# Development Management – Delegated Officer Report

**Application Number: AWDM/1280/22** **Recommendation: Refuse**

**Site:** **Elreg House, 58 Rosslyn Road, Shoreham-by-sea**

**Proposal:** **Two first floor extensions above existing ground floor rear wings**

**Date of Site Visit: 24 August 2022**

**Neighbours Checked: Y**

**Additional neighbour notification: N**

**Proposal, Site and Surroundings:**

The application property, known as Elreg House, is a former dwelling which has been used as a residential care home since 1962. It lies on the south side of Rosslyn Road, close to the junction with Rosslyn Avenue at the eastern end. The building has been extended on a number of previous occasions including with single storey flat roofed extensions at the rear. There are a number of outbuildings within the rear garden.

There are currently 31 residents in total within 27 rooms (4 shared rooms). This application proposes to provide 11 new rooms within two first floor extensions above the ground floor rear extensions. The extensions will be 6m tall with a shallow pitched roof. They will be 21m long and will come to within 1m of the rear boundary and just 0.5m of the eastern boundary.

The applicant has stated that the development is urgently required by the NHS and the local community.

**Planning History:**

ADC/0377/10 - Extension of pitched roof (including front, rear and west side dormers) to form additional single-occupancy ensuite bedrooms (increasing number of bedrooms from 21 to 24) – approved

ADC/0008/10 - Enlarged replacement single-storey east side/rear extension to provide enlarged dining room and bedrooms with ensuite facilities (increasing total number of bedrooms from 19 to 21) - approved

SU/190/84 - Extension to provide 7 single rooms and alterations to common rooms – approved

AWDM/0320/14 - Single storey rear (south) extension to existing care home to provide 3 no. additional bedrooms - approved

AWDM/0190/22 - Retention of open sided timber structure for outside meeting space and separate detached building for staff members to change into protective clothing - approved

**Consultations:**

**West Sussex County Council: The Highways Authority** has no objection.

Vehicular Accesses

The latest google mapping indicates that the site can be accessed via two vehicular access onto Rosslyn Road. However, this has not been demonstrated on the plan provided, therefore it is unclear if the existing access to the east is to be closed off as a result of the proposal? The proposed plans demonstrate parking layout accommodating 4 vehicles however the existing western access does not appear wide enough, therefore it may result in vehicles bumping off the full height kerb. Any unused access would require reinstatement of the kerb. Should the applicant propose alterations to the existing access arrangements, this should to be demonstrated on a plan and implemented under a WSCC Highways licence to specifications agreed with them.

Trip Generation

While a formal trip generation assessment has not been provided by the applicant, the Local Highways Authority (LHA) would be minded to advise that residential care homes are not traditionally significant generators of vehicular movements. Consideration is also given to the existing number of staff and residents at the site. On balance it would be extremely difficult to substantiate that the proposal would result in a material increase in vehicular movements which would result in any severe cumulative impacts on the operation of the highway network.

Car Parking

WSCC does not currently have an adopted parking standard for C2 use. As such, it is the responsibility of the applicant to demonstrate sufficient parking provision. The superseded WSCC Parking Standards outline the following parking demand for C2 use: 1 parking space per 20 residents, 1 visitor parking space per 8 residents, and 1 staff parking spaces per 5 residents. Two additional part time staff will be employed when compared to the existing arrangement. Based on the number of bedrooms against the superseded guidance up to 6 parking spaces in total, would be expected. It would be difficult to substantiate that the potential shortfall of two car parking spaces would create a highway safety issue. The Planning Authority may wish to consider the potential impacts of this development on on-street car parking.

Conclusion

In principle 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.
However, further clarification is sought, regarding the access arrangements, as described above. Please raise these issues with the applicant and re-consult. At which time suitable conditions can be recommended.

**Adur and Worthing Councils: Technical Services:** Flood risk- The application is within flood zone 1, but is shown to be at risk from surface water flooding. The proposals are at first floor, we therefore have no objection on flood risk grounds.

