DELEGATED APPLICATIONS

ASSESSMENT SHEET

APPLICATION NO/ADDRESS: 11/0048 – 53 Richmond Road

DATE OF SITE VISIT: 22/2/11

NEIGHBOURS CHECKED: Y

ADDITIONAL NEIGHBOUR NOTIFICATIONS (LIST ADDRESSES): None.

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS:

This application relates to an extended two/three storey building on the south side of Richmond Road. The building is prominently positioned on the south east corner of the Richmond Road/Shakespeare Road crossroads. The property is within the Winchester Road conservation area where it has been identified as positive contributor building. It is also a Local Interest building.

The property itself is a red brick construction with panels of rough cast render. It has a prominent double storey curved bay on its north west corner together with gable features on each road elevation. The building was extended along the Richmond Road elevation at two storeys in the late 1980's. There is a vehicular access off Richmond Road, adjoining No. 51 which is a dwellinghouse, and a detached garage in this position. The adjoining property to the south, No. 6 Shakespeare Road is a former house converted into 6 flats.

Until fairly recently the building was used to provide care to 8 young adults with learning difficulties. In the last year the building was sold to the current applicant who intends to open a Family Assessment Unit where care, support and training will be provided to seven young mothers and their babies. The building has been undergoing considerable refurbishment in the past months in preparation of this proposed use.

PROPOSAL

This application seeks replacement of a mono pitched, timber framed and glazed lean to addition on the Shakespeare Road frontage. The existing lean to extends from the curved bay across the frontage to the southern flank wall. It has a low white painted timber panelled plinth, vertical timber supports and glazed elevations with a poly carbonate roof on a timber frame. It has an eaves height of 2.9 metres and a ridge height of 4.4 metres which is just under first floor cill level. It extends 2 metres into the garden, just short of the depth of the adjoining bay. There are two steps up to it from the garden.

The proposed extension has twice been revised since first submitted and reduced in size. The latest revised proposal shows a curved conservatory in timber which sits slightly off the side flank wall and away from the original curved bay by 1 metre. It extends 2.95 metres out from the main front wall, 1.2 metres deeper into the garden than the existing lean-to structure and it is 5.45 metres wide. It is 2.8 metres high to eaves and 4 metres high to ridge. It is to be a

painted timber structure with a timber panelled plinth and a glazed roof with a lead sheet flat roof area dressed down over the glazing at the front.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY:

06/0119 – Erection of replacement conservatory to west elevation. Refused 15.5.06

88/415 – Erection of a two storey extension at side and detached garage and use of property as a residential home for a maximum of 8 mentally handicapped young adults. Granted 14.6.88

85/1085 – Change of use to residential home for up to 7 young adults with a mental handicap plus owner and family accommodation. Granted 23.12.85

RELEVANT PLANNING POLICIES:

RES7, TR9, H16 and H18 of the saved Local Plan.
BE1, BE6, T4, CC1 and CC6 of the South East Plan
PPS1 Delivering Sustainable Development
PPS5 Planning for the Historic Environment
Core Strategy Policy 16
Winchester Road Conservation Area Appraisal
Draft Winchester Road Conservation Area Appraisal
Draft Article 4 (1) Direction Winchester Road Conservation Area.

REPRESENTATIONS AND RELEVANT CONSULTATION RESPONSES:

One letter of representation received in response to the latest revised plans, summarised as follows:

i) this is a considerable improvement which takes on board many of the neighbours comments regarding the heaviness of the previous design and choice of materials;
ii) It should not project forward of the bay, this was the opinion of the Conservation Area Advisory Committee when they saw the initial plans.
iii) This development should not be granted planning permission whilst unauthorised works at the eastern end of the building are unresolved.
iv) Can the boundary fence between No. 20 Winchester Road and the site be improved to prevent a loss of privacy to the occupier of No. 20 from future residents use of the rear garden? This wasn't a problem with the previous use but could be with the new use.
v) We also request that a designated smoking room and mobile phone use room be found to prevent both these nuisance issues occurring in the rear garden and beyond to neighbours' gardens.

