1. **THE PROPOSAL AND THE SITE**

This is a full application to demolish a partially built block of flats and build seven new houses.

The proposal follows the grant of planning permission in 2007 on the current application site (No. 32 Hayling Rise) and the adjacent land at No. 24 Woodland Avenue (outside of the current application site) for sixteen flats arranged in four blocks, two storeys tall (plus accommodation in the roof and
basement) and served by an underground car park (WB/070170/OUT and WB/07/0567/OUT refer).

The relevant conditions attached to the planning permission were discharged and works commenced in April 2008. However, the developer fell into financial difficulties and construction activity ceased in December 2008 with the developer subsequently going into Administration. Works undertaken were limited to excavation of the site; construction of the shell (minus part of the roof) of the corner block (Oak Lodge) and substantial completion of the underground car park.

The site was acquired by the new owners in 2009 and negotiations with officers on a revamped scheme have run in parallel.

The site is at the north east corner of the T-junction between Hayling Rise and Woodland Avenue, in the inter-war and early post-war residential area of High Salvington, on the lower slopes of the Downs. This part of High Salvington is characterised by bungalows on the southern part of Woodland Avenue and southern stretch of Hayling Rise, and, generally, larger houses and chalet bungalows on the northern part of Woodland Avenue and facing northern stretch of Hayling Rise. The land slopes steeply north to south but also, more gently, from east to west. The area benefits from mature planting and, often, large gardens, with buildings well set back, though more recent infill and redevelopment has seen densities and the scale of development increase.

The current application site is 0.28 hectares (compared to 0.41 hectares in the approved scheme) in size and is irregular in shape. It was formerly occupied by No. 32 Hayling Rise, which sat in the northern part of the site and was a substantial chalet bungalow built in the inter-war period but extended since. It incorporated a large detached garage close to its northern boundary. Despite demolition and construction works, planting on the street boundaries (south and west), in the form of a thick evergreen hedge and mature tree in the apex of the corner remains as well as a group of three Monterey Cypresses protected by a Tree Preservation Order in the north east corner. However, a protected Ash close to the eastern boundary appears to have disappeared. The site is hoarded off.

To the north, on higher ground, is No. 34 Hayling Rise, a chalet bungalow with pitched roof and dormers which is set well back and separated from the application site by a garage and driveway and a screen of mature trees. No. 24 Woodland Avenue stands to the east of the application site at an angle to the road on appreciably higher ground. It is a smaller, post-war bungalow with hipped roof which has been extended since and incorporates a detached garage by its eastern boundary. Its western boundary with the application site is marked by a substantial fence and tree/shrub screen and, in the deep back garden, by several outbuildings.

A bus route runs along Hayling Rise with a bus stop directly outside No. 32.
The application proposes the demolition of the partially built block and construction of two pairs of semi detached houses and three detached houses. Their arrangement is not too dissimilar from the approved scheme and recently received revisions, following negotiations, have fine tuned the design.

All but Unit 7 in the north east corner appear to address either Hayling Rise or Woodland Avenue. Unit 7 is in a backland position and faces onto an internal landscaped courtyard in the centre of the site. The houses are well set back, following the notional building line, though slightly forward of the approved scheme.

Each of the houses has their own marked plots and gardens with independent pedestrian access from the street apart from Unit 7 which relies on a communal entrance. Vehicular access is, principally, via a new access in Woodland Avenue down a curved ramp into the basement car park. The basement provides parking for 12 cars, as well as parking for bicycles and motor bikes. In addition, it also offers substantial accommodation for Units 1, 2 and 7 in the form of utility/storage and home office space and in the case of Unit 7 bedroom space, taking advantage of the large light well. Unit 4 facing Hayling Rise exploits an existing vehicular access to serve two exclusive open parking spaces tucked in behind the front hedge and adjacent boundary hedge of its neighbour.

The new dwellings are arranged as large two storey residences which provide additional accommodation space in the roofspace and basements and have a minimum of four bedrooms. Whilst they are all individually designed in vernacular and traditional pre-war/Edwardian style, they are presented as a family group with strong common themes. The exception is Unit 7 in the north east corner. Prevalent architectural features in the family of villas/houses include hipped roofs, gables, chimneys, bays, oversailing eaves, jettied upper floors, porches, balconies and pitched roof dormers and rooflights. They are faced in a common palette of brick, various renders including Tudorbethan half timbers and clay roof tiles.

The most distinguished buildings are unit 4, half of a semi detached property, prominently sited on the apex of the corner and featuring a two storey turret with conical roof, and the aforementioned Unit 7. Unit 7 is not readily visible from the street and is arranged as a pavilion with hipped pyramidal roof and round bays, surmounted by balconies.

The applicant has confirmed that the front boundary hedges and remaining trees would be retained for the large and well screened front curtilage space used as the “back gardens” for the houses. Unit 7 benefits from a conventional rear garden. The central courtyard is predominately hard landscaped, though details are absent. Planting to define and reinforce the individual plots and screen and frame the main vehicular access to the basement is also shown, along with retained and enhanced boundary planting.
The applicant has subsequently agreed to building the scheme to achieve at least Level 3 of the Government’s Sustainable Homes Code.

2. **APPLICANT’S SUPPORTING STATEMENT**

Relevant extracts from the applicant’s supporting Planning Statement and Design and Access Statement are set out below:

**PLANNING STATEMENT**

“The proposed development embraces many of the key principles of national planning policy. It will make an efficient use of a brownfield site and provide family housing for which there is a need in the area.

The proposals have been formulated following a detailed assessment of the character of the locality and relevant planning policy context. The proposed scheme incorporates a quality layout and design that responds positively to the existing urban grain and respects the character and appearance of the locality. The proposals have also evolved following discussions with Worthing planners, local residents and the High Salvington Residents Association.

