



CHICHESTER CITY COUNCIL

PLANNING ADVISER'S REPORT FOR THE

PLANNING AND CONSERVATION COMMITTEE ON 15 FEBRUARY 2017

- (i) CC/17/00002/FUL
46 South Street Chichester PO19 1DS
Attic storey extension to create an additional apartment

Introduction

This application relates to 46 South Street and proposes an "Attic storey extension to create an additional apartment". The three storey property has a retail unit at ground floor and first floor with residential above. It is not listed but is flanked by the Grade II* properties Richmond House to the north and the Regnum Club to the south on the east side of South Street, within the Conservation Area.

Background

An earlier application (CC/15/00726/FUL) sought consent to retain the existing street façade and redevelop and extend the remainder of the building to accommodate an improved retail outlet at ground floor level with five flats above, including a small penthouse. The Committee resolved to "Object to the mansard roof and second floor extension as this would produce a bulky, unsightly building which would be harmful to the appearance of the conservation area and overbearing on the listed building to the north". The application was subsequently withdrawn.

A further application for "Extension and refurbishment works, including a change of use from retail (first and second floors only) to residential to create four units. Retail use to be retained on the ground floor" was permitted (CC/15/01445/FUL).

The permitted scheme retained the existing street facade and proposed to redevelop and partially extend the remainder of the building to accommodate an improved retail outlet at ground floor level, with living accommodation above. This comprises 3 flats (1 x 2 bed flat and 1 x 1 bed flat and 1 studio flat at second floor level), all of which will be accessed from the rear of the building. The reduction in the level of accommodation was achieved by removing the proposed mansard roof and reducing the depth of the rear extension at second floor level by 6m to about 9m.

It was considered that whilst the removal of the proposed mansard roof was an improvement, the reduction of the second floor extension was insufficient to alleviate concerns about the bulky and unsightly appearance and the harm to the conservation area and adjacent listed building. The Committee resolved to: "Object to the second storey extension as this would produce a bulky, unsightly building which would be harmful to the appearance of the conservation area and overbearing on the listed building to the north".

The Proposal

The current proposal seeks to reintroduce an additional floor in the form of a pitch roof with two dormer windows on the front of the building, with a flat roof extending about 12.5m. over the second floor then 9m. over an extended second floor to the rear. This would create 1 x 1bed & 1 x 2bed first floor; 2 x 2bed second floor and 1 x 1bed in the attic floor.

The applicants seek to justify residential accommodation at fourth floor level by reference to a number of examples which (they say) illustrates that four-storey accommodation is prevalent within Chichester's city centre and forms an intrinsic part of its historic character. They submit that historic photographs show the eaves line of the previous building to occupy this site was higher than that of 47 South Street and its ridge line also appears to have risen to a greater height.

The elevation the building presents to South Street will be enhanced through the removal of the parapet, creation of a dentilated eaves and construction of a pitched roof of characteristic pitch, materials and details. The use of hanging slate to the upper two floors of the side and rear elevations will help to articulate the form and prevent it from appearing as a singular volume.

It is also submitted that the full depth of the building will not be developed, only that part which has already been permitted to be constructed at three storeys. This responds to the issues of neighbourliness and access to light raised in the previous application. Furthermore the applicants maintain that the amount of development is appropriate, responding to the scale and massing of the Regnum Club to the south and mediating between that, its rear ranges and 47 South Street to the north. Furthermore, due to the height of the proposed extension and its position to the south west of the neighbouring property and to the front of the larger Regnum Club building, it would not have an overbearing impact upon the neighbouring properties or result in loss of light. A computer modelling analysis demonstrates that the proposed extension would have a negligible impact upon the shading of 47 South Street and Richmond Cottage, due to the taller structures located to the rear of the Regnum Club.

Planning Adviser Comments

It is considered that whilst there may be a historical precedent for a higher roof on the front of the building, the rearward extension will still result in a bulky, unsightly building which would be harmful to the appearance of the conservation area and overbearing on the listed building to the north.

Recommendation: Object to second and third floor rear extension as this would produce a bulky, unsightly building which would be harmful to the appearance of the conservation area and overbearing on the listed building to the north.