8 neighbour letters received in response to earlier consultations. The comments received are summarised as follows:

i) The revised proposal is still larger than the existing lean to. Though a relatively small increase it is still an example of creep.

ii) The extension size will make little difference to the building's usage but will have a detrimental effect on the amount of amenity space available for residents.

iii) The use of brick and slate will allow greater usage and will have too heavy an appearance detracting from the much lighter appearance of the existing structure.

iv) Development, without planning permission, has been undertaken i.e. increased areas of hardstanding for vehicles.

v) The revised proposal is only slightly smaller and still extends too far forward of the existing bay.

vi) It will cast too much shadow into the garden and bay to the detriment of residents.

vii) Although only a 2 square metre increase in floorspace new commercial owners should make do with existing floorspace and not refurbish a building and then issue requirements for more space and expect Committee to acquiesce to such demands.

viii) The proposal neither enhances the building nor respects the residential area.

ix) The proposal is for a larger extension which will lead to an intensification of use.

x) No information is provided regarding future occupancy levels.

xi) Too obtrusive. The existing lean to is not visible from the north and the existing bay is the dominant feature. The proposed extension would dominate views from the north, south and west. This proposal will not blend in and will dominate because of its mass and siting and because of its heavy appearance in slate.

xii) The proposal will eat into usable garden space to the detriment of residents. Dense boundary planting already impacts on the amount of garden available. This development must not be allowed to jeopardise this boundary planting for the sake of residents' privacy.

xiii) The loss of lawn is also a psychological loss for future residents. And probably more lawn will be lost than indicated if additional paving around the structure is required.

xiv) The extension will reduce the usefulness of the remaining garden due to the shadow it will cast and the shadow from boundary shrubbery.

xv) Future residents will be vulnerable young mothers. Developing the garden and pushing them closer to the boundaries in terms of their use of the garden is not desirable. Particularly as occupiers of other homes in the area have mental health problems and walk around the area. Users of the garden will be very visible to occupiers of the home opposite at 55.

xvi) The building is locally listed. Owners should respect this and not try to increase numbers of residents who then require more space resulting in alterations with issues of mass and scale.

xvii) An unobtrusive replacement wooden conservatory, no bigger than the existing one, might be preferable. Alternatively a much smaller scale extension if something more soundproof is required, but actually I think this is not necessary on this corner in terms of local residents' amenity.

xviii) We do not know how many people are to be accommodated and therefore what intensification there will be. No floorplans of the refurbished building are provided so we do not know how the building has been rearranged.

xix) The proposed use is not 'similar' to the previous one. The small number of previous residents were adults with no children who went out to work every weekday and were taken out to activities every weekend. The premises were empty after breakfast until tea time every week day. They were empty for long periods at weekends.

xx) We advised the current owners that this site was unsuitable for the intended use due to the number of surrounding institutions. Privacy at the front will be compromised by those who hang around on the street corners. Privacy will be compromised at the rear because they would be overlooked by private residents and others. The 1988 permission for the two storey extension required the bottom sash of first floor bedroom windows to be obscurely glazed. This is not the case now.

The Conservation Area Advisory Panel commented on the previously revised plan as follows: *No objection. Scale and detail much improved.*

Health: No objection subject to contamination watch condition.

HUMAN RIGHTS:

First Protocol (Protection of Property) of the Human Rights Act 1998 is 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 the level of development proposed would not cause undue harm in terms of additional noise, disturbance and loss of privacy and that, on balance, existing residential quality of life would not be adversely affected as a result of the proposal. Accordingly it is considered that it is acceptable with regard to Article 8 and Article 1.

PLANNING ASSESSMENT:

The main issues for consideration are the impacts of the conservatory on the appearance of the property, the Winchester Road conservation area and neighbouring amenity.

The existing lean-to, although dilapidated and unsightly, is a traditional form often found on Victorian Villas. Its uncomplicated form is subordinate both in scale and appearance to the elaborate double storey bay it adjoins.