Surface water drainage- the application is for change of use. We have no conditions to request. Any alterations to surface water drainage must be designed and constructed in accordance with building regulations.

**Public Health:**There are no EH objections in principle, however, it is a very tight site and we would want to ensure that the construction phase of any new development is undertaken with as little impact on nearby residents and existing residents of the home as possible. Therefore I would recommend a CMP condition be attached to any permission given. This should cover residential liaison, parking, deliveries, material storage, hours of construction etc.

**Private Sector Housing:** No comment

**Southern Water:** Standard advice

**Representations**

21 objections received:

- Increased traffic and number of visitors, deliveries, emergency vehicles etc
- Parking is very difficult on Rosslyn Road
- Inadequate parking on site
- Overlooking and loss of privacy
- Loss of light
- Increased noise
- Increased light pollution
- Inappropriate design, height and scale
- Out of character with quiet residential area
- Overdevelopment
- Overbearing development running the length of the garden
- Already extended far in excess of what would normally be considered for a residential property
- Lack of outdoor space for residents

**Relevant Planning Policies**

Adur Local Plan 2017 Policy 15, 28, 33
'Supplementary Planning Guidance' comprising: Development Management Standard No.2 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings''
National Planning Policy Framework (July 2021)
WSCC Guidance on Parking at New Developments (Sept 2020).

**Planning Assessment**

**Principle**

The relevant issues are the effects on the amenities of neighbouring residential occupiers and the effect on the character and appearance of the area.

**Visual amenity**

The proposed extensions are considered to be an overdevelopment of the site. The rear garden of this property is already intensively developed with the ground floor extensions and outbuildings, leaving little room to the boundaries. The addition of a first floor over both wings will exacerbate the cramped feeling within the site and the scale of the proposal is considered to be out of character and harmful to the site and its surroundings. Views of the extensions will be visible from Rosslyn Avenue to the east and their design is not considered to be sympathetic to the character of the original building.

**Residential amenity**

The site is surrounded by residential dwellings and the scale and proximity of the extensions to the boundaries will have a harmful and overbearing impact on those properties, in particular 16 and 17 Rosslyn Avenue to the east. No. 17 is a bungalow with a short rear garden and the height and length of the proposed extension at just over 5m from the rear wall of the bungalow will be very overbearing and will reduce light and outlook to an unacceptable extent.

The level of harm caused in visual and residential amenity terms outweighs any benefit that the application may have in terms of providing additional accommodation at this facility.

**Parking and Access**

The plans show 4 parking spaces at the front of the building. Recent alterations have widened the crossover and vehicles are able to access the forecourt without

bumping over the kerb. WSCC Highways have advised that it would be difficult to substantiate that the proposal would result in a material increase in vehicular movements which would result in any severe cumulative impacts on the operation of the highway network.

With regard to parking, there is not currently an adopted parking standard for C2 use. The superseded WSCC Parking Standards suggests that up to 6 parking spaces in total would be expected for the number of bedrooms proposed. WSCC Highways have advised that it would be difficult to substantiate that the potential shortfall of two car parking spaces would create a highway safety issue. The potential impacts of the shortfall on on-street car parking should be considered. While it will add to pressure to park in the surrounding streets, it is not considered that the shortfall is so significant as to warrant refusal on this ground.

**Recommendation**

REFUSE for the following reason:

The proposed extensions, by reason of their height, length, design and proximity to the site boundaries, are an overdevelopment of the site which would be harmful to the character and appearance of the site and its surroundings and would be overbearing to neighbouring occupiers causing unacceptable harm to residential amenity through loss of light and outlook. The proposal is therefore contrary to policy 15 of the Adur Local Plan and paragraph 130 of the NPPF

**Is recommendation contrary to letter(s) of representation N**

The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by identifying matters of concern with the proposal and discussing those with the Applicant. However, the issues are so fundamental to the proposal that it has not been possible to negotiate a satisfactory way forward and due to the harm which has been clearly identified within the reason(s) for the refusal, approval has not been possible.

Case Officer: Peter Barnett Date: 15 September 2022

Authorised by: Gary Peck Date: 15 September 2022