The development proposal and layout demonstrates that the site can accommodate 7 dwellings, with associated car parking without detriment to the amenities of adjoining occupiers. It also retains the existing boundary vegetation which is a feature of the site. The development complements the character of High Salvington and is in keeping with the surrounding residential area.

Given the above, it is therefore considered that the proposals comply with the relevant policies and proposals of national guidance and the saved policies of the Worthing Local Plan and emerging LDF. To conclude, with the existing planning permission for the site for a flatted scheme, along with the careful design of the proposal, it is considered that there are no undue reasons why a favourable consideration should not be given to this proposal.”

**DESIGN AND ACCESS STATEMENT**

“1.0 Introduction

1.1 The application is for the construction of seven detached and semi-detached properties on this prominent corner site. At present the site is partly developed, with the previous consent for 16 flats having been started some time ago. Unfortunately the developer has since ceased trading and works stopped with only the basement car park and the framing of one block complete.

1.2 The new owners of the site decided to re-appraise the scheme and concluded that a design based on family housing would be more appropriate to both the site and prevailing market conditions. The resulting scheme is based around the footprint of the previous
development and works with the completed basement structure. It is the result of extensive negotiations with both Peter Devonport of Worthing Council and the Local Residents Association.

2.0 **Use**

2.1 The site was formerly occupied by a single detached dwelling but this was demolished when works started on building the approved flats scheme. The site now comprises a concrete basement car park, ground floor transfer slab and partially built block of flats. The car park is to remain but the block is to be demolished, partly due to it not working with the latest proposals but mainly due to the fact that it is timber-framed and has been exposed to the elements for some time now.

2.2 The proposed use of the site as seven dwellings is in-line with the previous approval (07/0170/OUT) and appropriate for the suburban residential area. The existing housing stock in the area comprises mostly detached and semi-detached houses and bungalows so it was felt that a development of flats would not be in-keeping with the wider context. This point was acknowledged by Peter Devonport in pre-application discussions and the change has been whole-heartedly welcomed by the Local Residents Association.

3.0 **Amount**

3.1 The site is 2840m² and the development footprint (at ground floor) is 492m² equating to a ratio of 17.3% or 25 dwellings per hectare.

3.2 The Units are good-sized family dwellings as per the accommodation schedule below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>House No.</th>
<th>No. Bedrooms</th>
<th>Gross Internal Floor Area (m²)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>173.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>166.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>112.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>138.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>143.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4/5</td>
<td>133.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3/5</td>
<td>193.95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.0 **Layout**

4.1 The layout has been derived from two principle factors, namely:

4.1.1 The requirement to work with the previously approved and partially constructed scheme.

4.1.2 The change of use from flats to houses.
4.2 The resulting layout therefore has the approved basement footprint as its starting point. Units 1, 2, 5, and 7 line-up directly with these walls to incorporate basement rooms into the houses and Unit 7 also utilises the open lightwell to create a courtyard area. The other Units are set-out to occupy similar footprints to the previously approved blocks in order to maintain the same basic massing and building lines.

4.3 To fit within the general development footprint established, we decided at an early stage that the houses would have to be turned around with the ‘back’ gardens facing the street and the entrances to the properties from the central space above the car park. This was necessary to get sufficient private garden space for each property.

4.4 Having turned the properties around we have tried to avoid an inward looking development and have designed the individual houses to present a ‘frontage’ to the street (Hayling Rise and Woodland Avenue). This has been achieved in the following ways specific and general ways:

4.4.1 Unit 4 has its own vehicular access from the street which re-uses the existing entrance opening to a drive with off-street parking. The front door of the property is on this side of the property facing the road.

4.4.2 Unit 5 has an entrance on the side with the front door facing the road, this is accessed from the footpath leading off Hayling Rise.

4.4.3 The other Units have ground floor doors facing the street and use a combination of porches and canopies to suggest entrances. In all cases there are large windows facing the street giving an open aspect rather than blank walls and small openings.

4.5 The layouts of the individual houses respond to their positions’ on site and are orientated to avoid direct overlooking of one another and to benefit as much as possible from views down the hill towards the sea.

4.6 Unit 7 has a very specific design suited to its position on site, taking into account the following factors:

4.6.1 Flexible home office or bedroom accommodation at basement level to utilise the large lightwell.

4.6.2 Living accommodation at the first floor to maximise views across the site towards the sea and to link to the higher-level garden in the top north-eastern corner of the site.

4.7 The external appearance of the scheme is also something that the planners have been very concerned with so we have worked hard to give the individual houses the appropriate architectural language for High Salvington. As a result this has, to some degree, effected the internal arrangements, overall proportions and general layouts.
5.0 Scale

5.1 Through our discussions and negotiations with planners and residents alike we felt that scale was a critical issue and a slight concern with the approved flat scheme. In changing to individual houses we were able to reduce the scale of these and give the whole development a more domestic feel, in keeping with the properties in the immediate area.

5.2 In addition to this we have used a combination of bays, balconies, hips, gables and porches to bring interest and small scale detail to the facades.

6.0 Landscaping

6.1 A key feature of the approved scheme was the landscaping and particularly the way the blocks were in an informal setting of grass, shrubs, trees and meandering paths, set around the central pergola over the basement light shaft.

6.2 The revised scheme aims to maintain a similar feel within the constraints of the revised scheme. This has been achieved in the following ways:

6.2.1 Central area remains as ‘green’ and open as possible (given the limitations of planting over a concrete slab).

6.2.2 The fronts of the houses do not have boundary walls or fences so that they sit within the landscape as per the approved scheme.

