

**PLANNING
COMMITTEE**

9th April 2014

Planning Application 2013/302/FUL

Erection of an 8-bedroom & sitting room single storey extension, a single-storey laundry extension and associated site works

Haversham House, 327 Bromsgrove Road, Redditch, Worcestershire, B97 4NH,

**District: Webheath
Applicant: Mr BP Sinha
Expiry Date: 24th January 2014
Ward: WEST**

(see additional papers for Site Plan)

The author of this report is Sharron Williams, Planning Officer (DM), who can be contacted on Tel: 01527 534061 Email: sharron.williams@bromsgroveandredditch.gov.uk for more information.

Site Description

Haversham House is located off the east side of Bromsgrove Road and is one of a small line of properties which front onto that section of Bromsgrove Road which lies between Birchfield Road and the Bromsgrove Highway. The building is used as a care home for the elderly and has had a two storey extension to the rear. The property is served by a semi-circular driveway off Bromsgrove Road.

Proposal Description

Permission is sought to erect a single storey rear extension off the kitchen and sitting room to provide 8 additional bedrooms. Each bedroom would have toilet facilities. An assisted bathroom as well as a new sitting room would be included within the extension. The depth of the extension is approximately 16.5 m overall from the rear wall of an existing two storey rear extension with a varying width 16 - 20.8 m. The extension would have a flat green roof comprising of drought tolerant vegetation such as sedums, grasses, and meadow flowers. The walls would be finished in brickwork to match the existing building.

An additional laundry room measuring approximately 1.9 x 3m would be provided off the boiler room, and be finished with a flat roof and brickwork to match the existing building.

Relevant Policies :

Borough of Redditch Local Plan No.3:

BBE13 Qualities of Good Design
BBE14 Alterations and Extensions
CT02 Road Hierarchy
CT12 Parking Standards
H02 Homes for the Elderly

**PLANNING
COMMITTEE**

9th April 2014

Others:

NPPF National Planning Policy Framework
SPG Encouraging Good Design

Relevant Planning History

2006/255/FUL	Rear Single Storey Extension Of Ten Bedrooms, Sitting Room And Laundry	Refused	19.07.2006
2003/341/FUL	Two Storey Extension	Refused	17.10.2003
1988/336/FUL	Extension To Care Home For The Elderly	Approved	23.06.1988
1984/344/FUL	Change Of Use From Private Dwelling To Residential Home For The Elderly	Approved	29.10.1984
AP0131/HIS5	Two storey Extension To Existing Home For The Elderly	Dismissed at Appeal	04.03.1987
AP0367/HIS5	Two Storey Extension	Dismissed at Appeal	25.06.2004
AP0434/HIS5	Rear Single Storey Extension Of Ten Bedrooms, Sitting Room And Laundry	Dismissed at Appeal	24.01.2007

Consultations

Area Environmental Health Officer

The above application lies within 250m of 4 areas of unknown filled ground the closest being 20m from the site boundary. The application is considered not to require any condition regarding landfill gas.

It is advised that due to the close proximity of other residents that the applicant should be directed to the WRS best practice document regarding demolition and construction.

PLANNING COMMITTEE

9th April 2014

Highway Network Control

Has no objection to the grant of permission, but recommend the provision of an ambulance space. A drawing should be provided by the applicant showing such a space in an accessible area adjacent to the front of the building.

Residential Homes- Adult and Community Services

No comments submitted.

Public Consultation Response

3 objections received raising the following concerns:-

- Experienced disturbances from residents of Haversham House eg. shouting about five or six times between 10pm and 11 pm. Think this can only get worse with the proposed extension.
- Think the proposed development is completely out of character for the area, it is going to cause more noise and nuisance with deliveries in the day and emergency vehicles at night, also more staff on duty coming outside for a smoke and the banging of doors which have been experienced at 1am. Note on the plans eleven parking spaces but there would be 24 beds in total so a potential 24 vehicles visiting plus staff parking, they already park vehicles on the lawns making the front garden an eyesore especially when it is wet weather. This new extension will only add to that.
- Object to these plans because this is a residential area and they will be more than doubling their commercial property. This will bring congestion to the area both in terms of people visiting the place which includes workers, professionals and visitors and also the volume of traffic and noise levels, Bromsgrove Road is already a main busy road which gets traffic jams already. Think it will look unsightly as this will be our view from our house. They already have a high pitched bell going off constantly. The car park facilities proposed will not be adequate for the needs of the care home; they already have parking issues and people trying to access the property.
- This is a very large extension which covers a large proportion of their garden. This is a quiet area with lovely views but building that extension will ruin the surrounding area.

