Expiry Date - 08/02/2012

Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number:
AWDM/1027/11

Recommendation – Approve Application

Site: **Kingsland House Kingsland Close Shoreham-By-Sea West Sussex**

Proposal: **Extension to south (6 new bedrooms and dayroom)**

The Application

This application seeks planning permission for two extensions on the south side of the building. Permission was originally granted in 2008 but has since lapsed (ADC/0345/08).

The application relates to a single storey residential nursing home sited to the south of Glebelands Day Care Centre on the west side of Kingsland Close. Industrial units in Dolphin Road lie close to the southern boundary of the site. There is a recreation ground to the east. The building has been previously extended in 2002 and 2006 and it is now proposed to extend the building further on the south side to provide 6 bedrooms and a dayroom. There will be a net gain of 5 bedrooms as one room will be lost in order to access the extension.

The proposed bedrooms extension will project from the previous 2002 extension while the dayroom will project from the central wing of the building. The total floor area of the extensions amounts to 210sqm.

Consultations and Representations

Consultations/Comments

West Sussex County Council - The Transport Planning Officer has no objection to this application.

Third Parties

No representations received

Relevant Planning Policies and Guidance

Adopted Adur District Local Plan 1993 – 2006 (ADC 1996) (saved policies): AG1, AH7, AH10, ACS5 and Appendix 11 'Supplementary Planning Guidance' comprising Development Control Standard No.3 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings'

Planning Assessment

Policies

The site is located within a residential part of the built-up area of Shoreham and there is no objection in principle to such development.

Local Plan policy AH10 relates to residential care and nursing homes and states that extensions to such buildings must comply with Policy AH7 of the Local Plan. That policy 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.

Visual amenity and character

The extensions have been designed to match the design and materials of the existing building, with a fully hipped pantile roof and red and buff brickwork. The extensions are modest in scale, appearing as subsidiary to the existing nursing home. Their location on the south side of the building and set back from the frontage means that they are not prominent features in the street scene.

The southern boundary is marked by a line of trees and the closest extension will come to within 3m of the trunk of these trees. The land drops away to the south at this point too, but the extensions will be constructed on the higher, level ground. The trees will not be adversely affected by the development and will remain as a screen between the site and the industrial units beyond.

Residential amenity

The extension brings the nursing home closer to the industrial estate to the south. As stated above, the line of trees on the southern boundary is to remain and there is a fence approximately 3m in height beyond which acts as a screen. The bedrooms in the new extension have the potential to be affected by noise from the industrial units, but they have been designed so that windows face east and west only and not to the south. This also helps to ensure that light to the rooms is not adversely affected by the proximity of the trees.

The extensions are some distance from the nearest residential properties and the proposal will not result in any adverse impact on residential amenity.

Expiry Date - 08/02/2012

Access and Parking

The building is already a large nursing home with reasonable levels of car parking and it is not considered that the provision of an additional 5 bedrooms will result in any significant levels of intensification. There are no highway objections to the proposal.

Recommendation

APPROVE for reason that :-

1PPi

Subject to

1. C1Ci
2. C12Eii
3. Plans

Case Officer Peter Barnett Date 20 January 2012

20/1/12