6.2.3 Garden fences between the properties to be timber to height of 1500mm only to avoid too much sense of enclosure.

6.2.4 Planting at the vehicular entrance to the site (avoiding site lines obviously) to give screening to the access road/ramp.

6.3 Another striking feature of the site is the very high hedge along the road frontages. This is to be retained and opened-up only where the new entrance is located, to maintain the same degree of privacy for the site. As such the site when viewed from the road will appear quite similar to how it does now and this prominent corner will retain its essential character. It also gives privacy and enclosure to the private gardens behind, which due to the layout of the development face towards the site boundary.

7.0 Appearance

7.1 The appearance of the buildings has been dictated by negotiations with the planners who insisted on a contextual approach picking-up on local features in the High Salvington Area. At the same time we have tried to follow the lead of the previous approved scheme and not stray too far from this architectural language, which the planners deemed appropriate.
7.2 In studying the local vernacular we noted particular recurring styles, features and materials which have been incorporated into various parts of the design:-

- Bay windows – semi-circular, square and angled.
- Hipped roofs.
- Feature gables, some half-timbered.
- Tile hanging to walls.
- Face brick and render walls.
- Clay tiled pitched roofs.

7.3 At the request of the planners we have taken this basic palette of materials and applied it to all the houses to give a unified appearance. The individual house designs remain quite distinct though to give variety and interest as with the existing buildings in the locality. They are also designed to address the roads and have a ‘frontage’. This was at the request of the planners although it should be noted that the ground floor of all houses will not be visible from the road, being masked by the boundary hedge.

7.4 The area has a wide range of ‘vernacular’ houses and bungalows built through the last century. We have attached some examples below of some of the features that we used as inspiration for this proposal:

8.0 Access and Servicing

8.1 The scheme allows for car parking on site at a ratio of 2 spaces per dwelling in the following configuration:

8.1.1 Underground parking for 12 cars, serving 6 of the Units.  
8.1.2 Unit 4 has off street parking within its own curtilage.

8.2 The basement car park is accessed from Woodland Avenue and utilises the ramp that has already been formed. We have changed the access road to kink slightly to avoid direct views into the basement from the site entrance.

8.3 Unit No. 4 re-uses the existing entrance and cross-over from Hayling Rise to gain access.

8.4 The basement car parking area also has space for 4 motorbikes plus ample secure bike storage (giving at least 2 spaces per dwelling).

8.5 Units 1, 2 and 5 also benefit from basement storage within the property, accessed from the parking area itself, which we would consider to be used for bike storage amongst other things.

8.6 In addition to the provision made for parking, it should be noted that the site is on the No.6 bus route with hourly services to Worthing and there
is a stop directly outside on Hayling Rise. The No.84 bus route is a short walk down the hill on Arundel Road with 3 journeys a day to between Worthing and Chichester.

8.7 **Bin storage is provided at 2 points on site:**

- Adjacent to the entrance for Units 1, 2 and 3.
- On Hayling Rise boundary for Units 4, 5, 6 and 7.

*We would anticipate collection being from the roads without the need for a refuse truck to enter the site and manoeuvre.*

8.8 **All the dwellings are designed to meet Lifetime Homes Standards 1.”**

3. **CONSULTATIONS**

The comments of the **Highway Authority** are awaited.

The **Executive Head of Health, Housing and Community Safety** raises no objection.

The comments of the **Planning Policy Manager** are awaited.

4. **REPRESENTATIONS**

The consultation period does not expire until 17th June 2010 but at the time of writing, three representations have been received from the High Salvington Residents’ Association, No. 12 Hayling Gardens and No. 39 Hayling Rise.

The High Salvington Residents’ Association, raise no objections subject to the same conditions being imposed as on the previous approved scheme.

No. 12 Hayling Gardens and No. 39 Hayling Rise raise the following objections:-

i) The previous planning permission would have been preferable to the current scheme.

ii) The density is too high with miniscule gardens for 3 bedroom houses.

iii) How does this fit with the rest of the High Salvington layout?

iv) The greed of some developers seems to have no limit and this scheme beats all other changes seen in the area.

v) Although the development does need re-starting after the last failed attempt, I feel that to fit 7 dwellings on the plot is excessive and would be out of keeping with the existing dwellings in the area.

vi) The original plan for the 4 blocks of apartments was to also use the neighbouring property in Woodland Avenue. I would think that 7 dwellings would just about fit over both properties, but if using just No.
32 Hayling Rise, then 4 houses would fit in nicely, but still retain the feel of the surrounding area.

5. **PLANNING ASSESSMENT**

The main issues raised by this proposal are:

- The principle of residential redevelopment, density and dwelling mix;
- Impact on living conditions of neighbouring and quality of future occupiers' living conditions;
- Quality of design of the development and impact on the character and appearance of the area;
- Access and parking;
- Adequacy of development contributions;
- Sustainability issues.

As such the proposal should be principally assessed against saved Worthing Local Plan Policies BE1, H18; RES7, RES12 and South East Plan Policies BE1, BE6; SP3; CC1; CC2; CC3; CC4; H1; H3; H4: H5; T2; T4; NRM1; NRM4; SCT1;and SCT5. Government Policy is also relevant in Planning Policy Statement 1: Delivering Sustainable Development; Planning Policy Statement 3: Housing; PPG13: Transport: PPS25 Development; Flood Risk Development; PPG16: and Archaeology and Planning. The Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA), Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment and submitted Core Strategy are also pertinent.

