Expiry 11.06.07

Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: ADC/0228/07 **Recommendation - Refuse**

Site: **Norman Latham House 283 Old Shoreham Road Southwick West Sussex**

Proposal: **Hip-roofed first-floor rear extension (11 bedrooms)**

The Application

The application site is located on the northern side of Old Shoreham Road, to the east of the junction with St. Louie Close. It is a significantly sized site containing a large extended building currently being used as a nursing home. The original building is a two-storey Victorian style building which has been added to on the North, west and to the east side.
A recent permission has been granted for a first-floor link extension which will connect the main building to the east side wing. It would house a bathroom and w.c. only.

The property was being refurbished at the time of the site visit an there was no one occupied the nursing home.

The current proposal is for a hip-roofed first-floor extension to provide an additional 11 bedrooms. The proposal would be built above the existing single-storey west side 'wing'.

Consultations and Representations

Consultations/Comments

Chief Environmental Health Officer	There has been no clear guidance provided by the Department of Health on development within the vicinity of power lines, and therefore, as a precautionary measure, environmental health would advise that no new property or development should be permitted in an area where the magnetic fields exceed 0.4 micro-Tesla. I would request that the developer provide a report showing what the EMF levels are in the vicinity of the new development before any decision is made. EDF energy has provided these reports in the past and mau be able to assist in this case.
WSCC- Highways & Transport	Whilst no exact numbers are given in

respects of the number of existing rooms of the number of existing car parking spaces, the WSCC Car Parking Standards are such that at most the new extension would require 2 additional car parking spaces. Considering that the existing nursing home appears to have a fairly substantial car parking area, I would be satisfied that the existing access and parking arrangements would be sufficient for the extended nursing home.

Third Parties
There have been 5 letters of representation received from neighbouring properties. Four are opposed to the proposals and one has no objection to the planning application. The main areas of concern raised are:-

- Overbearing and claustrophobic effect.
- Gardens in constant shadow for a significant part of the year.
- Compromised privacy through overlooking.
- Increased nuisance of noise and smells.
- Health risks due to overhead cables.
- Loss of the enjoyment of the garden.
- Adverse effect on plants, trees and wildlife.
- Proposal will look out of place.

Relevant Planning Policies and Guidance
Adopted West Sussex Structure Plan 2001-16 (WSCC 2005): DEV1, DEV4-5.
Adopted Adur District Local Plan 1993-2006 (ADC 1996): AG1, AH7, AH10.
Development Control Standard No.3 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings'.

Planning Assessment
The application site is located with the main built-up area in an area which is predominantly residential on either side. To the north are the allotments at Mile Oak Road / Prince Charles Close located on rising ground.

Policy AH10 is concerned with Residential Care Homes, and states development will be permitted subject to the effect on surrounding dwellings being judged to be acceptable and provided that there is 10 sqm amenity space per resident. Policy AH7 concerned with residential development, which in this case is considered relevant, and states that proposals should not result in an unacceptable degree of overlooking, loss of natural light or overbearing effect on neighbouring dwellings.

The proposed first-floor development would have a similar footprint size to that of the existing 'wing' which projects to the west, save for an additional

enclosed staircase of the far west of the building. The resultant 'wing' would project from the west elevation of the existing building by 18.0m, it would be 10.0m in width, by 7.3m to the ridge of the roof with an eaves level of 4.75m.

The proposal would provide 11 additional bedrooms with a central corridor, 6 on the northern side of the building and 5 on the southern. Four of the south facing rooms would have windows which would look over the rear garden of the property.

The existing property is located within an angled site, with the six properties to the west in St. Louie Close backing on with differing length gardens from the west. The existing ground floor wing projects west from a two-storey north side extension to within 1m of the boundary adjacent to the rear of No's 4,5 & 6 St. Louie Close.

The south facing windows of the proposal would have views which would be directly into the gardens of the properties in St. Louie Close. Views would be angled in some cases but due to the proximity of two-storey elevation of the existing parts of the building it is considered that the resultant amount of overlooking would be unacceptably high, particularly for No's 2,3 & 4. No.2 being 17.5m away No.3 being 12m away and No.4 being 4m away. Limited screening exists in the form of deciduous trees at parts of the site boundary but it is considered that this would not overcome the considerable loss of privacy that would be sustained from the development.

The proposal would be located to the east and north-east of the residential properties to the west and would not have a harmful effect on the amount of sunlight available to their gardens and rear rooms.

The design is considered to be sympathetic to the existing building and although the scale and mass have implications with regards overlooking, in the context of the large widening site it does not feel over large. From the rear of No's 5 & 6 the outlook would be compromised to a certain extent, but given the comparative length of these gardens it would not justify refusal on this basis alone. The proposal would result in the building being able to accommodate 40 residents which would require 400 sqm of amenity space. The garden size on the west of the property allows for 13.5 sqm per resident which is considered adequate.

The EHO has raised concerns regarding development in the vicinity of over-head power lines which omit a magnetic field which exceeds 0.4 micro-Tesla. No information has been provided regarding the effect that the over-head power lines will have on the residents of the nursing home and it is considered that due to the general concerns surrounding the issues of health that this should be taken into consideration.

Recommendation

REFUSE for reason that :-

1. H20R – amended.

The proposed development, by reason of its excessive size and unneighbourly design, would be detrimental to the residential amenities of the locality, resulting in an unacceptable loss of privacy , contrary to the policies of the West Sussex Structure Plan (DEV1) and the Adur District Local Plan (AH7)

2. The ~~proposed development~~ site has not been shown to have sufficiently low levels of (micro-Tesla) ~~in the vicinity of the~~ from the adjacent over-head power lines. ~~It~~ the developer would therefore be considered to ~~have a detrimental effect on the amenity~~ pose unacceptable risk to the health and wellbeing of the proposed residents of the ~~nursing home contrary to the policies of the~~ exterior, not meeting the requirements of policy DEV1 of the West Sussex Structure Plan ~~(DEV1) and the Adur District Local Plan (AH10)~~ electro-magnetic field

Case Officer: [signature]
Date: 06.06.07

[signature] 7/6