CHICHESTER CITY COUNCIL

PLANNING ADVISER'S REPORT FOR THE PLANNING AND CONSERVATION COMMITTEE ON 15 FEBRUARY 2017

- (ii) CC/16/00154/FUL
Replacement dwelling and detached garage with associated works
Northwood, Chestnut Ave.

Introduction

The application site is located within the residential area of Summersdale on the western side of Chestnut Avenue, close to the junction with The Drive, with vehicular access to both Chestnut Avenue and The Drive to the north. Northwood occupies a large plot, roughly rectangular in shape extending approximately 45m deep by 22m wide, with a second vehicular access to the north, running between the properties 'Cobley' to the east and 'Huntersmeet' to the west. The existing site comprises a detached chalet bungalow providing three bedrooms, two within the loft space and includes a detached flat roofed garage to the northern site boundary.

This part of Summersdale is characterised by mainly large detached houses of individual character set back and facing the road, interspersed with apartment buildings designed to appear as large detached properties.

The proposal seeks to demolish the existing chalet bungalow on site and construct a large detached two-storey dwelling.

Background

The area is predominantly residential which has experienced in recent years the redevelopment and subdivision of plots to create additional houses. For example:

- The demolition of White Eaves to the south of the application property and its replacement with a detached 5-bed dwelling and a pair of semi-detached houses. Permission Ref: CC/13/01457/FUL.
- Demolition of both White Eaves and Doric House adjacent and the construction of four detached dwellings, in addition to the detached 5-bed dwelling already approved, Permission Ref: CC/13/02965/FUL.
- Demolition of the existing dwelling and erection of two dwellings at Lever House, 20A Lavant Road. Permission Ref: CC/15/03442/FUL.
- Demolition of a single dwelling and construction of a terrace of five two and a half storey town houses, corner of Lavant Road and Hunters Way. Permission Ref: CC/05/00977/FUL.

The Proposal

The application proposes a large 5 bedroom detached two-storey dwelling in place of the existing chalet bungalow. The applicants submit that, in view of the size of the plot and the character of the area, the replacement house has been designed to have a spacious layout and good sized gardens, with the rear garden extending to over 21m in depth and a landscaped front garden with generous parking. The separation gap between the replacement dwelling and northern and southern boundaries would be 4.2m and 5.8m respectively.

The proposed house has been designed as a high quality detached dwelling with accommodation over three floors, the proposed roof form is broken up with hipped ends to reduce massing and the height of the ridge acknowledges existing development on Chestnut Avenue.

The architectural approach focuses on a traditional design with a hipped clay tiled roof featuring bonnet hips and a central oak entrance porch flanked by gables. A double height bay window with timber sliding sash windows provides a feature of interest to the front elevation. The materials palette is reflective of the local vernacular with high quality red/orange brickwork, clay tiles to the roof, clay tile hanging at first floor level and feature windows contributing interest and character to the streetscape.

Given the size of the plot and significant gaps which would exist between the proposed property and the existing neighbours, together with existing screening, the proposals are not likely to give rise to overlooking concerns or be detrimental to residential amenity in any respect.

The existing accesses from Chestnut Avenue and The Drive would be retained and a garage/garden room and hardstanding is proposed to the western boundary, accessed from The Drive. Provision for car parking has also been made on a gravel hard standing forward of the proposed dwelling. The hard standing would allow for the parking of at least three cars clear of the highway and would allow for vehicle turning, in order for vehicles to exit the site in forward gear.

The proposals recognise the location of mature landscaping and protected trees on land adjacent to the highway. All trees are to be retained and will be protected during the construction phase in order to retain the well-established planting to the site boundaries and the verdant character of the area.

Planning Adviser Comments

The application site lies within an established residential area, wherein there have been a number of redevelopments, notably to the south of the application site where 5 detached dwellings have replaced two originals. The principle of a suitable redevelopment has largely been established in this area.

The replacement house is larger than the existing property, extending up to 14.5m in depth at two storey level by 11.5m in width and has a 10m x 6.5m single storey rear extension. The proposed front elevation of the main house projects 3m in front of the building line to the north and 4.5m to the south, but is still 9m back from the pavement. The rear garden extends 13 – 21m from the rear of the property. A gap of 4.5m and 6m is proposed between the north and south boundaries respectively.