**The principle of residential redevelopment, density and dwelling mix**

The principle of the residential redevelopment of the site was accepted in 2007 when outline and Reserved Matters permission was granted and the approved scheme partially implemented. This was on the basis of the approved scheme achieving a density of 39 dwellings per hectare and making efficient use of brownfield land (and including the site of No. 24 Woodlands Avenue) in an urban, but only moderately, sustainable location. It addressed the acknowledged demand for flats at that time and contributed significantly to meeting the saved West Sussex Structure Plan housing target.

Since that time, the Saved West Sussex Structure Plan Policies have lapsed and the South East Plan adopted. That said, the new Secretary of State has signalled the intention to abolish the South East Plan (as the relevant Regional Spatial Strategy) and has indicated that decisions on housing supply should rest with Local Planning Authorities without the framework of regional numbers and plans and that this announcement should be a material consideration in any planning decisions. However, the South East Plan currently still remains part of the Development Plan, and, as such, has statutory weight.

The Draft Core Strategy has also emerged, recently completing formal consultation with a view to submission in June/July and is informed by the
studies of The Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment and The Strategic Housing Market Assessment, published in 2009.

Perhaps most importantly, National Planning Policy Statement 3: Housing has been modified very recently to exclude domestic gardens from the definition of brownfield land to prevent “garden-grabbing” and also to scrap the national minimum density of 30 dwellings per hectare in preference for locally set densities.

Against this background, there remain some strong arguments in favour of residential development.

Not the least is the fact that the extant planning permission may still lawfully be fully implemented, if desired (if development were restricted to simply the plot of No. 32 Hayling Rise and excluded No. 24 Woodland Avenue, it would still need to ensure it complied with all the relevant conditions). That said, the applicant reports that the partly built block has been so damaged by exposure to the elements over the past year and is not economically feasible. Furthermore, the market has changed significantly to favour family houses over flats.

Whilst the precise status of the site in terms of the new Planning Policy Statement 3: Housing brownfield land definition is unclear, there is a good case to be made that, as an abandoned building site, albeit for residential development, with no real evidence of gardens remaining or being laid out, it would be unreasonable to treat this site as a domestic garden.

Certainly, the site is identified in the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment as a potential development site, although largely on the basis of the extant planning permission.

The switch to family houses proposed in the new application also gels with the findings of the Strategic Housing Market Assessment and the recent Core Strategy, and, as such, better meets current identified housing demand. The reduction in dwellings yielded by the shrunken site and downscaled development is regrettable but acceptable as there is still scope to redevelop the adjacent No. 24 Woodland Avenue, if this is desired.

The net increase of six dwellings on the site will still contribute materially towards the regional housing target and identified local housing requirements. Whilst the density of development has reduced to 25 dwellings per hectare, with the scrapping of national minimum density of Planning Policy Statement 3: Housing and the Secretary of State declaring his intention to abolish the South East Plan (with its target of 40 dwellings per hectare), this is acceptable in this instance. Critical to this judgement are the prevailing densities and character of the area; the noted benefits of family housing in better meeting housing demand; and the constraints posed by the partly built-out approved scheme. In any event, South East Plan Policy H5 offers significant flexibility by setting the density figure as a regional target over the plan period and does not require each scheme to meet this. Finally, the residential floorspace
provided in the new scheme appears not to be significantly different, pro rata, to the approved scheme.

Impact on living conditions of neighbouring and quality of future occupiers’ living conditions

The proposal broadly follows the layout and form of the approved scheme, and, as such, avoids the pitfalls of harming the amenity of neighbouring occupiers. Adequate separation distances are retained and good boundary screening may be secured by condition. Other safeguarding measures include the upper floor north facing secondary window to a bedroom in Unit 6 adjacent to No. 34 Hayling Rise being obscure glazed (it faces a blank gable, in any event); and the east elevation of Unit 1 which adjoins the neighbouring No. 24 Woodland Avenue and is windowless at upper floor level.

Acceptable relationships between the new houses themselves are also generally achieved by careful arrangement of windows to avoid overlooking and good separation distances. As a wholly new dwelling in the north east corner of the site, occupying a space reserved as a communal garden in the approved scheme, Unit No. 7 merits fuller attention. In plan form, it appears close to the boundary with No. 24 Woodland Avenue. However, due to the topography and the fact that the ground floor sits in wholly excavated ground, only the second floor rises above the adjacent ground level of No. 24. As such, it reads as a bungalow from this vantage point. Given the separation distance, oblique siting and boundary screening, this is considered acceptable. Following negotiations, the latest revisions show an improved and acceptable relationship between Units 6 and 7 in terms of spacing and overlooking.

All the new houses enjoy a satisfactory standard of accommodation and generous and secluded gardens. A particularly welcome feature is the fact that all units would meet the Lifetime Homes standard in terms of adaptability for use by people with mobility difficulties. Balcony views to the street, to the sea and into the courtyard are also positive points. Unit 7’s basement accommodation is unconventional but exploits this unusual opportunity imaginatively and enjoys adequate light and air.

Quality of design of the development and impact on the character and appearance of the area

Broadly echoing the form and layout of the approved scheme, the proposal generally harmonises well into the townscape. Whilst set slightly forward of the building line of the approved scheme to allow a less congested and more satisfactory layout, it still retains the open character of the corner and deeply recessed building line.

The street frontage buildings generally reproduce the characteristic spacing of the neighbourhood and sit comfortably in the space, though the now divorced No. 24 Woodland Avenue sits at a slightly awkward angle. The individual and marked plots reproduce the characteristic rhythm of the townscape.
Although only Units 4 and 5 actually look onto Hayling Rise, the semblance of all houses facing the street is cleverly retained by Units 1, 2, 3 and 6 still presenting their principal frontages to the street, incorporating doors to these elevations and all of these benefiting or capable of benefiting from individual pedestrian gated accesses to the street and largely screened by the existing hedge, or supplementary screening, as necessary.

The internal courtyard is an interesting, if untypical feature, which nonetheless, lends focus and cohesion to the development and enables, the otherwise, anomalous Unit 7 in the north east corner, to integrate successfully. Its design will need careful consideration and is secured by condition.

The design quality of the buildings, individually, and as family, is good, responding well to local distinctiveness in terms of height and design and topography and incorporating characteristic local vernacular materials and features and palette of materials. As pairs of semi detached villas facing Woodland Avenue, Units 1 to 4 are larger than typical for the area but not unacceptably so, against the background of the approved scheme. Unit 7 is unusual in its design, form and siting being landlocked in the rear of the site. However, it is not visible from the street and whilst it appears as an anomalous feature of the layout, it displays an attractive and striking design, which sits comfortably in this context, having regard to the approved scheme layout.

The verdant character of the site is safeguarded by the retention of the feature front hedge and boundary planting, supplemented as necessary, with deep front lawns.

The basement parking conceals what would otherwise be unsightly surface car parking and is a major asset. The main vehicular ramp access is well screened by the curved drive and planting which may be supplemented and secured by condition.

The site in its current part-built form and hoarded off is unattractive and its development would remove this eyesore.

Access and parking

Located in a hilly, outer residential suburb and not close to many local facilities, the development is largely reliant on car for access, though a bus stop served by an infrequent bus service is sited directly outside the Hayling Rise frontage.

The principal vehicular access is off Woodland Avenue, just to the west of the access in the approved scheme. The 12 basement parking spaces and two private spaces served by the existing access off Hayling Rise would provide two spaces per house. Generous cycle and motorbike parking is also shown.

The car parking provision is less than the maximum standard of 3 cars per four bedroom house as set out in the published Supplementary Planning
Guidance but acceptable, especially given the extensive scope for on-street parking.

Direct and convenient pedestrian access to each dwelling is provided, though the landlocked Unit 7 relies on a communal access via the courtyard.

Ventilation for the underground car park is via the courtyard but details are awaited.

The views of the Highway Authority are awaited.

Adequacy of development contributions

The applicant has agreed in principle to meet the Highway Authority’s requirements for a development contribution towards upgrading local transport facilities to meet the additional pressure generated by the development, and details of the financial sum are awaited.

Sustainability issues

The applicant has agreed to design the building to achieve at least Level 3 of the Government’s Sustainable Homes Code.

6. CONCLUSION

This is an abandoned building site where no domestic garden remains and the principle of residential redevelopment has been established previously and development begun. The new scheme makes efficient use of the land and meets an acknowledged demand for family housing. The scheme would remove an unsightly half-built blot on the landscape and largely echoes the general layout and form of the approved scheme, respecting the building line and spacing of the prevailing built development in the area, though significantly larger in scale. The designs respond to the local vernacular and the verdant setting is retained. The scheme avoids harm to neighbouring properties by careful siting, design and screening and the properties would enjoy a high quality environment. The houses are sustainably designed. Whilst the Highway Authority’s comments are awaited, and the development is reliant on the car, the access arrangements appear satisfactory and the basement parking is a major benefit, with scope to accommodate any notional overspill parking demand in the street. A legal undertaking is required to secure the necessary development contributions towards upgrading transport facilities and sustainable design and the applicants have agreed this in principle. As such it should be supported, subject to appropriate conditions and legal agreement.
7. **RECOMMENDATION**

THAT SUBJECT TO THE COMMENTS OF THE HIGHWAY AUTHORITY, THE DECISION IN THIS CASE BE DELEGATED TO THE EXECUTIVE HEAD OF PLANNING, REGENERATION AND WELLBEING TO AWAIT THE COMPLETION OF A LEGAL AGREEMENT WITH A VIEW TO PLANNING PERMISSION BEING GRANTED SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:-

1. C1A Standard full condition 5 YEARS
2. C12B Windows to be obscure glazed.
3. C12D No new windows (dwellings).
4. Provide parking before occupation
5. C6F Measures for surface water discharge.
7. C6L Materials/plant area during construction
8. C7E Provide scheme for dust suppression.
9. C7C No extension/alterations to building(s).
10. C7G Limitation on hours of construction.
11. C8A Agree/provide landscaping scheme.
12. Agree boundary treatment
13. C9B Agree samples of materials.
14. C6D Visibility to be provided to access.
15. Agree architectural details
16. Build strictly in accordance with approved plans

AND THAT IN THE EVENT OF THE LEGAL AGREEMENT NOT BEING SATISFACTORILY CONCLUDED WITHIN A REASONABLE PERIOD, THAT THE APPLICATION BE DELEGATED TO THE EXECUTIVE HEAD OF PLANNING, REGENERATION AND WELLBEING TO REFUSE THE APPLICATION ON THE BASIS OF FAILURE TO PROVIDE FOR THE REQUIRED DEVELOPMENT CONTRIBUTIONS AND SUSTAINABLE DESIGN.

8. **BACKGROUND PAPERS**

Observations of the Highway Authority
Observations of the Executive Head of Health, Housing and Community Safety
Observations of the Planning Policy Manager
Letters of Representation from Members of the Public
Letter of Support from the Applicant or Applicant's Agent

22nd June 2010
Location: Sunhill Court Mill Lane

Proposal: Proposed rear first floor extension to provide additional residential accommodation (4 en suite bedrooms and dayroom) positioned above previously approved ground floor extension (WB/09/0712/FULL refers).

