expires:
25.09.09.

Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: ADC/0296/09 Recommendation - REFUSE

Site: **Elreg House, 58 Rosslyn Road, Shoreham-by-Sea, West Sussex, BN43 6WP**

Proposal: **Enlarged replacement single-storey east side/rear extension to provide enlarged dining room and bedrooms with ensuite facilities (increasing total number of rooms from 19 to 21).**

The Application

The application relates to a detached chalet-style bungalow on the south side of the road within the residential built-up area of Shoreham. The site is currently in use as a 19 bedroom care home with a 23 person occupancy.

The building has been modified and extended over the years since the original change of use from a residential property to a care home in 1962 (173/62). Currently the building has a relatively conventional main front section with a tiled hipped west side extension, and tiled hipped east side small projecting element. The two tiled additions have different eaves heights to that of the original building. To the far east of the building is a former detached garage, which has been converted into habitable accommodation with the addition of a front wall with window where usually there would be a garage door. The former garage has been now attached to the building by the means of infilling the passageway between the two sections. It has been attached to the rear by other living accommodation which extends a total of 22.5m from the front of the former garage to the rear. The property has five small roof dormers, four of which are small tiled hip-roof dormers (two in the south roof plane, one to the east and one on the north), one additional flat roofed dormer is located in the north roof slope.

Permission is sought for the demolition of five of the existing rooms located on the east of the building, (comprised of the converted garage and rear extension) and the erection of a new single storey side extension with flat roof (minimal 3 degree pitch). The extension would house seven bedrooms and an additional dining room (a net increase of 2 bedrooms). The bedrooms would be served by an east side corridor adjacent to the boundary, with each room having an outlook onto an existing raised decking area (adjacent to an existing rear projection housing 5 further bedrooms). The proposed extension would be 4.2m in width at the front (north) and extend to being 7.5m at the widest point to the rear, it would be 32m in length (front to back) and the height would be 3.1m to the apex of the shallow roof on the north elevation increasing to 3.5m at the rearmost point, due to the sloping site.

To the east of the application site are three dwellings located in Rosslyn Avenue. No's 15 & 16 are a pair of semi-detached houses, located directly to

the east of the existing series of extensions. They have small rear gardens 4m in depth, but have larger side gardens, the whole depth of the dwellings. No.15 is separated from the site by a 1.6m high fence, and No.16 by the same fence and a hedge which is 3m in height.

Further to the South is No.17 Rosslyn Avenue a chalet-style bungalow, again with a shallow rear garden of 5.3m in depth. It too is also bounded in part by the high hedge growing on the side of the care home, but it is well maintained by the owner of No.17, and is approximately 2.5m in height. Part of the boundary is made up by a brick wall surrounding the occupants patio area.

Relevant site history

173/62 – Change of use to care home. Approved 04.09.62
251/63 – Extension. Approved 08.10.63
71A/64 – Extension. Approved 04.08.64
285/65 – Garage extension. Approved 07.12.65
95/81 – Conversion of living quarters and covered way to bedroom and lounge. Approved 06.05.81
SU/101/82 – Enclosure of front of garage by wall with window (to replace garage doors). Approved 10.09.82
SU/36/84 – Extension to provide 12 single rooms and alterations to common rooms. Refused 03.04.84
SU/190/84 – Extension to provide 7 single rooms and alterations to common rooms. Approved 11.12.84
SU/223/85 – Retrospective application for additional fire exit. Approved 14.01.86

The planning application for an extension to house 12 single rooms was proposed to be two-storey with a mansard roof, projecting from the west side of the original dwelling. It was refused for the reasons that: -

1. *The proposed extension, by reason of its large scale and proximity to the adjoining property, projecting well beyond the rear of the dwellings to the west, would be out of keeping and incompatible with existing development in the locality, and would have a detrimental effect on the environment and present character of the area.*
2. *Adequate provision cannot be made on the site for the parking of vehicles in a satisfactory manner to the standard required by the Local Planning Authority.*

West Sussex County Council: The Highways Officer states that from an inspection of the plans alone the proposals are not anticipated to result in a significant increase in vehicle movements, and the most recently available verified accident records reveal there have been no personal injury accidents in the vicinity of the existing access, indicating a low risk of highway safety issues. West Sussex County Council therefore has no highway safety concerns regarding the application.

Adur District Council: there are no Environmental Health objections to the application.

Third Parties: There have been no third party objections to the proposals.

Relevant Planning Policies and Guidance

Adopted Adur District Local Plan 1993-2006 (ADC 1996) (saved policies): AG1, AH10, AH7 and Appendix II 'Supplementary Planning Guidance' comprising: Development Control Standard No.3 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings.'
PPS 1 'Delivering Sustainable Development' (ODPM 2005)

Policies
Policy AG1 of the Local Plan requires development not to detract from the existing urban local environment.

Policy AH10 of the local plan relates to changes of use and conversions of dwellinghouses to residential care, nursing and other types of home. It states that permission will be granted provided that the buildings are within the built-up area with good access to community and public transport facilities; the building is large and detached and has an extensive curtilage with adequate amenity space in the order of 10 square metres per resident; and sufficient separation from neighbouring dwellings; and access and car parking provision is acceptable under Policy AT12. With regards to existing residential care/nursing homes, extensions will only be permitted where they comply fully with policy AH7.

