consultation in respect of the above planning application and would provide the following comments.

Summary
The proposal seeks to erect a side extension to the existing dwelling at 3 Foxholes including conversion of garage on ground floor to create a self-contained annexe and on first floor create additional habitable living space. The proposal would see the removal of a potential parking provision within the garage although the application form states that it is currently not in use for this purpose.

Access
The site is accessed via Foxholes, a D classified road subject to 30mph speed restrictions. From observation of WSCC mapping data, there appear to have been no recorded accidents or personal injury claims within the vicinity of the access to the property to flag any concerns with the existing operation. The proposed annexe is not anticipated to give rise to a severe material increase in vehicular movements over that already generated by the dwellings.

Foxholes is approximately 5m in width along its length with allocated parking bays also present; any parking on the carriageway may restrict the ability for two vehicles to travel in opposing directions at the same time. One vehicle may be required to wait while another passes if parking is present. However, the presence of enforceable waiting restrictions at the junction to Church Street and the presence of residential accesses along the road provide sufficient space for vehicles to wait while another passes.

Parking
The accommodation is to be solely for purposes ancillary to the occupation and enjoyment of the property as a whole, as a single dwelling house and shall not be used as a separate dwelling. Therefore as a single unit, as previously advised would generate the requirement for three parking spaces.

The existing garage has previously undergone internal arrangements which have included a utility room inside, therefore the garage in its current format could not accommodate two vehicles. WSCC specifications for a garage space are 3m x 6m for a single and 6m x 6m for a double, based upon the submitted plans at best the garage has a 2.75m x 5.3m usable internal space which may be possible to accommodate a small car, however falls short of the required specification and therefore does not count towards the existing provision.

The LHA will only consider the impact of overspill parking from a safety perspective; matters of amenity would be a matter for the consideration of the Local Planning Authority. While it is likely that some overspill parking may occur it is not considered that this would be detrimental to highway safety and key locations in the public highway are subject to enforceable parking restrictions.

I note representations made online relating to on street parking. On street parking cannot be restricted and is open for all users of Foxholes. I note concerns surrounding the co-op overspill parking- these trips are likely temporary and the co-op has its own allocated provision. On street parking is offered on a first come first served basis.

Conclusion
The LHA are required to consider the merits of the application submitted. Comments made in this report relate to the development proposed, as set out above. Any further applications on the site would be considered on their own merits at the time of submission.

The LHA does not consider that the proposal would have a 'severe' impact on the operation of the highway network, therefore is not contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework (para 115), and there are no known transport grounds to resist the proposal.

Jodie Wilkes
West Sussex County Council – Planning Services