1 Representation

- Whilst not objecting to the building of the extension would like to ask that as part of the permission the owners should erect and maintain a 6 foot high wooden fence at the end of their garden. Their garden backs onto mine and their fence is not properly maintained which has in the past meant that one of their residents has turned up in our kitchen in the middle of the night in a very confused state. Feel that the increased number of residents would encroach on our privacy in our garden without adequate fencing.

Assessment of Proposal

Members may recall that an application (2006/255) was considered at Planning Committee on 18 July 2006 for a similar shaped proposal. However, the proposal was for

**PLANNING
COMMITTEE**

9th April 2014

10 bedrooms and therefore, had a larger footprint than the one proposed now. The 10 bedroom extension utilised a good proportion of the rear garden area and was single storey finished with a hipped roof. The application was recommended for approval as it was considered by officers that the design was sympathetic to the building and surrounding area having a low pitched roof, and part of the extension sunken into the ground in order to reduce its impact. The application was considered by members and was refused 19 July 2006 for the following reasons:-

1. Due to its size, the proposed extension would add significantly to the amount of built form on the site, leading to overdevelopment of the site and lack of suitable amenity space. As such, the proposal would unacceptably detract from the character and visual amenity of the area, contrary to policies H.2, B(BE).13 and B(BE).14 of the Borough of Redditch Local Plan No.3.
2. Due to its size and close proximity to adjacent dwellings, the proposed extension would unacceptably detract from the living conditions of adjoining residents by reason of dominance and general noise and disturbance associated with an increased level of activity arising from the development.

The applicant appealed against the Council's decision. The appeal was dismissed 3 January 2007. The Inspector made comments in his decision as summarised below:-

It is noted that the care home needs a number of improvements and upgrading to both benefit residents and to keep pace with current standards, which can only be done on the back of a significant increase in the number of bedrooms.

The Inspector observed that the building was not typical of other detached properties alongside, in terms of size and character, but it nevertheless appears spacious in its setting. Having regard to these characteristics, to add a substantial addition, covering much of the rear amenity space and close to the boundaries of adjoining gardens, would result in a visually intrusive form of development. It would add significantly to the plot coverage and there is nothing equivalent locally in terms of the amount of built development on a plot. Whilst the additional structure would not impinge on the streetscene, it would be readily visible from neighbouring properties, introducing a bulky and incongruous feature into a spacious environment and as such would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the area.

In terms of the relationship to neighbouring properties, the Inspector stated that although the new accommodation would be close to boundaries, the extension has been designed to minimise direct overlooking of rear gardens and loss of privacy. However, the Inspector agreed with residents that although the extension would now be single-storey, walls and roof would be clearly visible from within habitable rooms, which reinforcing the existing boundary hedging would not ameliorate.

With respect to noise and disturbance, the proposed laundry room would be 6m from the gable wall of the neighbouring house and consider that the imposition of conditions

**PLANNING
COMMITTEE**

9th April 2014

relating to its construction and operation would ensure that there would be no significant noise and disturbance.

The proposal has been amended to address the Inspector's reasoning for dismissing the above appeal. The proposal raises the following matters:-

Design and layout

The overall footprint of the extension has been reduced and would maintain approximately 16 metres garden length between the proposed extension and the rear garden boundary. The extension now comprises of a flat green roof rather than a hipped roof further reducing the overall impact of the extension. The green roof comprising of drought tolerant plants would further enhance the visual appearance of the extension.

Comments have been made in respect to the size of the extension; however, it is considered that the reduced footprint of the scheme is an improvement to the appeal proposal. In addition, it is considered that the revised extension would address issues raised by the inspector as there would be a generous spacing between the extension and rear boundary. The positioning of proposed windows is such that there would be minimal overlooking of neighbouring properties. The proposal would comply with policies B(BE).13 and B(BE).14 and design policies in the NPPF. Although the proposal would potentially conflict with the 60 degree guide set out in SPG Encouraging Good Design, the distance between neighbouring windows and the extension set at a 60 degree angle is approximately 10 metres, therefore, taking into account the design of the extension and distance between the neighbouring properties concerned, it is unlikely that the proposal would have a detrimental impact on the amenities of the neighbouring occupiers.

Noise and general activity associated with the care home.

Several comments have been made in respect to general disturbance associated with the use, with one neighbouring occupier stating that a resident managed to get into their rear garden / kitchen due to the poor quality of the existing boundary treatment. The applicant has been advised of this matter, and plans submitted now clarify that boundary hedging and fencing will be upgraded for the security of the residents. Neighbours have also referred to noise issues including bells ringing. The agent has clarified that the only bells within the building are residents call bells for assistance and a fire alarm bell that is tested occasionally. There are no external bells. Worcestershire Regulatory Service has been consulted and raised no objection to the scheme.

