DELEGATED APPLICATIONS ASSESSMENT SHEET

APPLICATION NO./ADDRESS: 12 Queens Road WB/10/1069/FULL

DATE OF SITE VISIT: 28/1 and 5/2/2011

NEIGHBOURS CHECKED: Y

ADDITIONAL NEIGHBOUR NOTIFICATIONS: N

PROPOSAL, SITE AND SURROUNDINGS:

The application property comprises a double fronted 2-storey detached Victorian villa with rooms in the roof located on the east side of Queens Road. It was formerly used by the NHS as care home but is currently vacant. The building has previously been enlarged by a large single-storey flat-roofed rear extension and side and rear dormers. The building, which incorporates bay windows and feature gables and banding, is primarily faced in brick but with distinctive tile-hanging to the first-floor, and the ground-floor front elevation rendered. The main roof (and that over the bay windows) has been recovered using profiled concrete tiles. The majority of windows in the original part of the building consist of timber, sliding sashes.

As originally submitted planning permission was sought for extensions and alterations in connection with the conversion of the property into 8 x 1-bedroom flats, 1 x 2-bedroom flat and 1 studio flat. This involved a large L-shaped, first-floor extension above the existing single-storey addition, with a dual ridged, pitched and gabled roof. The submitted drawings show parking provision for 4 cars on the existing surfaced frontage utilising the existing access. Bins and bike storage are shown in the rear garden.

Queens Road is primarily made up of detached and semi-detached Victorian and Edwardian villas, which are similar in style but not identical in appearance. The majority, including the application property, have suffered a number of unsympathetic alterations not only to the building themselves, but also their surroundings, with the loss of boundary treatments and front gardens to parking. Much of the surrounding area, including Edinburgh Cottages which backs onto the application site, is located within the Marine Parade and Hinterland Conservation Area.

Following discussions amended drawings have been received substantially reducing the scale and extent of the proposed first-floor rear extension thereby reducing the number of proposed units to 8 x 1-bedroom flats, providing the extension with a hipped (instead of gabled) roof, altering the fenestration within the existing single-storey extension to provide a more traditional vertical proportion, re-locating the bin store to the north side of the building, re-locating the bike store to the far south-eastern corner of the rear garden, reducing the number of parking spaces on the frontage from 4 to 3 (re-placing the existing 'crazy paving' with block paving) and introducing boundary treatment on the north side of the frontage.

The site falls within the controlled parking zone.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY:

00/00139/FULL	Amendment to condition 3 of planning consent WB/1498/88 to allow the use of the property as a Nursing Home	GRANT CONDITIONAL CONSENT	04-04-2000
00/00583/FULL	Two additional bedroom windows at first floor level (one each to north and south elevations) and double doors in place of	GRANT CONDITIONAL CONSENT	15-08-2000
07/1177/FULL	Change of use from a 9 bedroom residential home to offices and associated consulting rooms for outpatient work	GRANT CONDITIONAL CONSENT	07-12-2007
10/1069/FULL	Proposed first-floor rear extension and conversion of former care home to provide 8 x 1-bedroom flats.	PENDING	
1498/88	CHANGE OF USE FROM AN HOTEL TO A REST HOME. 12 QUEENS ROAD	APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS	21-02-1989
277/76/A	SINGLE-SIDED ILLUMINATED BOX SIGN ON FRONT ELEVATION. 12 QUEENS ROAD	WITHDRAWN	
433/76/A	SINGLE-SIDED ILLUMINATED BOX SIGN. SUSSEX HOTEL 12 QUEENS ROAD	APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS	21-05-1976
815/89	SINGLE-STOREY EXTENSION AT REAR & PROVISION OF LIFT SHAFT IN MAIN BUILDING. 12 QUEENS ROAD	APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS	21-08-1989
90/0561	AMENDMENTS TO SINGLE-STOREY EXTENSION APPROVED UNDER WB/851/89 RESITING OF LIFT SHAFT TOGETHER	REFUSED	23-07-1990
90/0838	RE-SITING OF LIFT SHAFT WITHIN BUILDING WITH MINOR PROJECTION ABOVE RIDGE OF REAR EXTENSION. 12	REFUSED	12-11-1990

RELEVANT PLANNING POLICIES:

South East Plan 2009
CC1, CC6, H1, H2, H4, H5, H6, T4, BE1, BE6

Saved Worthing Local Plan 2003
BE1, TR9, H10, H13 H18.

Worthing Core Strategy 2011
7, 8, 9, 10, 15, 16, 17

REPRESENTATIONS AND RELEVANT CONSULTATION RESPONSES:

Planning Policy Manager: "*The development of 10 flats contributes to the housing supply and assists with meeting the housing need as set out in Policy 7 of the Submission Core Strategy. The site offers 8 one-bed flats and 1 studio flat plus 1 two-bedroom flat. Policies 8 and 9 in the Worthing Core Strategy address the shortage of family homes in Worthing based on evidence set out in the Strategic Market Housing Assessment. The main objective of Policy 8 is to redress the imbalance in the housing mix that has dominated recent new development, namely smaller flats and the need for more family accommodation.*

Based on the above attention is drawn to the fact that this is a development with smaller flats and we would like to encourage developers to consider including a larger flat possibly on the ground floor with some outdoor amenity space.

It is encouraging to see that the internal lay-out has been designed with flexibility in mind with rooms that can be planned for the needs and lifestyle of their occupants.

Affordable housing
The Submission Core Strategy sets out affordable housing requirements. On a site of 6-10 dwellings this would be 10% of affordable housing that will be sought by financial contribution.

Parking
There is provision for 4 car parking spaces on-site which is considered appropriate for this sustainable location. Cycle storage is provided for 11 bicycles which contributes to making this development sustainable.

Sustainability
A Sustainability Statement has been provided in which sustainable construction, waste and energy efficiency and other issues have been addressed. This is encouraging and in line with Core Strategy policies.

Weight of Submission Core Strategy policies
The Core Strategy was submitted to the Secretary of State on 9 July 2010. The policies in the Submission Core Strategy have been subject to a Hearing by an independent Planning Inspector in November/December 2010 and the Inspector's Report is expected in February with adoption by the Council expected in April provided the Core Strategy is found sound. Substantial weight should be applied to the Core Strategy policies until the Core Strategy has been found sound.

Conclusion
It is encouraging to see a proposal for a sustainable housing development. Applicants and developers are encouraged to consider the need for family housing based on Core Strategy Policy 8 and the SHMA.

A financial contribution of 10% for off-site affordable housing is required.

There is no objection from a planning policy view to this proposal."

Additional note dated 7/2/11

LR8 Open Space Contributions
Policy LR8 seeks a provision for outdoor recreation space for residential developments of 10 units or more. In cases where the outdoor recreation space cannot be provided on-site a financial contribution will be sought.

The proposed development is located in Heene ward. There is a shortfall in provision of equipped play space and adult/youth outdoor sport facilities. This

shortfall is described in the 1999 survey report 'Outdoor recreation space survey'. Calculations are based on Supplementary Planning Guidance 'Providing for play: A guide for residential developers on the provision of outdoor recreation space (1999)'.

The total required contributions for 9 one-bed/studio flats and 1 two-bed flat are £ 6,287. Please note that the requirement for equipped play space is not applied to one-bed flats.

The contributions are calculated as follows:

Total number of residents: 9x2=18 plus 1x3=3
a total of 21 residents
***Equipped play space**: 1 x £234 = £234*
***Casual/Informal play space:** 21x £39.37 = £826.77*
***Adult/youth outdoor sport**: 21 x £248.88 = £5,226.48*
Total contributions: £ 6,287

The policy is applied to the total number of new dwellings and is not intended for or should be applied to a decrease in number of dwellings based on net gain of dwellings."

Executive Head of Housing, Health and Community Safety: No objection.