1. THE PROPOSAL AND THE SITE

The proposal is to extend the north wing of the Sunhill Court Nursing Home at first floor level above an existing ground floor extension. It would measure some 2.5 metres in height, (giving an overall height of about 6.5 metres) 9.9 metres in width and 9.65 metres in depth. It would not extend the full size of the ground floor extension being some 3.1 metres shorter on the north side and some 2 metres shorter on the east side. It would be joined to the existing
building by a glazed link and it would be finished in a pale yellow render to match the existing. It would provide four en-suite bedrooms and a day room for residents. Three of these would be for existing residents who are sharing undersized double rooms at present.

The home is a large building, mainly two-storey with a high roof fronting Mill Lane but increasing to three storeys at the rear as the land falls towards the Gallops. A balcony runs along at first floor level. The frontage to Mill Lane incorporates a drive with ingress and egress points and vehicle parking. One additional parking space would be provided.

At this point Mill Lane is an unmade road. The area is semi-rural and verdant in character, with views into the Gallops and The South Downs National Park. Surrounding detached properties are domestic in scale and of various designs and styles.

2. APPLICANT’S DESIGN AND ACCESS STATEMENT

The applicant has submitted a Design and Access Statement summarised as follows:-

“Amount
The proposal is to extend over the existing ground floor to provide four new bedrooms and a staff room

Layout
The main building is accessed by a ramped drive from Mill Lane.

Scale
The building would have maximum dimensions of 6.15 metres above ground level, 5.3 metres above the raised patio, 9.65 metres wide and 11.90 metres deep.

Landscaping
The existing landscaping would be unaffected

Appearance
Pale yellow painted rendered block-work with felt roof to match existing

Use
Bedrooms and a staff room

Access
Site accessed from Mill Lane by sloping forecourt to entrance. Ramp provided for wheelchair access. Car parking provided on west side of site. There is a bus route (No.6) along Hayling Rise which is a short walk west of site. Residents are transported by cars. There will not be an increase in traffic flow due to these proposals.
Additional Information

Our client currently has three double rooms in the home, which are undersized under legislation – being the Care Quality Commission, Care Homes Regulations 2001. He will be de-registering these as doubles, and register them as single rooms. This leads to a loss of three residents. The new extension will house these three residents plus one more, leading to the increase of plus one bedroom/resident.

With each resident, there is also the requirement to provide 4.1 square metres of lounge area. The day room indicated on the plans is to satisfy this requirement. This room will be kept free of televisions and radios, and used as a quiet room.

The parking provision will increase by one. I am updating plans to indicate this. There are no specific areas for staff, visitors or ambulances in the parking area.

Our client will be advised of the need to keep noisy residents out of the new bedrooms (by its nature old age can affect people differently you must agree, so a quiet resident one day could be noisy on another day). The west window nearest the property to the north has been moved from the boundary. Regulations restrict the opening of upper floor windows to 75mm, which may help to lower noise levels.

Our client will provide a new fence to the north boundary with screen planting to match that cur back to facilitate the lower ground floor extension to ensure privacy is maintained.”

3. CONSULTATIONS

The views of the Highway Authority are awaited.

The views of the Executive Head of Health, Housing and Community Safety are awaited.

4. REPRESENTATIONS

Four letters of objection have been received from occupiers of Moonrise, Toftwood, Little Pitches and Millstones in Mill Lane whose comments are summarised below:-

i) Overdevelopment.

ii) Mill Lane is unsuitable for fire and ambulance service access.

iii) It will result in an increase in the number of residents and consequently increase staff and visitors.
iv) There is already noise from the kitchen and refuse bins and patients crying out during day and this will increase and be brought nearer to the neighbour at unsocial times of day and night.

v) The delivery trucks speed in the lane.

vi) There is likely to be an increase in traffic and Mill lane cannot cope.

vii) It is only a year since the home applied to build its last extension and it already dominates its neighbours.

viii) Further development would be out of keeping.

ix) The building is already out of character.

x) The submitted plans do not show the neighbour’s extensions.

xi) There will be a loss of privacy for the neighbour.

xii) The neighbour will lose the open outlook which will be replaced by an unattractive building.

xiii) The roof of the existing building is already 1.7 metres above the neighbour’s garden and this will be increased by a further 2.5 metres which will result in loss of light.

xiv) The previous application to extend the conservatory over this front roof was refused and this is bigger.

xv) This property has been massively extended by stealth with a large number of incremental additions.

xvi) There will be a need for a Party Wall Agreement.

xvii) Public transport to the area is very limited.

**High Salvington Residents’ Association** objects as follows:-

i) There would be overshadowing and loss of amenity and light.

ii) The extension would be only 2-3 metres away and at same level as first floor living room and terrace of Moonrise to the north. It would extend by at least 12 metres and be at least 3 metres high. Such a large area of masonry would be oppressive and overpowering in mass and bulk and would severely affect residents’ enjoyment.

iii) It would severely reduce the amount of natural light and sunlight available to the east facing rear rooms and terrace of Moonrise, particularly in winter when the sun is low in the sky.

iv) The windows in the west elevation of the extension would overlook the rear terrace and living room window of Moonrise from an angle and at such close proximity that privacy would be severely compromised.

v) The windows on the east side would be so high above the ground they would look directly into parts of the rear garden.

vi) At its closest point, the exterior would be only 30 centimetres from the wall of Moonrise. Foundation work close to the boundary could affect the foundations of Moonrise.

vii) Sunhill Court is designated as a ‘Radon affected area’ there is no mention of special procedures regarding this.

5. **RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY**

The nursing home has been extended incrementally over time. Most recently a single storey rear extension to lower ground floor bedrooms and a raised patio
area was approved (WB/09/0712/FULL refers). Previously, permission was granted for an extension to the first floor conservatory (WB/04/01349 refers).