Car parking

As part of the proposal, the car parking layout has been amended increasing the number of spaces to 13 and an ambulance space has been provided as recommended by Highway Network Control. Comments have been made by neighbouring occupiers in respect to the current car parking issues. The car parking provision does not fully meet the maximum requirements set out Local Plan No. 3 in respect to staff parking which requires 1 car space per bedroom for staff parking. Given only a total of 8 staff would be employed once the property is extended, the car parking standard does seem excessive. A total of 6 car parking spaces would be required for the proposed increased number of

**PLANNING
COMMITTEE**

9th April 2014

residents. The proposal shows a total provision of 13 car parking spaces (excluding ambulance space), making a shortfall of 1 space (based on proposed total number of staff and the 6 spaces required for residents). However, there may be scope to add an additional space to make the provision up to 14. Further details on this matter will be provided in the update report. Highway Network Control has no objection to the proposal.

Conclusion

It is considered that the revised proposal addresses concerns raised by the Inspector in relation to the previous scheme. Several comments have been made by neighbouring occupiers in terms of its size and design; however, changing the roof design and reducing the footprint of the extension helps to reduce its impact on the neighbouring occupiers. Other comments have been submitted relating to general noise and disturbance, however, Worcestershire Regulatory Services has no objections, and every effort is proposed to improve security of the site. The proposal complies with policies in the Local Plan and policies in the NPPF.

RECOMMENDATION:

That having regard to the development plan and to all other material considerations, planning permission be GRANTED subject to the following conditions:

Conditions

- 1) The development to which this permission relates must be begun not later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date of the grant of this permission.

Reason:- In accordance with the requirements of Section 91(1) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

- 2) All new external walls shall be finished in materials to match in colour, form and texture those on the existing building, or if a near match cannot be found, the written approval of the Local Planning Authority should be obtained for materials, prior to development commencing. The development shall then be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason:- To ensure that the development is satisfactory in appearance to safeguard the visual amenities of the area and is in accordance with Policy B(BE).13 of the Borough of Redditch Local Plan No.3.

- 3) The development hereby approved shall be implemented in accordance with plans to be defined.

Reason: To accurately define the permission for the avoidance of doubt and to ensure that the development is satisfactory in appearance in order to safeguard

**PLANNING
COMMITTEE**

9th April 2014

the visual amenities of the area in accordance with Policy B(BE).13 of the Borough of Redditch Local Plan No.3

- 4) The Development hereby permitted shall not be brought into use until the parking facilities shown on the approved plan have been properly consolidated, surfaced, drained and otherwise constructed in accordance with details to be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority and these areas shall thereafter be retained and kept available for those uses at all times.

Reason:- In the interests of highway safety, to ensure the free flow of traffic using the adjoining highway and in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework.

- 5) During the course of any site clearance and development, the hours of work for all on-site workers, contractors and sub-contractors shall be limited to between:

0800 to 1800 hours Monday to Friday
0900 to 1200 hours Saturdays

and NO WORKING shall take place at any time on Sundays, Bank Holidays or Public Holidays or at any time outside of the above permitted working hours unless first agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of neighbours amenity and in accordance with Policy B(BE).13 of the Borough of Redditch Local Plan No.3

- 6) No development shall take place until full details of both hard and soft landscape works have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. These details shall include proposed boundary treatment and other means of enclosure, hard surfacing materials, new planting, trees and shrubs to be retained, together with measures to be taken for their protection while building works are in progress.

Reason:- In the interests of the visual amenity of the area and in accordance with Policy CS.8 of the Borough of Redditch Local Plan No.3

- 7) All hard and soft landscaping works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details. The works shall be carried out prior to the occupation of any part of the development or in accordance with a programme agreed in writing by the local planning authority. Any trees or plants which within a period of 5 years from the completion of the development die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of similar sizes or species unless the local planning authority gives written approval to any variation.

**PLANNING
COMMITTEE**

9th April 2014

Reason:- In the interests of the visual amenity of the area and in accordance with Policy CS.8 of the Borough of Redditch Local Plan No.3

- 8) Development shall not begin until parking for site operatives and visitors has been provided within the application site in accordance with details to be submitted to, and approved by, the Local Planning Authority and such provision shall be retained and kept available during construction of the development.

Reason:- To prevent indiscriminate parking in the interests of highway safety and in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework.

Informatives

- 1) The applicant is advised that due to the close proximity of other residents, the applicant should be directed to the following document for best practice during demolition and construction:

Worcestershire Regulatory Services "Code of Best Practice for Demolition and Construction Sites" which can be found on the WRS website.

- 2) The application site lies within 250m of 4 areas of unknown filled ground the closest being 20m from the site boundary. Given that the application is for an extension, gas protection measures should match those measures in place in the existing property. If there are no gas protection measures in the existing property there is no need to incorporate gas protection measures in the extension. The applicant may wish to undertake a landfill gas survey for their own piece of mind.

Procedural matters

This application is being reported to the Planning Committee because two (or more) objections have been received.