In spatial terms, it is considered that the plot can accommodate the replacement dwelling without appearing cramped or overdeveloped, even with the addition of a proposed garage (11.5m x 5m) on the access to The Drive.

In terms of the house design, the traditional characteristics of a hipped roof, chimney gabled frontages and bay windows with clay tile hanging and facing brickwork are appropriate within this area. Whilst the proposed building has three floors of accommodation, the overall height of 8.6m is not excessive and would be in keeping with the scale of other properties in the area.

With respect the impact upon amenity, the main windows face down the gardens with mainly obscure wc. windows in the flanks and veluxes in the roof, which would not normally facilitate overlooking. Potentially of concern is the view of the northern elevation from The Drive, however, the new dwelling is set further forward than the existing and on balance, the impact should be acceptable.

Recommendation: No objection



CHICHESTER CITY COUNCIL

PLANNING ADVISER'S REPORT FOR THE

PLANNING AND CONSERVATION COMMITTEE ON 15 FEBRUARY 2017

- (iii) CC/17/000219/FUL
34 Ormonde Avenue
Chichester

Introduction

The application site comprises 34 Ormonde Avenue, a three bedroom brick property and a square shaped lawned garden area beyond the rear boundary of the property. Together the total area for the site measures 0.1ha with the land to the rear measuring 0.08ha.

It lies adjacent to numbers 28, 30, 32, 34 Ormonde Ave. and south of numbers 1, 3, 5, 7 Velyn Avenue, with the Council allotments located to the south and west. Velyn and Ormonde Avenues are characterised by blocks of terraced residential properties arranged in groups of four. Between the groups are pathways which provide access to the rear of the properties.

The proposal is for "Demolition of existing dwelling and erection of 3 no. dwellings, with associated access, parking and landscaping- (resubmission of 16/02363/FUL)".

Background

A previous application was considered by the Committee for 3 dwellings (CC/16/02363/FUL). The Committee resolved to make "Strong objections on the grounds that the cramped relationship between the houses and the limited parking and turning areas equates to an overdevelopment of the site. Furthermore, there are serious concerns about the likely impact upon wildlife, trees and landscaping, the potential for flooding and highway safety at the junction of the proposed access and Ormonde Avenue".

Over 40 letters of objection were submitted and planning permission was subsequently refused by the District Council on the grounds that the proposal would result in an incongruous form of development which would fail to reflect the existing pattern and character of an area; the site is located within Flood Zones 2 and 3 and development should not be permitted if there are reasonably available alternative sites and the site is located within the 5.6km 'zone of influence' of the Chichester and Langstone Harbour's Special Protection Area and the applicant has failed to make sufficient mitigation.

The Proposal

The proposed demolition of 34 Ormonde Avenue is to create a vehicular access to the land to the rear and facilitate the construction of 3 no. 3 bedroom terraced dwellings with associated parking. The dwellings are east facing two storey units, each plot has two parking spaces located adjacent or opposite the properties.

The applicants have identified the differences from the earlier submission:

- The 3 detached dwellings have been replaced with a small terrace of 3 dwellings to reflect the surrounding pattern of development.
- The two storey projecting bay features and associated decorative gables have been replaced with single storey bay windows at ground floor level, more in keeping with the surrounding area.
- The parking layout has been amended to increase the distance between parking spaces and the front elevation of the proposed units and providing additional turning space within the front forecourt.
- A communal bin store is now provided within the front forecourt instead of the rear garden.
- A cherry tree is removed on the eastern boundary to accommodate car parking and additional landscaping to accommodate is proposed.

The applicants have also supplied information in support of this application:

- Density - the proposal is 30 dwellings per hectare (in accordance with Section 17 of the Chichester Local Plan) which advises that in general new housing development on greenfield and brownfield land should be broadly 35 dwellings per hectare. However higher densities may be sought in urban areas.

Taking a sample size of numbers 2-48 Ormonde Avenue the density of this area is 48 dwellings per hectare. It is therefore considered that the amount of housing proposed on the site should be considered appropriate in relation to policy and to the surrounding area.