6. **PLANNING ASSESSMENT**

   The main issues for consideration are the principle of additional residential accommodation, its impact on the amenities of the existing nursing home's residents and neighbours, the quality of design and impact upon the character and appearance of the area, and the setting of the South Downs National Park. As such the application should be considered against South East Plan Policies SP3, CC1, CC5, CC6, BE1, H1, H2, H4, H5, H6, T4, T5, C5, BE2, and ‘Saved’ Worthing Local Plan Policies RES7, BE1, TR9, H14, H16, H18. Planning Policy Statement 1: Delivering Sustainable Development, Planning Policy Guidance 13: Transport, and Planning Policy Guidance 24: Planning and Noise are also relevant.

   **Principle**

   The principal of extending the use is acceptable. The extension would provide upgraded accommodation for three existing residents, who currently share undersized double rooms, and a dayroom for all residents in order for the home to comply with current regulations.

   Although the number of residents on site has increased over the years, it is considered to have sufficient capacity to accommodate the extension and one additional resident in terms of indoor and outdoor communal space and therefore, on this basis, the proposal does not represent an over-development of the site.

   **Impact upon Nursing Home residents and neighbours**

   As designed, the extension would face directly the windows of the existing rooms. The distance between the extension and existing windows would be 5 metres and because residents spend a large proportion of their time in their rooms, this close relationship is likely to have a severe impact on the privacy and outlook for existing occupiers and is considered unacceptable.

   The extension would be close to the northern boundary and it is this neighbour who would be principally affected. This neighbouring property, Moonrise, has a first floor study window facing the shared boundary. A roof terrace is accessed from this study and this too faces the boundary. A raised sun terrace, off the lounge and dining room at ground floor level also faces the boundary. The rear windows of the proposed extension would be set slightly lower than the roof terrace and the sun terrace would be at the same height as the extension. Although no direct overlooking onto the neighbour to the north would occur since no windows are proposed in the northern elevation of the
extension, there would be an oblique relationship whereby some privacy would be lost.

The extension would be set away from the northern boundary by a minimum of some 4 metres. The bulk of the extension would be set away from the boundary at an angle with a flat roof which reduces some of its impact. However, the outlook and view from the windows, balconies and garden of Moonrise would be reduced. Due to the height and position the extension would be overbearing and result in unacceptable overshadowing. It should be noted that the first floor conservatory had to be reduced in size to avoid such an impact (WB/04/01349 refers) and it was not proposed as close as the current extension.

In terms of noise, the additional disturbance that would result from one extra resident on site would be insignificant but the extension would bring a source of noise and disturbance closer to the neighbour which would be unacceptable.

**Quality of design and impact upon character and appearance**

The design of the extension is functional and unattractive but is similar to earlier extensions and would therefore be difficult to refuse purely on design grounds given its position at the rear of the property. The continuation of flat roof does provide a horizontal emphasis to the building, in line with a previous extension. The windows of the extension would sit directly above those of the ground floor to continue the rhythm and form. Guards have been incorporated into the first floor windows to improve the overall quality and interest of the scheme.

**Setting of South Downs National Park**

The site is partly visible from the Gallops and from views across to Cissbury Ring, but there is reasonable tree screening to the site, so views of it would be filtered and the setting of the South Downs National Park would not be adversely impacted upon. The applicant has agreed to supplement existing boundary treatment with additional planting which could be the subject of a condition.

**Access and parking**

Ample parking is available on site and the increase in the number of residents by one would not give rise to any highway safety concern but the views of the Highway Authority are awaited. The applicant has offered to provide one additional parking space and Officers are in discussion with the applicant over its location.
7. **CONCLUSION**

The proposal would be an unsightly addition which would be overbearing for Moonrise severely restricting its outlook and amenities whilst bringing the potential for noise and disturbance nearer to that property added to the reduction in privacy from the windows in the proposed extension.

8. **RECOMMENDATION**

**Refuse** on the grounds that:-

The proposal would introduce an intrusive and unsympathetically designed extension, unacceptably close to the neighbouring property Moonrise, such that it would be overbearing, create overshadowing and loss of privacy for the occupiers as well as introducing an additional source of noise and disturbance which would result in further loss of residential amenity. As such the proposal is contrary to saved Worthing Local Plan Policies RES7 and H18 and South East Plan Policies BE1 and BE2.

9. **BACKGROUND PAPERS**

Observations of the Highway Authority
Observations of the Executive Head of Health, Housing and Community Safety
Observations of High Salvington Residents’ Association
Letters of Representation from Members of the Public

22nd June 2010
Location: 21 Raglan Avenue

Proposal: Demolition of existing garage and construction of a two storey x 3 bedroom dwelling to the side of existing property.

2. THE PROPOSAL AND THE SITE

The application site comprises a parcel of garden land to the side of a pair of modern two-storey residential properties. Located on the south side of Raglan Avenue, the site has a wide plot accommodating an existing single storey extension to the side. The recent assisted living residential scheme in Littlehampton Road is in the process of being built out to the west of the site.
The application proposes to demolish the existing side extension and erect a two storey three bedroom house attached to the flank wall of the existing dwelling. The proposed house would be 6.2 metres wide with a ground floor bay window and first floor tile hanging.

5. **APPLICANT'S DESIGN AND ACCESS STATEMENT**

The applicant has submitted a Design and Access Statement summarised as follows:

*Context/use*

The development will meet or exceed Code for Sustainable Homes Level 3.

*Amount*

A new dwelling to the side of the existing property.

*Scale*

The new property is a copy of the existing. The layout is derived from the requirement to maintain the local pattern of development.

