expires 08-08-10

Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: ADC/0008/10 Recommendation - Approve

Site: **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 bedrooms from 19 to 21)**

The Application

The application is the resubmission of a recently refused application (ADC/0296/09) for the demolition of part of the care home consisting of 5 bedrooms and ancillary storage, and the erection of an extension comprised of 7 bedrooms and additional dining room space, to the east of the existing main home.

The existing home is 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 projection. The two tiled additions have different eaves heights to that of the original building. 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.

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 attached to the building by the means of infilling the passageway between the two sections, and comprises of one bedroom and ancillary storage rooms. Attached to the rear is another extension comprising 4 bedrooms which extends a total of 22.5m from the front of the former garage to the rear.

Permission is sought for the demolition of the five 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 dummy pitch roof to the north and east. 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 4m in width at the front (north) and extend to being 7.3m at the widest point to the rear, it would be 32.8m in length (front to back) and the height would be 4.4m to the top of the dummy pitched roof on the north and east, with a 2.9m high flat roofed rear section (east elevation).

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 private 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 in excess of 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.

Site History
The previous application ADC/0296/09 was refused for the reasons that:-

1. *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)*

2. *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.*

Consultations and Representations

West Sussex County Council: The Highways Officer states that it is not anticipated that the proposals will increase vehicle movements to the point where a highway safety issue would arise. The most recently available verified accident records reveal there have been no personal injury accidents in the vicinity of the existing point of access, and therefore WSCC has no highway concerns regarding the application.

Adur District Council: No Environmental Health objections.

Third Parties: There have been two letters of representation from the owners of No's 16 & 17 Rosslyn Avenue located to the east.

The owner of No.17 states that they have concern regarding drainage surrounding the proposed extension and that soakaways should be used to

prevent her garden flooding, and that the drainage system for effluent should be adequate.

The owner of No.16 states that there are concerns that the privet hedge separating the site from their dwelling will be removed. Currently it hides the bare wall of the existing building, and the proposed 2m high fence will not hide the 3m high building which would be overbearing. The privet hedge also serves as a screen between the eastern roof dormer and the rear kitchen and dining room, and the proposed fence would not be high enough to replace the natural screen. They state that they would be happy if the existing hedge was to be retained, which would leave the aspect of their garden unchanged.

The application has now been amended to show the building stepped in 0.6m from the boundary, and the full retention of the boundary treatments and privet hedge in its entirety.

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)

Planning Assessment

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 (not a 'saved' policy). 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 residents within the care home.

The 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 retained between the east elevation and the boundary with the residential dwellings in Rosslyn Avenue which is 1m, allowing for a thick hedge to grow along most of that 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 states 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 particularly relevant in this case as the building is located in the residential part of the built up area, and the considerations regarding good 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, and the amended scheme now shows a dummy pitch roof which is far more sympathetic to the design of the original building than the flat roof which was refused previously.

Residential amenity

The majority of the extension would be located in a similar position to the existing garage and series of additions, to the east of the original dwelling where currently a high hedge obscures the existing building from view. The proposed extension would be inset from the boundary for 20m, across the majority of the rear of No's 16 & 17 Rosslyn Avenue (10.9m and 9.7m

respectively), however contrary to the previous refused scheme the boundary to these properties will now remain unchanged, with the existing fences/wall and high hedge retained (as per the amended plans). The submitted plans have been amended to show the proposed extension stepped in from the boundary by 0.6m in total. In addition the applicant's agent has confirmed that the foundations will be piled with a possible ring beam above. It is considered that a relevant condition which would require the applicant to show how the existing hedge will be protected during the construction phase of the proposals.

The hedge currently is 3m in height at the rear of No.16 and slightly less (approximately 2.75m high) at the rear of No.17. The main concern with the original refused application was that the replacement of the boundary treatments with a 2m high close boarded fence would result in a poor outlook from the rear of the adjacent dwellings which have particularly shallow gardens (4m and 5.3m respectively). Although the retention of the hedge will require maintenance annually, it is considered that this is no more of a burden to No's 16 &17 than currently exists. The retention of the hedge (and boundary treatments) does soften the outlook from the rear of the gardens. The proposed extension would be obscured from view from the rear of No.16 as the existing hedge would be higher than the 2.9m high flank wall of the extension, thus the outlook would be unchanged from the current situation. The hedge and existing brick wall at the rear of No.17 would also obscure all but the very top of the extension, and again it is considered that the amenity and outlook of the rear rooms of that property would not be harmed to such an extent that would warrant refusal.

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. The addition of the dummy pitched roof would only be seen in front of the existing two-storey section of the care home thus preventing a loss of outlook.

Residential amenity - occupants

The garden space available for the residents is 400sqm which is in excess of the 10sqm minimum per resident as set out in the above policy. The rooms themselves would be a vast improvement on the rooms that currently exist within the piecemeal additions, 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, it is considered that this relationship would be no worse than the current layout that 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 highway safety in this case.

Other matters
The proposed extension would require a building regulations application to be made, which would in itself cover all matters pertaining to the relevant drainage and soakaway requirements of the building.

Recommendation

Approve for the reason that:-

1PPii

1. C1Ci
2. C11D – amended
   The existing hedge along the eastern boundary shall be retained and be protected for the duration of construction works in a manner to be agreed with the local planning authority before the development commences and shall not be damaged, destroyed, uprooted, felled or lopped. Any part of the hedge removed without consent or dying or being severely damaged or becoming seriously diseased during the period shall be releplaced in the following planting season with hedges of such size and species as may be agreed with the Local Planning Authority.
   Reason: *In the interests of visual amenity and to protect the character of the locality and to comply with policy AB25 of the ADLP.*
3. C12Eii
4. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 0434 / 004 Rev B proposed elevations; and 0434 / 003 Rev B proposed floor plans date stamped received 02.03.10
   Reason: *For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.*
5. C18Eiv – east

Case Officer: [redacted]
Date: 03·03·10

Planning Services Manager:
Date:

Chair of the Planning Committee:
Date: