18 DCSE2005/0879/F - REFURBISHMENT AND EXTENSION OF EXISTING HOME TO PROVIDE 15 PLACE DAY CARE CENTRE AND 2 CRISIS CARE FLATS AT WOODSIDE RESIDENTIAL HOME, REYNOLDS COURT, HILDERSLEY, ROSS-ON-WYE, HEREFORDSHIRE. HR9 7NE

For: Shaw Healthcare (Herefordshire) Ltd. per Pentan Partnership, Beaufort Studio, 1 Atlantic Wharf, Cardiff CF10 4AH

Date Received: 18th March, 2005 Ward: Ross-on-Wye East Grid Ref: 61101, 24036

Expiry Date: 13th May, 2005

Local Members: Councillor Mrs. A.E. Gray and Councillor Mrs. C.J. Davis

### 1. Site Description and Proposal

- 1.1 Woodside Residential Home is situated on the south side of the A40(T) just to the east of The Mead. It adjoins sheltered accommodation (Reynolds Court) to the west and south and a detached house (Long Close) to the east. Vehicular access is off The Mead and through the access drive and parking area of Reynolds Court. The residential home has a small parking and service area. Currently there are just 8 places at the home plus a small day centre. The building is single-storeyed and forms the third side of a courtyard, the other two sides being two of the buildings of Reynolds Court.
- 1.2 It is proposed to reduce the number of units to two crisis-care flats, which would occupy the same part of the site as the existing bedrooms and bathrooms. The day centre would be expanded by a single-storey extension to the west side of the building. This would be about 6.8 m x 5.5 m and would be constructed of facing brickwork and concrete tiles, both to match the existing building. It would be used as a lounge.

### 2. Policies

### 2.1 Hereford and Worcester County Structure Plan

Policy CTC1 - Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty

#### 2.2 South Herefordshire District Local Plan

Policy C8 - Development Within Area of Great Landscape Value

Policy CF5 - Provision of Community Buildings
Policy GD1 - General Development Criteria

### 2.3 Herefordshire UDP (Revised Deposit Draft)

Policy CF5 - New Community Facilities

Policy CF7 - Residential Nursing and Care Homes

### 3. Planning History

3.1 There have not been any recent applications relating to these premises.

## 4. Consultation Summary

# **Statutory Consultations**

4.1 Welsh Water recommends that conditions be imposed regarding drainage.

### Internal Council Advice

- 4.2 Traffic Manager has no objections to the grant of permission.
- 4.3 Head of Environmental Health has no adverse comments on the proposal.

## 5. Representations

- 5.1 The applicant's agent make the following comments:
  - (1) the proposal maintains the existing day care areas whilst the extension provides an additional lounge area
  - (2) the 2 crisis-care flats replace the residential accommodation
  - (3) this proposal is to provide new facilities that are more appropriate for current and future care needs of residents and day centre users.
- 5.2 In addition a supporting statement has been submitted which is included as an appendix to this report.
- 5.3 Ross Rural Parish Council have no objections to this small building extension but objects to the change of residential to day care facilities.

In addition the Council requested that the following points be considered:

- following a meeting on Sunday 10th April between the 2 ward councillors and Mrs Johnstone, Manager Hanover Housing Association, we understand that access to the existing residential home is a right of way over land owned by Hanover Housing Association
- currently Woodside Residential Home has parking on their land for 3 cars (as per their application) but the current staff/residents require 5 spaces. The application is to increase daily use to a 15 place day care centre with additional staff, visiting professionals etc. This is likely to lead to an additional daily parking requirement.
- additionally, vehicles parked on land owned by Hanover Housing Association currently causes access problems for emergency vehicles. These problems will be increased by further development. The consequences of ambulances and fire engines not being able to access the site are something that this council would not want to be responsible for

