
Report to: [Planning Committee](#) **Date of Meeting:** [08 February 2012](#)

Subject: [S/2011/1531](#)
[Hatherlow House, 27 Park Crescent, Southport](#)

Proposal: [Erection of a part two, part four storey living with care facility comprising 33 individual suites, including the layout of car parking spaces and landscaping \(alternative to S/2011/0117 refused 8 Apr 2011\)](#)

Applicant: [Methodist Homes](#) **Agent:** [AA Design Limited](#)

Report of: [Head of Planning Services](#) **Wards Affected:** [\(Cambridge Ward\)](#)

Is this a Key Decision? [No](#) **Is it included in the Forward Plan?** [No](#)

Exempt/Confidential [No](#)

Summary

This application is being presented for information only at this stage and is seeking consent for the erection of a part two, part four storey living with care facility comprising 33 individual suites, including the layout of car parking spaces and landscpaing (alternative to S/2011/0117 refused 08/04/2011)

The main issues for consideration in the assessment of this application are the principle of development, Class C2 use (residential institutions), design and visual impact on the street scene and character of the area, impact on residential amenity, heritage asset value in terms of the existing building under Planning Policy Statement 5 (PPS5) and site planning and planning policy constraints.

Recommendation(s)

For Information Only

Reasons for the Recommendation:

Committee are asked to give a view on how they wish the application to proceed on the basis of the latest scheme with particular reference to its design when assessed against the importance of the existing building which has significant architectural merit.

Implementation Date for the Decision

Immediately following the Committee/Council/Working Group meeting

Contact Officer: [Mrs S Tyldesley](#) Telephone 0151 934 **3569**

Case Officer: [Andrea Fortune](#) Telephone 0151 934 **2208 (Tues- Fri)**

Email: planning.department@sefton.gov.uk

Background Papers:

The following papers are available for inspection by contacting the above officer(s).

History and Policy referred to in the report

The Site

The site occupies a corner plot at the junction of Park Avenue, Park Crescent and Cambridge Road. The site is currently occupied by a large, vacant 3 storey villa with significant architectural merit and a later single storey extension at the rear. The building was previously occupied by a residential care home. The site is bound by Berkley Court (three-storey block of flats) to the south-east and Nightingale House (three storey block of flats with basement garages) to the north-east. Vehicular access to the site is from Park Avenue and the site lies opposite Hesketh Park which is registered as a Grade II Listed Historic Park.

This application is being presented to Planning Committee Visiting Panel for information only, see 'background' below.

Proposal

Erection of a part two, part four storey living with care facility comprising 33 individual suites, including the layout of car parking spaces and landscaping (alternative to S/2011/0117 refused 08/04/11).

History

S/11344 Alterations to fire escape at rear. Granted 10/05/79.

S/2011/0117 Erection of a part three, part four storey residential care development comprising 35 individual suites, including the layout of car parking spaces and landscaping. Refused 08/04/2011.

Consultations

Highways Development Control – There are no objections to the proposal to erect a residential care development on this site as there are no highway safety implications. The existing vehicular access to the site off Park Avenue will be widened to cater for two cars to pass one another without difficulty. The existing vehicular access at the corner of Park Crescent / Park Avenue will be closed off and as such the footway crossing will need to be reconstructed as footway. A separate pedestrian access will be provided onto the footway close to the corner of Park Crescent / Park Avenue. There is an existing pedestrian refuge and two existing fully accessible bus stops on Park Crescent (one on each side of the road) a short distance from the site, however, there is no safe and convenient crossing point for pedestrians on Park Avenue at the roundabout junction with Park Crescent, together with flush kerbs and tactile paving on the footway either side of the refuge. In addition, it will be necessary to reconstruct part of the footway on the north-west side of Park Avenue adjacent to the site frontage so that it is level and suitable for use by pedestrians who may have mobility difficulties. A total of 12 off-street car parking spaces (including two marked out for use by disabled persons) are proposed, which is an acceptable level of parking provision. However, cycle parking will also be required at the ratio of one secure covered staff space per 5 staff members present at the busiest time, plus one cycle stand per 20 residents, which can be secured by condition.

Built Environment Director – Head of Environment – Comments awaited.