The **Highway Authority** comments as follows:-

Summary of Contributions

S106 type	Monies Due
Education - First	£341
Education - Middle	£384
Education - Secondary	£514
Education - 6th Form	No contributions required
Libraries	No contributions required
Waste	No contributions required
Fire & Rescue	£157
No. of Hydrants	No hydrants required
TAD	£4,095
Total Contribution	**£5,491**

This response comprises of the views of West Sussex County Council Local Development Division. Advice has been sought from various Local Development Officers in respects of the highways and infrastructure contribution requirements of this proposal have been considered and these views are incorporated within this response. This response has been prepared by the Officer named above.

Given the location of the site, the principle of this proposal would be acceptable. The parking implications of this proposal do need to be considered against the recently adopted WSCC Car Parking Demand Generator. Based on the calculator, this does indicate that the proposal would generate the total demand for 8 car parking spaces. Evidently the site

only accommodates 4 spaces, although the application form indicates 5 are provided. The car parking demands that are not accommodated within the site therefore would need to take place on-street. The site does lie within an area of parking restraint (within the Worthing Controlled Parking Zone) and as such on-street parking is limited, hence there are enforceable measures in place to control and prevent parking from occurring in inappropriate locations which may then be detrimental to highway safety. The site does also lie within a central location and close to frequent passenger transport provision, and should therefore promote and encourage the use walking, cycling and passenger transport in accordance with current sustainable transport policies. Whilst some account could be taken of parking demands from the former use, care homes tend to generate relatively few movements and as such limited weight is given to this.

In conclusion, whilst this proposal may result in further on-street parking, an objection on the basis of highway safety would not be raised. The Planning Authority may wish though to consider the implications of this proposal upon on-street parking.

With respects, to detailed matter, no concerns would be raised with the continued use of the existing parking areas. Provision for cycling parking should be secured in accordance with the approved plans prior to occupation.

No highway objection would be raised to this proposal.

Following consulted on the amended (8 x 1 bedroom flats) there is no contribution required for education, waste or fire hydrants, and the TAD contribution is reduced to **£2,970**.

Representations have been received from Abbeyfield Society (14 Queens Road), 14b Western Row, 3, 4 and 5 Edinburgh Cottages, (Flat 2) 10 Queens Road raising the following concerns:-

i) An overdevelopment of this site which backs onto a Conservation Area. There is no need to provide such dense, overcrowded accommodation.

ii) Abbeyfield House provides sheltered accommodation for 9 very elderly residents. It is run by a non-profit charity which is dependant on being able to let all the rooms to make the home viable. Two rooms have windows on the south side which are gloomy due to their proximity to No.12 and on an overcast day, electric lights are needed. If the development is allowed it will turn these rooms into caves and unletable. The proposed extension will even impact on the conservatory which gives residents a space full of natural light to enjoy the garden, bird life etc. Parking is also a concern and access for emergency vehicles is needed at all times.

iii) It is incorrect to state that there are no trees on the site, there is a mature sycamore in the grounds and other trees and bushes. What will happen to the wildlife if the development goes ahead. It is hoped some screen planting will be introduced into the communal garden.

iv) Parking pressures will be increased.
v) Proposed extension will block light natural light in the living room, bathroom and one bedroom at Flat 2, 10 Queens Road.
vi) Rear garden at 10 Queens Road will be completely overlooked which will affect the value of the property.
vii) Concerned about the hygiene of locating bins close to No.10, especially if bins are not brought out for collection regularly.
viii) The area is close to a Conservation Area and any development should be in keeping and not allowed to become a concrete jungle.
ix) Windows in the first-floor extension would overlook the rear of Edinburgh Cottages resulting in a loss of privacy.

Following consultation on revised drawings further representations have been received from:-

Abbeyfield Society (14 Queens Road), (Flat 2) 10 Queens Road, 14b Western Row:-

x) Abbeyfield House would still lose too much light to an already gloomy house, the rooms facing south would become unusable and would put the sheltered residential home out of business. Light is very important to the psychological welfare of visually impaired residents and artificial is no substitute for natural light.
xi) Parking problems caused by 8 x 1-bedroom flats would be huge and access is required at all times for emergency vehicles as well as for nurses and carers attending residents.
xii) Loss of light will greatly affect the health and welfare of the occupiers of Flat 2, 10 Queens Road.