Policy AH7 of the Local Plan states that extensions and alterations should be designed so as not to result in an unacceptable degree of overlooking, a loss of natural light or an overbearing effect on neighbouring dwellings. They should be of sympathetic design and materials to the original dwelling and the area in general, the proportion of the garden area taken by the proposal would not be excessive having regard to the character of the area.

Government policy is set out in Planning Policy Statement PPS1 'Delivering Sustainable Development'. Relevant paragraphs are 17, which refers to the commitment to protecting and improving the environment; 18 which states that planning should seek to maintain and improve the local environment and help to mitigate the effects of declining environmental quality through positive policies on issues such as design; and 34 which states that good design is indivisible from good planning and that design which is inappropriate in its context, or which fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area, should not be acceptable.

Visual amenity
The existing property has previously been subject to a number of piecemeal developments to extend and increase the building footprint, and as a result the number of occupants within the premises.

Current appearance of the building is sprawling with varying designs for the different added elements. The original garage built in 1965 has been converted into additional room space and has been extended southwards, however there is a gap between the east elevation and the boundary with the residential dwellings in Rosslyn Avenue is 1m, allowing for a thick hedge to grow along most of the boundary.

The front of the converted garage is considered to be out of keeping with the appearance of the rest of the building, which as described above already has been subject to other additions which have a more sympathetic roof form. Policy AH7 of the Local Plan states that development should be sympathetic in design to the original dwelling and the surrounding area. The Development Control standard also says that side extensions clearly visible from the road will be required to have a roof that matches that of the original dwelling which in most cases should be a pitched roof. Whilst these standards relate to residential dwellings, it is considered that they are still relevant in this case as the building is located in the residential part of the built up area, and the considerations regarding sympathetic design are still important.

Whilst the existing garage and covered way area were not originally intended for the use by patients in the care home, their conversion into habitable accommodation is nevertheless part of the facilities provided by the home. The garage and covered way do appear to be in a poor state of repair and could do with replacing. The proposals would be an improvement to what is currently on site, nevertheless it is still considered that the proposals do not take the opportunity to replace the existing appearance of a converted garage with a structure that would be more sympathetic to the original building, which could be assimilated far more readily. The resultant extension would still have a discordant appearance that it is considered to be out of keeping with the design of the original building contrary to policy AH7 of the Local Plan, and Government Guidance PPS1.

Residential amenity – neighbours

The majority of the extension would be located in a similar location to the existing garage and series of additions, to the east of the original dwelling where currently a high hedge obscures the extension from view. The proposed extension would abut directly to the boundary for 20m, across the majority of the rear of No's 16 & 17 Rosslyn Avenue (10.9m and 9.7m respectively), and necessitate the removal of the existing hedge and boundary fences and walls . The flank wall of the extension would be 3m in height.

It is considered that the outlook from the rear of No.15 Rosslyn Avenue would be unchanged, as a separation of 1m is still proposed between their rear boundary and the side of the extension and a fence would be retained. However the rear outlook from both the side and rear of No's 16 & 17 would be greatly affected. Both of these dwellings have very shallow gardens with the rear elevation being 4m and 5.3m in depth respectively. The flank wall of the extension would project above where the current fence/wall lines are by 1.3m, and whilst it would be replacing a hedge, that in the case of the rear of

No.15 is higher than 3m, it is considered that the formation of a solid wall would have a far more harsh appearance, resulting in an enclosing and overbearing affect that would have a harmful effect on the outlook of these two dwellings.

Residential amenity - occupants
Garden space available for the residents is 400sqm which is in excess of the 10sqm minimum as set out in the above policy. The rooms themselves would be an improvement on the rooms that exist, in that they would all have ensuite facilities and the extension would improve the overall amount of communal living space. The issue of personal privacy would be acceptable in terms of facing windows with direct garden outlook being directly opposite other bedroom windows less than 5m away, given that it is no worse than currently exists.

Access and parking
The additional two bedrooms result in their being a maximum onsite parking allowance of 10 spaces as per the West Sussex County Council Parking Standards. No layout for parking has been submitted with the application however it is clear that 10 cars could not park on the narrow forecourt. On street parking is unrestricted and given the residential nature of the area and the comments from the Highways Officer it is not considered that the additional rooms would have an impact on access or parking in this case.

Recommendation

REFUSE for the reasons that:-

B5BR – amended
The proposed extension would, by reason of its unsympathetic design, be out of keeping in appearance with the original building and would detract to an unacceptable extent from the visual amenities and residential environment of the locality and thereby conflict with the policies of the Adur District Local Plan (AG1, AH10 & AH7)

H20R – amended
The proposed extension, by reason of its excessive size and uneighbourly siting would be detrimental to the residential amenities of No's 16 & 17 Rosslyn Avenue resulting in there being a loss of outlook and an overbearing and enclosing effect, contrary to policies AH10 & AH7 of the Adur District local Plan.

Case officer [redacted] PB 18/9
Date: 17.01.09