DELEGATED APPLICATIONS - ASSESSMENT SHEET

APPLICATION NO./ADDRESS:
DC/24/0306
26 Weston Avenue, Broadbridge Heath, West Sussex, RH12 3XE

DESCRIPTION:
Conversion of existing garage into habitable space and erection of a single storey side extension

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY:

DC/16/1073	Reserved Matters application for the residential element of outline planning permission DC/13/2408, comprising 165 residential units, including 66 affordable units, and associated, parking, landscaping, and open space	Application Permitted on 31.10.2016.
DC/22/0852	Erection of a single storey rear extension.	Application Permitted on 27.06.2022.

RELEVANT PLANNING POLICIES
The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

Horsham District Planning Framework (2015):
Policy 31- Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity
Policy 32- Strategic Policy: The Quality of New Development
Policy 33- Development Principles
Policy 40- Sustainable Transport
Policy 41- Parking

Neighbourhood Plan:
Broadbridge Heath has not been designated as a Neighbourhood Plan area.

REPRESENTATIONS AND CONSULTATIONS RESPONSES

Consultations:

WSCC Highways: Comment: -
This application seeks the conversion of existing garage to habitable space and erection of single-storey side extension. The site is located on Weston Avenue, an unadopted road – as such, these comments should be considered as advice only.

An existing garage will be lost as part of the proposals, and the driveway will be reduced in depth. Space for one off-street parking space will be retained. The potential displacement of two cars would therefore have to be accommodated on-street. Whilst this would not be anticipated to give rise to a highway safety concern or parking capacity issue in this location, the LPA may wish to consider the potential impacts on on-street parking from an amenity point of view.

In summary, the LHA does not consider that this proposal would have an unacceptable impact on highway safety or result in 'severe' cumulative impacts on the operation of the highway network,

therefore is not contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework (paragraph 115), and that there are no transport grounds to resist the proposal.

Natural England: Standing Advice: -

It cannot be concluded that existing abstraction within the Sussex North Water Supply Zone is not having an adverse effect on the integrity of the Arun Valley SAC/SPA/Ramsar sites. Developments within Sussex North must therefore must not add to this impact and one way of achieving this is to demonstrate water neutrality. The definition of water neutrality is the use of water in the supply area before the development is the same or lower after the development is in place.

To achieve this Natural England is working in partnership with all the relevant authorities to secure water neutrality collectively through a water neutrality strategy. Whilst the strategy is evolving, Natural England advises that decisions on planning applications should await its completion. However, if there are applications which a planning authority deems critical to proceed in the absence of the strategy, then Natural England advises that any application needs to demonstrate water neutrality.

Parish Comments:
No specific objections. However, the committee did raise concerns relating to the reduction in parking space. It was also noted that the proximity to the neighbouring property leaves very limited space for the construction phase detail should be sought on how this will be managed, material/equipment/waste storage, etc.

Representations:
None received.

HUMAN RIGHTS AND EQUALITY:

The application has been considered having regard to Article 1 of the First Protocol of the Human Rights Act 1998, which sets out a person's rights to the peaceful enjoyment of property and Article 8 of the same Act, which sets out their rights in respect to private and family life and for the home. Officers consider that the proposal would not be contrary to the provisions of the above Articles.

The application has also been considered in accordance with Horsham District Council's public sector equality duty, which seeks to prevent unlawful discrimination, to promote equality of opportunity and to foster good relations between people in a diverse community, in accordance with Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010. In this case, the proposal is not anticipated to have any potential impact from an equality perspective.

PLANNING ASSESSMENT

Character and Appearance

Policy 32 and 33 of the HDPF seeks to ensure that development promotes a high standard and quality of design in order to enhance and protect locally distinctive characters. The policies also seek to ensure that the scale, massing, and appearance of development relates sympathetically with the built surroundings, landscape, open spaces, and routes within and adjoining the site, including any impact on the skyline and important views.

26 Weston Avenue is a detached dwelling located within the built-up area of Broadbridge Heath. It is currently a 3-bedroom property, but through the extensions and alterations would become a 5-bedroom property. Planning permission is sought to convert the existing garage into habitable space and erect a single storey side extension for additional habitable space. The proposed extension would follow a similar building design to the existing garage, with a pitched roof. The extension would not extend as close to the shared boundary as the garage, maintaining a distance of 0.5m. The extension would be set back from the existing building line, in order to maintain a subservient appearance, and this would also be hidden from public vantage points in the wider area by the neighbouring property.

The proposal would be a subservient addition, considered to match the design and form of the existing garage and uses materials that would match the existing dwellinghouse. The design, form and scale, is considered appropriate to the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and is not considered to harm the character or appearance of the wider area. It is therefore considered that the visual impact of the proposal is acceptable and would accord with the above polices.

Impact on Neighbouring Amenity

Policy 33 of the HDPF states that permission will be granted for development that does not cause unacceptable harm to the amenity of the occupiers/users of nearby properties and land.

It is considered that the siting and layout of the proposed extension and the resulting relationship with adjoining properties would be sufficient to prevent any unacceptable harm to neighbouring amenity.

Impact on Parking Provision

Policy 41 of the HDPF states that adequate parking and facilities must be provided within developments to meet the needs of anticipated users. Development which involves the loss of existing parking spaces will only be allowed if suitable alternative provision has been secured elsewhere or the need for the development overrides the loss of parking and where necessary measures are in place to mitigate against the impact.