PLANNING ASSESSMENT:

The main considerations are the principle of extending and converting this former NHS care home into 8 self-contained flats, the effects on the appearance of the building and the surrounding built environment, the living conditions of future occupiers and effects on the residential amenities of adjoining occupiers, highway safety and parking considerations. The relevant Core Strategy policies are 7, 8, 9, 10, 15, 16 and 17. The relevant saved Local Plan policies are BE1, TR9, H10, H13 and H18.

The principle of development
Core Strategy policy 8 seeks to deliver a wide choice of high quality homes to address the housing needs of the community with higher density housing to be located in and around the town centre. Saved LP policy H13 supports the principle of converting residential and non residential accommodation into flats subject to the character, appearance and amenity of the area not being adversely affected, there being no detriment to neighbours through increased movement or unacceptable overlooking, and subject to provision of adequate parking in accordance with TR9.

There is no objection in principle to the proposed conversion of this former residential home into self-contained flats. The proposed development would

not result in the loss of garden space (other than the siting of the proposed cycle storage) in the context of the recent changes to PPS3:'Housing'. It would help meet the Borough's housing target set out in the SE Plan and the CS. Notwithstanding the comments of the Planning Policy Manager concerning the desirability of broadening the mix of units to include a larger 2-bedroom units, the proposal for 1-bedroom units complies with CS policy 8, which allows for higher density development in and around the town centre.

Affordable housing

Core Strategy Policy 10 states that on all sites of 6 to 10 dwellings, 10% affordable housing will be sought via a financial contribution. This is supported by an evidence base comprising the Strategic Market Housing Assessment (SMHA) which identifies that there is an acute affordable housing need within the Borough, and an Affordable Housing Development Viability Study (by Adams Integra in 2007), which supports the approach of sites of this size contributing to affordable house need, and concluded that the proposal to collect a financial contribution in lieu of on-site construction is viable. The financial contribution is calculated using figures prepared by District Valuation Services as set out in the draft Planning Contributions SPD. The contribution amount reflects the cost to a Registered Social Landlord or other affordable housing provider of buying serviced land on an alternative site in the Borough. In this case the proposed development for 8 x 1-bedroom flats triggers a 10% affordable housing contribution which amounts to £35,496.

The Government considers that planning obligations remain the best way of delivering affordable housing. Paragraph B12 of Circular 5/05 states that planning obligations can be used to secure the implementation of a planning policy in order to make acceptable a development proposal that would otherwise be unacceptable in planning terms, for example, the inclusion of an element of affordable housing. Paragraph B14 recognises that there may be circumstances, where is may not be necessary for provision to be on-site and where a financial contribution may represent an appropriate option. Such an approach is further sanctioned by PPS:3 (paragraph 29).

The Council's policy approach to affordable housing within the Submission Core Strategy which seeks a 10% financial contribution on sites of this size is supported by a robust evidence base which has been subject to scrutiny as part of the recent examination and found to be 'sound' by the Inspector. However, the applicant's planning consultant has argued that his client agreed to purchase the application property, subject to contract and planning, on 22 October 2010 – the date the offer was accepted by the NHS – before the Examination in Public commenced in November 2010. The initial negotiations (with the NHS) had not taken into consideration this additional and unexpected cost which only came to the attention of the applicant after the CS was approved by the Inspector (in February 2011). This clearly indicates the importance of pre-application discussions involving the LPA (of which there were none) since the affordable housing policy has been well publicised as part of the consultation procedures pertaining to the emerging LDF. This aside, some weight has been given to the circumstances and timing of the purchase offer, and exceptionally, in this case, a reduced contribution of £15,000 is considered acceptable.

