**Broughty Ferry** 

# **KEY INFORMATION**

Ward

#### Proposal

Attic extension to nursing home providing 6 single ensuite bedrooms with ancillary accommodation

#### Address

34 Albert Road Broughty Ferry Dundee DD5 1AZ

#### Applicant

Guidefirst Consultants Westbay Nursing Home 34 Albert Road Broughty Ferry Dundee DD5 1AZ

Agent

James R Culloch RIBA ARIAS The Design Studio 95 Dundee Road Carnoustie DD7 7EW

Registered 30 July 2002

Case Officer Charlie Walker

# RECOMMENDATION

The proposed development will detract from the visual amenity of the conservation area contrary to Policy BE11 of the Plan and the statutory duty on the Planing Authority to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the conservation area. The application is therefore recommended for REFUSAL.



Item 9

Attic extension to nursing home providing 6 single en-suite bedrooms with ancillary accommodation is **RECOMMENDED FOR REFUSAL**. Report by Director of Planning and Transportation

# SUMMARY OF REPORT

- Planning permission is sought to form an additional storey of accommodation on the eastern extension to the nursing home to provide 6 bedrooms, a lounge, casual seating area and ancillary accommodation. The proposed extension effectively infills a valley in the existing eastern extension with a flat roofed structure and extends the roofspace by providing 5 dormers on the east elevation and 2 dormers on the west elevation. The site is within the Grove Conservation Area.
- Policy H12 of the adopted Dundee Local Plan 1998 sets out requirements for residential and nursing homes. Policy BE11 states that within conservation areas all development proposals will be expected to complement and enhance the character of the surrounding area.
- A letter of objection was received from a neighbour concerned about the over intensification of use of the property, the adverse impact on the appearance of the existing house and adjoining houses and additional overlooking of an adjoining garden. Broughty Ferry Community Council have also objected to the application on grounds of adverse visual impact and overdevelopment of an already overcrowded site in a conservation area.



### Page 27

# DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL

Planning permission is sought to form an additional storey of accommodation on the eastern extension to the nursing home to provide 6 bedrooms, a lounge, casual seating area and ancillary The proposed accommodation. extension effectively infills a valley in the existing eastern extension with a flat roofed structure and extends the roofspace by providing 5 dormers on the east elevation and 2 dormers on the west elevation. No changes to the garden or parking areas are proposed. The applicants indicate that they are prepared to provide 2 additional parking spaces.

## SITE DESCRIPTION

The site comprises the Westbay Nursing Home, a 32 bedroom nursing home with 34 residents. The original villa has been much extended with large 2 storey extensions on the east and west elevations so that the resulting building is a large L shaped structure covering most of the rear of the site. To the rear a garden and drying area are enclosed by the buildings and to the front there is a landscaped garden and parking areas.

The surrounding area is predominantly residential in character. To the east is the Broughty Ferry bowling club and to the west is a detached dwelling. To the south west is St Lukes and Queen Street Church. To the south and south east are large villas on Dundee Road and the house to the south east is a listed building. To the north, on the opposite side of Albert Road are houses.

The general pattern of development in the surrounding area is typified by large stone villas with some more modern infill housing. This area is designated as part of the Grove Conservation Area.

## POLICY BACKGROUND

Policy H12 of the adopted Dundee Local Plan 1998 sets out requirements for residential and nursing homes. It states that extensions should have appropriate parking and open space.

Policy H10 of the Plan contains the guidelines for parking and open space.

For this development there should be 10 sq. metres of open space per resident with an open sunny outlook separate from the parking area and parking provision should be 1 space per 6 residents and 1 space per staff member.

The overall area is designated in the Local Plan as an existing residential area where Policy H1 seeks to protect amenity.

Policy BE4 concerns garden ground development. Although it is principally concerned with extending the existing footprint of buildings it states that proposals must be of high quality design. Policy BE11 states that within conservation areas all development proposals will be expected to complement and enhance the character of the surrounding area.