It is considered that the conservatory proposed in the latest revised drawings is a more appropriate form in terms of its likely impact on this local interest building and the wider conservation area. Its scale, design and materials have all improved in the latest proposal.

The new proposal sits comfortably away from the original double storey bay corner feature. It is a five sided design to reflect the angle of the original bay, although it is a much shallower curve. It is deeper than the bay but only by 500mm. It is not considered that this extra depth and projection beyond the line of the bay will be damaging to the setting of the bay, or to the overall appearance of the building.

This property is prominently positioned on the corner of two roads in the conservation area and it is a local interest building. It is not considered that the

RECOMMENDATION

Grant planning permission subject to the following conditions:

1. 3 years
2. Revised Plans
3. Contamination Watch

REASON FOR APPROVAL

The proposed extension would preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and would not be harmful to the character of this Local Interest Building. It can take place without resulting in unacceptable detriment to the amenities of neighbouring properties or the streetscene and without detraction from highway safety. It would consequently not conflict with the relevant 'saved' policies of the Worthing Local Plan (H16, H18, TR9), South East Plan Policies (CC1, CC6, BE1, BE6, T4), Core Strategy Policy 16, the Winchester Road Conservation Appraisal and Planning Policy Statement 5: Planning and the Historic Environment.

REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION:

The proposal complies with the relevant policies of the Development Plan.

IS RECOMMENDATION CONTRARY TO LETTER (S) OF REPRESENTATION?
Yes.

DELEGATED

Case Officer sign..... [redacted] ....Date..... 24/6/11

Authorising Officer sign..... [redacted] ....Date..... 27/6/11

extra depth of the conservatory beyond the bay's line will de damaging to the wider streetscene either. The existing lean-to structure is visible from Shakespeare Road and Richmond Road. It is set well away from either boundary and the difference in depth may not be perceptible at these distances. The revised use of glazing for the roof ensures a more lightweight structure akin to the existing lean-to. The use of timber and glass is appropriate in the conservation area. The revised proposal, reduced in depth, pulled away from the bay and in timber and glass, despite being slightly deeper, will remain subordinate to the original bay.

The extension is set well off the boundary with No. 6 Shakespeare Road and will not lead to any harm to occupiers of this building. The common boundary is well planted also. It also sits comfortably off the existing bay thus preventing any significant overbearing effect or loss of light to this room.

The loss of front garden area is not significant in terms of future occupiers open space. Ample front garden and rear garden will remain for future residents and their babies. There is no planning requirement to provide a particular level of outside amenity space for a use of this nature.

The applicant's agent has stated that the conservatory is not required to meet a particular registration standard. Ofsted has registered the property. The requirement to provide this 'break out' space comes from the intended client, in this case Social Services. They want to see an area linked but separate from the communal living room. Otherwise, occupiers will have their own living rooms within their own 'flatlet' . These flatlets will also include small kitchens so that mothers can learn to care independently for their babies. A communal kitchen/dining room is also available.

The proposed conservatory is acceptable in design terms and will not be harmful to neighbours' living conditions. The revised proposal is not much bigger than the existing lean-to and will not result in a material increase in floorspace for the care home and as a result of itself will not lead to an intensification of use.

Neighbours have reported unauthorised works at the eastern end of the building where an additional area of hardstanding has been created. This matter is being investigated by Enforcement. This breach cannot reasonably hold up the determination of this application. Neighbours would also like the Planning Department to require improved fencing between No. 20 Winchester Road and the site and also to control where residents and staff will smoke and use their mobile phones in the future. They do not want these activities in the rear garden. The Planning Department has no authority to enforce either requests. This is a matter to be discussed between neighbours and the managers of the new home.

Conclusion

The revised extension is considered to be a much improved proposal that will preserve and arguably enhance the appearance of this conservation area. The proposed extension will replace a dilapidated lean-to. It will not be damaging to the appearance of this local interest building or harmful to neighbouring occupiers living conditions.