The dwelling is a detached two-storey 3-bedroom property, the proposed extensions would make the dwelling a 5-bedroom property. The existing parking arrangement comprises one parking space contained within the existing garage, and two parking spaces in front of the garage, on a driveway. The site is located on Weston Avenue, an unclassified road that is not subject of parking restrictions (double yellow and/or resident parking permits).

Broadbridge Heath falls into Parking Behaviour Zone 2 of the WSCC Parking Demand Calculator. The West Sussex County Council Guidance on Parking at New Developments (September 2020) states that expected levels of parking demand in residential development should be determined, where appropriate, taking account of location (parking behaviour zone), dwelling size (rooms), parking provision (allocated or unallocated), and arrangements for control/enforcement (charges, etc.). Calculation of expected levels of parking demand should normally be based on local or comparable data taking account of forecast changes in demand for the local plan period.

Table 2 within the West Sussex County Council Guidance on Parking at New Developments (September 2020) indicates that a 3-bed dwelling within Parking Behaviour Zone 2 would be anticipated to provide 2.1 off-road parking spaces. As the application proposes to make the dwelling at 5-bedroom dwelling, it is anticipated that this would need to provide 2.7 off-road parking spaces.

The subject dwelling currently provides 1 garage space and 2 parking spaces in front of the garage. The loss of the garage space and partial loss of the driveway would result in only 1 off-street parking space being provided, which would be an undersupply of 2no off-street parking spaces. The reduction of 2 parking spaces would exacerbate the existing parking pressures within the locality.

The applicant's personal circumstances are noted by the Council. The Equalities Act (2010) is considered regarding protected characteristics and the Council is mindful of the reason for the application. There must be due regard to identified Equality policy objectives of the Council, as found within the adopted Single Equality Scheme, in taking any decisions that may affect a person with protected characteristics defined under the Equalities Act (2010). While this is acknowledged and considered, due to the loss of parking, which cannot be offset sufficient elsewhere, the proposal is not considered acceptable. Extension to the dwelling is not ruled out, as there may be potential for rear expansion that may alleviate the current reason for refusal.

Whilst it is recognised that parking within the locality includes parking on the street, where such parking is restricted, the undersupply of off-street parking spaces at the application site is considered to put additional demand within the immediate vicinity and locality. It is noted that while the retention of

garages was not conditioned on the original planning permission ref: DC/16/1073, parking was detailed within plan; *Planning Layout 061505-BEL-SL-01* which annotated the parking spaces available to each dwelling, which in this case was 3. It is considered that the site was planned to provide adequate parking for the development in the interests of highway safety, where an increase in on-street parking has the potential to adversely impact highway safety.

A recent appeal has been determined by the Planning Inspectorate within the last year that support the Council's case on the parking matters as highlighted above, which was located within a new build estate: DC/23/0652 40 Carter Drive (APP/Z3825/D/23/3325522). In the case of this appeal, similarly, the appellant proposed to part convert the garage into a home office, thus result in the loss of one off street car parking space. At paragraph 11 of their report, the Inspector noted physical constraints on the street for on-street parking, owing to narrow highway and footpaths, and that the increase in on-street parking would 'result in disrupting the free flow of vehicles'.

On the basis of the above, it is considered that the loss of 2 off-street parking spaces, which would subsequently fail to address the anticipated needs of the 5-bed dwelling, would detrimentally affect the interests of highway safety. The proposal would therefore be contrary to policy 41 of the HDPF.

Water Neutrality

There is no clear or compelling evidence to suggest the nature and scale of the proposed development would result in a more intensive occupation of the dwelling necessitating an increased consumption of water that would result in a significant impact on the Arun Valley SAC, SPA and Ramsar sites, either alone or in combination with other plans and projects. The grant of planning permission would not therefore adversely affect the integrity of these sites or otherwise conflict with policy 31 of the HDPF, NPPF paragraph 180 and the Council's obligations under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017.

Other Matters

It is noted that the site is located within an Archaeological Notification Area. Given the scale of the proposed extension and existing built-up nature of the surroundings, it is not considered that the proposal would have a detrimental impact on any historical artefacts or remains.

Conclusion

The proposal is not considered to comply with relevant local and national planning policies and is therefore recommended for refusal.

Recommendation: Application Refused

Reason for Refusal:

1. The proposed development would result in the loss of a garage and an inadequate level of on-site parking provision, which would adversely impact highway safety. It has not been demonstrated that the suitable alternative provision could be secured or that the need for the development overrides the loss of parking. The proposal would therefore be contrary to Policy 41 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

POSITIVE AND PROACTIVE STATEMENT

Statement pursuant to Article 35 of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015. The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by assessing the proposal against all material considerations, including planning policies and any representations that may have been received, in order to be able to, where possible, grant permission.

Plans list for: DC/24/0306
Schedule of plans/documents **not approved**:

Plan Type	Description	Drawing Number	Received Date
Location & Block plan		A03 REV P1	23.02.2024
Elevation & Floor plan	Roof, as existing	A01 REV P1	23.02.2024
Elevation & Floor plan	Roof, as proposed	A02 REV P1	23.02.2024

DELEGATED

Case Officer sign/initial Bethan Tinning Date: 22.04.2024

Authorising Officer sign/initial RHERMITAGE Date: 23.04.2024