Living conditions of future occupiers and the effect on the amenities of neighbouring residents

The submitted floor plans show that all the proposed 1-bedroom flats would be of a satisfactory size, consisting of regular-shaped habitable rooms with satisfactory natural daylight and an outlook. On the other hand, only 3 no. of the flats would benefit from bathrooms/shower rooms having natural ventilation, which is not ideal.

Other than access to cycle storage provision, the rear garden would be shared solely between the 2 ground-floor rear flat units (flats 3 and 4). The applicant is reluctant to provide a communal garden area owing to the management difficulties of maintaining a shared space where no one individual has responsibility, particularly in the context of 1-bedroom units. Overall, it is considered a satisfactory standard of accommodation would be provided for the future residents of the 1-bedroom flats.

With regard to the effect on the residential amenities of the neighbouring properties, it was considered that the scale and bulk of the first-floor extension as originally proposed was excessively large and would impact unacceptably on the daylight/sunlight and outlook of the occupiers of the neighbouring residential home to the north (No.14) and the rear-most flats within the converted building to the south (No.10).

The most affected rooms in No.14 would be 2 bedrooms on the ground and first floor which are served by windows in the south side of the main villa. These windows face the north flank of No.12 and consequently the rooms are already somewhat dark. However, it was considered that the height, depth and proximity of the proposed first-floor extension to these windows would have a deleterious enclosing effect as well as making the rooms substantially darker. Following discussions the scale of the first-floor extension has been substantially reduced to extend only from the existing gable feature on the south side of the rear elevation by approximately 4m. In view of its orientation to the south of No.14, the proposed first-floor extension – some 8 metres distant – would still result in some additional overshadowing and loss of daylight, primarily affecting the ground-floor bedroom of No.14, but it is considered the impact would not be significantly worse than the existing situation, nor would the extension be so overbearing or visually intrusive in its effect as to now warrant refusal on this ground.

Windows in the south side of No.14 would be directly overlooked by bedroom windows serving two of the converted flats (flat 1 and 6) and also the dormer window on the north side of the roof serving a living room (flat 8), but this arrangement is existing and would not necessarily give rise to a greater degree or intensity of overlooking than previously arose from the use of No.12 as a residential home.

The most affected flat units at No.10 are those served by windows in the north and east elevations, most particularly the maisonette which makes up the original rear outrigger of No.10 and which was extended (in conjunction with a matching addition to No.8) in 1987. The most affected windows serve a ground-floor living room and first-floor bedroom and face north, overlooking

the main flank wall of No.12 at a distance of less than 5m. As originally proposed, it was considered that the height, depth and proximity of the proposed first-floor extension would heighten the existing tunnelling effect resulting in a loss of outlook and daylight for the occupiers of this unit. The amendments have involved reducing the depth of the extension by 1 metre on this side, setting it in (north) by 1m and altering the gable roof to provide a hipped roof. It is considered that the resulting reduction in the overall 'bulk' would satisfactorily relieve the overbearing impact of the extension and minimise the loss of daylighting to an acceptable extent. The amended drawing shows a kitchen window in the south side of the proposed extension as being obscurely glazed to safeguard the occupiers of the neighbouring property from overlooking. However, an enlarged window in the south side of the existing building (currently serving a bathroom) is shown as clear-glazed and serving a bedroom. The larger bedroom window has the scope to result in an unacceptable degree of overlooking, and whilst it is not ideal to require a habitable room to be fitted with obscured glass, it is considered necessary in this case to safeguard against a potential loss of privacy.

As part of the amendment, the bin stores have been re-sited to a more accessible and convenient position on the north side of the building, which addresses one of the concerns raised by the occupier of 10 Queens Road (Flat 2).

The effect on the appearance of the building and the surrounding area

As amended, the size and massing of the proposed extension would appear as a subordinate element, in keeping with the scale and appearance of the existing building. The window proportions have been designed to reflect the traditional vertical proportions of the existing windows. The drawings show the windows having traditional heads and cills which should be secured by condition. The amended drawings also show several of the existing windows in the single-storey flat-roof addition altered to create a more traditional vertically proportional opening which is welcomed. The application forms stipulate the materials of the proposed windows and doors as being white painted timber, in keeping with the traditional character of the building.