RTH ELEVATION

## LOCAL AGENDA 21

The Council's Local Agenda 21 policies are not directly relevant to the determination of this application

# SITE HISTORY

Planning permission was granted for a large 2 storey with attic extension on the east elevation of this building to provide 16 bedrooms in 1991 - application ref. no. D16075 refers. The extension was not constructed in accordance with the approved plans and a subsequent application to retain the extension as built was approved in 1992 - application ref. no. D17840 refers.

## PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

Statutory neighbour notification was carried out and the proposal was advertised as affecting the Grove Conservation Area. A letter of objection was received from a

## Application No 02/00543/FUL

neighbour (copy available for inspection in the Members' Lounges). The neighbour is concerned about the over intensification of use of the property, the adverse impact on the appearance of the existing house and adjoining houses and additional overlooking of an adjoining garden. These points are considered in the Observations Section of this Report.

# CONSULTATIONS

Broughty Ferry Community Council have objected to the application. They state that the development will have an adverse visual impact when viewed from the north and south by increasing the overpowering and unbalancing effect that this extension already has. They also state that the proposal will result in the overdevelopment of an

already overcrowded site in a conservation area.

# **OBSERVATIONS**

The determining issues for the Committee in this instance are:

1 Will the development adversely affect the visual amenity of the conservation area contrary to Policy BE11 of the Local Plan and the statutory duty in Section 64 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1997 to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the conservation area?

- 2 Will the proposal result in overdevelopment of the site, taking into account the parking and open space requirements set out in Policies H10 and H12 of the Local Plan?
- 3 Will the proposal result in unacceptable overlooking of adjoining properties?

The original building at 34 Albert Road has been much extended and in particular the more recent eastern extension appears to dominate the original house. Any additions to this extension need to be carefully considered in terms of their impact on the visual amenity of the area.

Much of the proposed extension involves development within a valley in the roofspace and the impact on the

## Dundee City Council Development Quality Committee

### Application No 02/00543/FUL

northern and southern elevations is lessened by providing a mansard style roof on the building. However despite this the extension will have a heavy appearance and will be clearly visible from Albert Road and at a distance from West Queen Street to the south, as well as from adjoining properties. In addition the provision of 5 dormers on the eastern elevation and to a lesser extent 2 dormers on the western elevation will accentuate the dominance of the extension.

It is considered that the erection of this extension onto the roof of the existing building will emphasise and add to the dominance of the existing extension. The proposed development will detract from the visual amenity of the conservation area contrary to Policy BE11 of the Plan and the statutory duty on the Planing Authority under Section 64 of the 1997 Act to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the conservation area.

In terms of the overdevelopment of the site and Policies H10 and H12, it is not considered that the increase in numbers of residents by 6 will constitute overdevelopment of the site. The existing garden area will satisfy the requirement of 10 sq. metres per resident and the current level of parking provision appears adequate and can be slightly extended if required.

Finally the objector is concerned about overlooking of a garden area. It is not considered that the proposed development will lead to any significant increase in overlooking given that there are existing upper floor windows on the eastern and western elevations of this building.

### Design

It is considered that the design of this extension onto the roof of the existing building will emphasise and add to the dominance of the existing extension and will detract from the visual amenity of the conservation area.

## CONCLUSION

The proposed development will detract from the visual amenity of the conservation area contrary to Policy BE11 of the Plan and the statutory duty on the Planing Authority to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the conservation area.

# RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that planning permission be REFUSED for the following reason:

1 The proposed extension is of a design that will emphasise and add to the dominance of the existing eastern extension to this building and will thereby detract the character from and appearance of the Grove Conservation Area contrary to Policy BE11 of the adopted Dundee Local Plan 1998 and the statutory duty set out in Section 64 of the Planning (Listed Conservation Buildings and Areas) Act 1997. There are no material considerations to justify the approval of the development contrary to the Plan.