*Appearance*

The design of the dwelling will mirror the existing dwelling in terms of proportions, materials and finishes. The proposed dwelling is well designed and proportioned and will result in an enhancement to the street scene.

*Landscaping*

The land to the front is a concrete hard standing. It is proposed to use the existing crossover and off road parking.

*Location/Access*

The existing dwelling will have off street parking and it is proposed to use the same access. New and existing dwelling will have cycle storage.”

6. **CONSULTATIONS**

The **Executive Head of Health, Housing and Community Safety** has raised no objection subject to the imposition of a precautionary ground contamination condition.

The views of the **Highway Authority** are awaited.

7. **REPRESENTATIONS**

One letter has been received on behalf of Nos. 65, 67, 69, and 71 Raglan Avenue stating that these residents would not wish to see the scheme of new houses to the west, under construction but on hold due to market conditions, affected by this proposal.
5. **RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY**

In 2002 an application for a two-storey side extension to provide an annexe for elderly parents was approved (WB/00/00930/FULL refers).

6. **PLANNING ASSESSMENT**

The main issues raised by this proposal are the principle of residential development, the impact on the amenity of neighbours and future occupiers, design and impact on the character of the surrounding area, parking and access. As such the application should be principally considered against saved Local Plan Policies BE1, TR9, and H18 and South East Plan Policies CC1, CC2, CC4, CC6, H1, H2, H4, H5, BE1, BE2, BE6, NRM11, and T4. Government policy in PPS1: Delivering Sustainable Development, PPS3: Housing and PPG13: Transport and allied design and other guidance are also particularly relevant.

**Principle**

The principle of more intensive residential use of the existing urban area, such as the plot subdivision proposed, is supported. However, the acceptability of the specific proposal depends upon the particular circumstances which are considered below.

**Impact of the amenity of neighbours and future occupiers**

The internal layout of the proposed dwelling would provide a good standard of accommodation for future occupiers with adequate light and ventilation. However, the garden area to serve the new dwelling narrows sharply and the amount of useable garden space would be relatively small for a 3 bed family house when compared with its neighbours.

The new dwelling would be attached and formed as an extension to the existing pair of semi-detached properties. There would be a rear projection at first floor level of some 2.2 metres. This would affect the outlook, daylight and sunlight to the rear bedroom window of the existing property. A similar but lesser impact would occur to the front bedroom window of the adjoining property from the small forward projection at the front.

The proposal would also impact upon the new residential properties approved on the land to the west of the site, as part of the wider assisted living scheme along Littlehampton Road. Although not yet constructed, the impact upon that development is a material consideration in judging the acceptability of the current proposal. There would be two affected properties which are a pair of semi-detached houses located within just 8 metres of the western boundary of the application site. The garden area serving the nearer house is angled towards the site and there would be an adverse and overbearing impact on this property from the development of the proposed house.
Design and impact on the character of the surrounding area (including trees on adjoining land)

The applicant has attempted to include certain architectural features from the existing pair of semi-detached properties into the new dwelling. However, this has been largely unsuccessful. Due to the width of the site, the proposed dwelling would be much narrower than the other similarly styled properties in the street upon which the design is based (excluding, of course, No. 21 which has been extended). Added to the existing two storey extension the new dwelling would form a long terrace. This would further break the rhythm and pattern of houses on this side of the street. Furthermore, the narrower width would result in a contrasting arrangement of windows and a front entrance compared with the original designs and only emphasises the differences, as does the proposed front bay which is an alien feature not present on the other similarly styled properties in the street.

In addition, the proposed dwelling would involve the cutting back of an established tree on the western boundary. This has been incorrectly shown on the submitted plans and the spread of the tree is not accurately portrayed. This tree was retained as part of the residential development to the west because it contributed toward the visual amenity of the scheme and its surroundings. Any severe cut back would unacceptably reduce the amenity value of that tree to the detriment of the visual amenities of the area.

Parking and Access

The site is within reasonable walking distance of local facilities and public transport in Littlehampton Road. In terms of parking standards the maximum standard for the proposed dwelling would be two parking spaces. The plans do not show any parking for the proposed or existing houses. However, at least one on-site space could be provided for each property which is below the maximum parking standard and acceptable. The views of the Highway Authority are awaited.

7. CONCLUSION

Although the principle of infill residential development may be accepted, the design of the proposed dwelling has not taken sufficient account of the impact upon the amenity of neighbouring occupiers and the established character and appearance of the street scene. The scale, position and form of the proposal in relation to the neighbouring properties under construction to the west and to the existing property would result in overshadowing, be overbearing and un-neighbourly and detract from the character and appearance of the street.

9. RECOMMENDATION
Refuse on the grounds that:-

1. The proposed dwelling would, by reason of its proximity and massing, be detrimental to the residential amenities of No. 21 Raglan Avenue and the residential development under construction to the west having an overbearing and overshadowing effect, resulting in loss of light and reduced outlook. As such the proposal is considered contrary to saved Worthing Local Plan Policies BE1, H16, and H18 and Policy BE1 of the South East Plan 2009.

2. The proposed dwelling would, by reason of its position, discordant design and attachment to the existing un-matching two storey extension present an incongruous addition that would integrate poorly with this group of similar properties to the detriment of the character and appearance of the street scene and would result in harm to an important tree on the western boundary of the site. As such, the proposal conflicts with saved Worthing Local Plan Policies BE1 and H16 and Policies BE1 and CC6 of the South East Plan 2009.

9. BACKGROUND PAPERS

Observations of the Executive Head of Health, Housing and Community Safety
Observations of the Highway Authority
Letter of Representation from Members of the Public