- The design is similar to the existing properties and it has reduced the bulk of the rooflines with a hipped design on the rear replacing the original gable.
- Layout – The demolition of no. 34 would leave a gap which is not prominent. The proposed dwellings are over 35m away from the rear elevation of the existing properties along Ormonde Avenue to the east and over 25m from properties to the north on Velyn Avenue. This minimises the impact upon neighbouring properties and as the height is comparable with existing development, the overall impact on the streetscape is insignificant.
- The garden sizes are considered to provide an appropriate level of outdoor amenity for this type of development.
- Access and Car Parking - the proposals provide two parking spaces per dwelling, in accordance with West Sussex County Council's Parking Standards, it is assumed that visitors could park on street.
- The biodiversity of the site has been taken into account, the scheme will be serviced by an appropriate access road and a sustainable construction method will be employed.
- Flood resilience measures are to be incorporated including raised floor levels, sensitive landscaping and sustainable surface water drainage systems.

Planning Adviser Comments

The site is located outside the conservation area and the dwelling at 34 Ormonde Avenue is not a listed building. Planning permission is not normally required for the demolition of a dwellinghouse and therefore this aspect cannot form part of the material considerations.

All of the site lies within the settlement boundary of Chichester and comprises a private house and associated curtilage including a rear garden area (containing a summer house and lawn), in a

sustainable brownfield location. In principle, this would be an appropriate site for a suitable form of residential development.

The proposed terraced houses are sited in a single block with no separate access to the rear garden of the mid terrace unit. The height of the houses (which has been reduced from 9m to 8m) is about average and the design with ground floor bay windows and rear hipped gable roof to the rear is a conventional approach. The scale and design of the individual houses is not considered to be inappropriate.

The proposed houses are located more centrally within the site than the previous scheme with 4.4m (previously 3m) from the northern boundary, 9m from the west, 4.7m (previously 2m) from the south and 12m from the east. This places the houses at an average of about 26/27m from the rear elevations of properties in Velyn Ave. and Ormonde Ave. and 11m from the front elevations to the eastern site boundary. This is unlikely to result in an unacceptable level of overlooking and loss of visual amenity to neighbouring properties.

However, access to the site is achieved by demolishing this end of terrace property and creating a driveway which is about 36m in length and between 3.7m – 4.2m in width. (4.2m is about sufficient for two cars to pass). This leaves a gap of 1.8m to the side wall of no.32. to the south. Parking is arranged with two spaces per unit with no visitor parking.

This is a long narrow access route, particularly for service vehicles, which have limited turning space at the end. It is also considered that the parking and turning spaces for residents are inadequate and that additional space should be allowed for visitors. The adjacent properties (particularly to the south of the access road) are inevitably going to experience additional noise and disturbance from the development from vehicle movements and general activity associated with three dwellings.

It is important to retain the boundary hedgerows and tree planting to alleviate the visual impact of the development, especially as there are views of the site from the open space to the west. Issues of flooding and biodiversity are considered by the specialists at the District Council.

In summary, this is a sustainable site close to the City Centre. Inevitably “backland development”, which is becoming increasingly common in the area, raises concerns about access, impact upon the amenity of neighbours and the wider visual impact upon the locality.

In this case the extensive driveway leading to the development, results in a difficult access and turning for service and residents vehicles and no parking for visitors.

It is also considered that the level of traffic movements and general disturbance in this quiet location is likely to result in some loss of amenity to neighbouring properties, but there is not likely to be significant overlooking because of the separation distances.

The design of the proposed dwellings is considered to be appropriate for this locality; however, their close proximity will result in a block of development, with no visual gap.

Overall, it is considered on balance, that whilst this is a suitable site for a suitable form of residential development, the current proposal is cramped with insufficient room for parking and turning vehicles and will have an adverse impact upon the amenity of the area.

Recommendation: Objection on the grounds of overdevelopment as the current proposal is cramped with insufficient room for the parking and turning of vehicles and it would be likely to be harmful to the amenity of nearby residents as a result of additional disturbance and traffic generation.