Merseyside Police Architectural Liaison – Detailed comments have been forwarded to the applicant via their agent. Summary of comments as follows:

- Park Crescent is a relatively low crime area.
- Fencing to perimeters should be minimum of 1800mm in height, close-boarded fencing with no footholds to the outface.
- Defensive planting is advisable where side fencing exists to properties, eg, pyracantha, berberis and hawthorn.
- Shrubs and hedges should generally have max growth height of 1metre whilst trees should be pruned up to a minimum height of 2 metres, to maintain clear field of vision around the site.
- Recommend boundary abutting gated pathway to north east is raised to height of 1.8m, to reduce potential for unauthorised entry.
- Street lighting should provide suitable low level of ambience to discourage offenders and provide natural surveillance.
- Recommend adequate parking spaces are incorporated into development to accommodate all residents.
- Communal parking area must be within view of 'active' rooms within apartments.
- Building lines should be kept simple as recessed areas create hiding places and reduce natural surveillance.
- Side access gates should be positioned to the front building line to avoid blind spots, be lockable and a minimum of 1800mm in height.
- Recommend that the link block be constructed to prevent scaling and to eliminate the possibility of accessing upper floors.
- All ground floor and any accessible windows or roof lights must be independently certificated to British Standards and must include minimum 6.4mm laminated glazing within its double glazing system.
- The plans do not indicate bin storage and should have a dedicated area in an open fence structure.
- Recommend an internal letterbox to serve all apartments.
- Recommend CCTV as a minimum to cover the main entrance and lobby/waiting area.

Neighbour Representations

Last date for replies: 7th March 2012

Received to date: Letters of objection received from flats 1, 5, 14, 16 Berkley Court (2 Park Avenue) raising the following concerns:

- Rear building is up against boundary and will cause loss of light and open aspect when in the garden.
- Height of rear building at 11m to eaves and even more to the ridge will cause overlooking and a loss of light.
- No bin stores shown on plans this time, should not be at front as would be unsightly.
- Loss of iconic building with tower that can be seen from far away, should not be demolished, façade should be retained.
- Lack of car parking spaces.
- Need clarification of the boundary wall height between site and Berkley Court.

- Consider that reasons 1, 2 and 3 still apply, despite amendments.

Comments were also made that residents were pleased that the main block of the building had been moved away from the boundary with Berkley Court and the link section reduced in height. Comment also made that the redevelopment of the site is welcomed as the existing site is often vandalised and unsightly.

Letter from 26 Darwin Court stating no objection to the scheme.

Policy

The application site is situated in an area allocated as Primarily Residential on the Council's Adopted Unitary Development Plan.

AD2	Ensuring Choice of Travel
CS3	Development Principles
DQ1	Design
DQ3	Trees and Development
DQ4	Public Greenspace and Development
H10	Development in Primarily Residential Areas
HC5	Historic Parks and Gardens Archaeology
PPS5	Planning for the Historic Environment

Comments

The main issues in the assessment of this application will be the principle of development, Class C2 use (residential institutions), design and visual impact on the street scene and character of the area, impact on residential amenity, heritage asset value in terms of the existing building under Planning Policy Statement (PPS5) and site planning and planning policy considerations.

Background

An application was refused in April 2011 for the erection of a part three part four storey residential care development of 35 units. The application was refused on the basis of four grounds including the scale, massing and design which resulted in an unacceptable form of development; the scale, siting and layout would have a detrimental impact on the amenity of neighbouring properties; the loss of the significance of Hatherlow House as a non-designated Heritage Asset and the failure to provide a financial contribution towards the provision of off-site public greenspace and the provision of trees under policy DQ3.

This revised application is presented with a number of amendments to the original scheme in an attempt to address the above reasons for refusal. A number of the concerns with the original scheme have been addressed satisfactorily and now comply with policy which will be set out below, however, other issues remain outstanding and the views of Planning Committee are now sought as to the progression of this application and a further assessment of the site and existing building.

Principle

The site lies within a primarily residential area where the principle of residential use with care is acceptable subject to other policy constraints.

C2 Use

The application seeks consent for a residential care development (Use Class C2). In defining C2 uses, the emphasis is upon the provision of a significant level of care and type of accommodation.

The importance of establishing the level of care to be provided is linked to the requirement of policy H3 for housing development over 15 units to provide an affordable housing contribution. If the applicant can demonstrate that the proposal is for residential care and not just for apartments, there is no requirement to seek any affordable housing contribution under policy H3.