The removal of the existing crazy-paving on the site frontage and its replacement with permeable block paving is welcomed, as is the introduction of a low boundary wall on the north side of the frontage.

A number of third parties have drawn attention to the mature sycamore tree in the rear garden of this site which provides a habitat for local wildlife as well as screening the building in views from the rear of the smaller-scale terrace of cottages to the east. The siting of the cycle store in the position shown would necessitate it removal, which would be a shame. An alternative position for the cycle store is advised to enable the tree to be retained. This could be dealt with as a condition of planning permission.

Access and parking

The amended drawing shows provision for 3 on-site parking spaces utilising the existing dropped kerb which extends virtually the width of the frontage. A

main concern expressed by third parties relates to the lack of available parking to serve the proposed flats. Based on the recently adopted WSCC Car Parking Demand Generator, the proposal would generate a demand for 8 parking spaces of which only 3 could be accommodated on-site (compared to a parking demand for 5 spaces in respect of the former 9-bed residential home). The remaining 5 spaces would need to be accommodated on-street. The site is located within the CPZ where parking restrictions are enforced and no highway safety objection has been raised by the Highway Authority.

The key objective of PPG13 is the adoption of an integrated approach to transport and planning, shaping the pattern, location and density of development in order to reduce the need to travel, especially by private car, at the same time making it easier for people make more sustainable transport choices. The site is within easy walking distance of the shops and facilities in the town centre, and is well-located in relation to public transport alternatives. It has been accepted that satisfying the Council's maximum car parking standards is not obligatory in sustainable locations. For this reason, even though capacity for additional on-street parking is extremely limited, in the absence of any objection from the Highway Authority, it is considered it would be difficult to substantiate refusal on grounds of an increased parking demand.

REASON FOR APPROVAL

The proposed development would make an efficient re-use of this attractive character building in this sustainable location close to the edge of the town centre, and subject to an affordable housing contribution of £15,000 would contribute toward providing meeting the housing needs of the Borough. The proposed development would not detract from the surrounding built environment and subject to the recommended safeguarding conditions can take place without adversely impacting upon the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers. Having regard to Government planning policy guidance contained in PP13, and in the absence of any objection from the Highway Authority it is considered that subject to a sustainable transport contribution of £2,970, refusal would not be warranted on highway safety grounds.

RECOMMENDATION:

APPROVE SUBJECT TO THE PRIOR COMPLETION OF A UNILATERAL UNDERTAKING TO SECURE THE AFFORDABLE HOUSING CONTRIBUTION AND THE SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORT CONTRIBUTION (£17,970 IN TOTAL) AND SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:-

1. Standard time limit
2. Approved drawings
3. Boundary treatment to be agreed and implemented.
4. Surfacing of parking area to be agreed.
5. Notwithstanding siting of cycle store shown on approved plan, details of cycle store to be agreed
6. Extension in matching materials.

7. Details of timber windows to be agreed, including cills and heads.
8. No waste pipes, meter boxes on front elevation
9. Refuse storage provision
10. Construction method statement
11. Hours of construction work
12. Landscaping scheme to be agreed and implemented
13. Obscure glaze first-floor windows in north and south sides (flat 5)

HUMAN RIGHTS:

Article 8 (Right to Respect of a Private and Family Life) and Article 1 of the First Protocol (Protection of Property) of the Human Rights Act 1998 are relevant to this application. It is accepted that the proposal, if approved, would have some impact on the neighbouring properties. However, it is considered that on balance, existing residential quality of life would not be significantly adversely affected as a result of the proposal. Accordingly it is considered that it is acceptable with regard to Article 8 and Article 1.

IS RECOMMENDATION CONTRARY TO LETTER (S) OF REPRESENTATION?

Yes

DELEGATED

Case Officer [redacted]
Sign.....Date.....5.5.11.....

Authorising Officer [redacted]
Sign.....Date.....4/5/11.....