- the site, which is occupied by both Hanover Housing Association and Woodside Residential Home, borders a residential road and the A40 Trunk road, neither of which is suitable for on-street parking
- this council now objects to the additional development of the site on the grounds of safety due to the lack of parking facilities within the area.
- 5.4 12 letters have been received objecting to the proposal from Hanover Housing Association (which manages Reynolds Court) and residents of the sheltered housing. In summary the following concerns are raised:
  - Reynolds Court is a Sheltered Housing Scheme for the elderly and disabled, with 29 units. When it was constructed some 17 years ago the amount of through traffic was negligible
  - there are now more residents with cars and for this reason part of the garden is now used for 4 more parking spaces
  - a strict rule applies that only residents can use car parking facilities, their visitors, no matter what their state of mobility, MUST park out in The Mead. This alone causes a lot of problems
  - also required to keep clear access AT ALL TIMES for emergency vehicles needing to get both to Reynolds Court and Woodside - a point everyone seems to have missed
  - Estate Manager seems to spend half the day acting as 'Traffic Warden' which is not enjoyable let alone the aggravation it causes
  - where is all the extra traffic going to park? A lot of service users will be dropped off and the vehicle leaves, but it is double jeopardy they have to be picked up again in the evening
  - instead of 8 service users per day this will be increased to 15, extra facilities are to be offered therefore more traffic from outside agencies, and presumably more staff, who, despite requests, refuse to park in The Mead and use up what parking spaces Woodside currently have making it impossible for deliveries etc.
  - For these reasons the situation regarding current traffic problems let alone those that would occur should planning permission be granted for the extension and change of use should be carefully considered . In my estimate it would involve at least three times the amount of traffic
  - vehicles needing to access Woodside seem to think they have the right of way and have been rude, abusive and threatening to residents (taxi drivers in particular). I understand that one of our residents has an ongoing complaint with the licensing authorities over one particular incident
  - it would not be possible to install 'sleeping policemen' to slow traffic, many of our residents have both sight and mobility problems and these would only cause more problems

- no more day care places are needed at this resource centre. The Community Hospital has a wing that has never been commissioned, if extra day care places are needed why not there!
- to increase the amount of traffic coming through estate would be paramount to suicide to residents.

The full text of these letters can be inspected at Southern Planning Services, Blueschool House, Blueschool Street, Hereford and prior to the Sub-Committee meeting.

### 6. Officers Appraisal

- 6.1 The two main issues raised by this proposal are (i) whether there would be an increase in traffic and if so the effect on road safety and (ii) the effect of the extension on the amenities of neighbours.
- 6.2 It is clear from the representations that there are significant problems arising from limited off-street parking at both Reynolds Court and Woodside Residential Home and from the vehicular access to the latter being through the parking area for the sheltered housing. The concern of local residents is that an increase in traffic would significantly increase these problems. However according to figures submitted by the applicants for projected traffic generation there may well be less vehicular movements. This would be a consequence of the lower numbers of staff throughout the day, fewer visitors as less residents, fewer deliveries and fewer visits by GPs/nurses. This reduction would be offset if all 15 day centre users arrive individually by car or taxi. It is anticipated however that most, if not all users, would travel by mini-bus, which would not be parked at Woodside. This cannot be guaranteed but seems probable in view of the frailty of most users. The 7 people who currently attend the day care centre all travel by mini-bus, it is understood. It is concluded therefore that an increase in traffic would be unlikely and on this issue there would not be sufficient grounds to refuse permission.
- 6.3 The extension would project northwards towards one of the buildings forming Reynolds Court. The end units have living room windows facing towards the extension. The gap between the two buildings would be reduced to about 5 m. However the extension would not be directly in front of the units in Reynolds Court and there is a row of screen windows in the existing building. It is not considered therefore that the extension would be overbearing in relation to these neighbours nor result in a significant loss of privacy. The part of Reynolds Court directly facing the extension does not have living room windows.
- 6.4 One other concern has been raised by the Parish Council viz. change of use from residential to day care use. This is not in fact the case as the area occupied by the two new crisis-care flats is the same as that of the current 8 bedrooms; the existing day-care provision is being expanded but not at the expense of residential accommodation.

#### **RECOMMENDATION**

That planning permission be granted subject to the following conditions:

1 A01 (Time limit for commencement (full permission))

Reason: Required to be imposed by Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

2 B02 (Matching external materials (extension))

Reason: To ensure the external materials harmonise with the existing building.

3 H13 (Access, turning area and parking)

Reason: In the interests of highway safety and to ensure the free flow of traffic using the adjoining highway.

## Informative(s):

1 - N15 - Reason(s) for the Grant of Planning Permission

Decision:	 	 	
Notes:			
. 101001			

## **Background Papers**

Internal departmental consultation replies.