In this case, there is further work to be done in order to establish whether the applicant has fully demonstrated that the use is C2, but on the basis of information submitted to date, it is likely that the proposal is capable of being considered as C2. A suitably worded condition could also be used to ensure that the scheme is C2 including a minimum age on entry being set, a definition of personal care and number of hours of personal care to be provided to residents. This issue would be reported in full at the next committee once the detail has been finalised.

Residential Amenity

The original scheme has been amended in order to address a number of concerns raised relating to the impact on residential amenity, particularly of those in Berkley Court adjacent.

The main building has been reduced in size and moved away from the boundary with Berkley Court. This has increased the distance from the kitchen windows of flats in Berkley Court being increase from 7.2m previously to 10.6m. Whilst this is less than the 12 m recommended in SPG, it is on balance considered to be a sufficient distance to prevent any outlook or overlooking issues. Furthermore, windows in the side gable of the proposed building will be obscurely glazed to prevent overlooking.

The central link has been reduced from 3 storey to 2 storey and the roof garden removed. First floor windows in the elevation facing the gardens of Berkley Court will be obscurely glazed to prevent overlooking. The impact on residential amenity of neighbours in terms of overlooking has therefore been addressed with these amendments.

Residents have objected to the fact that the rear building fronting Cambridge Road is still too close to the boundary and will therefore affect the outlook from properties at the rear of Berkley Court. This will be addressed in more detail at next committee following further consideration.

Generally it is considered that the amendments to date have reduced the potential impact on the amenity of neighbours to some degree.

PPS5 and the value of the building as a Heritage Asset

Hatherlow House is a building of some significance and of such high architectural quality that it has been the subject of applications for listing in the past and more recently in response to this site being proposed for redevelopment. English Heritage accepts that the building is of local interest as a prominent building within the local area and that it was part of the original planned development surrounding Hesketh Park. However, within a national context it lacks the special architectural and historic interest required to qualify for listing. Therefore as the building is not covered by any formal designation, but still possesses historical interest it is defined under PPS 5 as a non-designated heritage asset, of which it is a material consideration when planning applications are received that would impact on its significance or its setting therefore its retention is sought. It is also believed that the demolition of this building along with any new development would also impact on the setting of Hesketh Park, which is a designated Heritage Asset. It is important, however, for Committee to note that the demolition of the building is possible without any planning permission being required as the building has no legal protection to prevent this.

The concern with this scheme is that given the high quality of the existing building, its replacement, if any, should be of significant design quality in order to compensate for the loss of this building. However, the design submitted for this scheme, although different from the previous, still lacks some architectural quality and may not be sufficient to replace the existing building. Significant and detailed design advice was provided to the applicant following the previous refusal which included examples of elements of good design locally that could be replicated in this scheme. Unfortunately some of this advice has not been incorporated into the revised design resulting in a scheme which is still lacking the strength in design concept required for this site.

The site occupies a prominent corner and the design of any replacement building must embrace this prominence with strong design features. Committee are asked to consider the proposed design and existing building.

Trees and Greenspace

Calculations are required in terms of the number of trees required on the site depending on the number of trees proposed to be removed from the site. There is some debate in terms of whether existing trees are actually trees and access to the site has been requested to enable the Council's tree officer to look into this matter in more detail. This will be reported in full at next committee.



Similarly, the requirement for Greenspace contributions will be reported in full at next committee once this has been finalised and agreed by the applicant.

Drawing Numbers

11033-RP-01, 02, 03B, 04C, 05C, 06C, 07B, 08, 09B, 10, 12A, 13A, 14A & 15

Existing site plan



<p>Sefton Council  Department of the Built Environment Jane Gowing Head of Planning Services</p>	<p>S/2011/1531 Hatherlow House, Park Crescent Southport</p>	<p>Standard Site Plan Scale: 1:1250 Date: 24/1/2012 Drawn By: ROBID cm</p>	
	<p>OSGR: 335125, 418245 Sheet(s) 6118 Area: 2857 sqm</p>	<p>Ward(s): Cambridge Postcode Sector(s): PR09 Polling District(s): X4, X5 Parishes(s): None Found</p>	
<p>© Crown copyright and database right 2012 Ordnance Survey 100018192</p>		<p>Created by Sefton Council Planning Services using MapInfo Professional</p>	

Proposed site plan



