

Name of Applicant Type of Certificate	Proposal	Map/Plan Policy	Plan Ref. Expiry Date
<b>WORCESTER- SHIRE MENTAL HEALTH PARTNERSHIP NHS TRUST 'A'</b>	Refurbishment and extension of existing mental health unit - Brook Haven, Princess Of Wales Hospital, Stourbridge Road, Bromsgrove, B61 0BB	Res	<b>11/0238-DK</b> 28.06.2011

**RECOMMENDATION:** that permission be **GRANTED**.

Consultations

WH	Consulted: 12.04.2011. No response received to date.
ENG	Consulted: 12.04.2011. Response received: 19.04.2011. No objections.
EDO	Consulted: 12.04.2011. Response received: 15.04.2011. Economic Development supports the application.
CLIMCHG	Consulted: 12.04.2011. No response to date.
EHO	Consulted: 12.04.2011. Response received: 12.04.2011. The premises and business will be required to comply with Food Safety legislation which is enforced by this Council and Health and Safety legislation which is enforced by the Health and Safety Executive. The premises will be subject to routine inspection by this Council to assess compliance with food safety legislation.
Tree Officer Publicity	Consulted: 06.06.2011. No response to date. 17 letters sent 12.04.2011. Expire 03.05.2011. Site Notice posted 11.05.2011. Expired 01.06.2011. Press Notice published 21.04.2011. Expired 12.05.2011.
	1 comment received 15.04.2011 as follows:  No objections although it is requested that an hours of construction condition is applied to restrict early morning/late night working and Sunday and Bank Holiday disturbance.  The addition of hedge planting within the site as shown on the landscape plan would be welcome. It is believed that the original plans for the development of Brook Haven and the adjacent houses within All Saints Place showed hedging along this dividing boundary which was never planted. As a consequence, the area significantly lacks wildlife. It is suggested that some consideration should be given to the species of planting used within the hedges to help to enhance biodiversity in the area in accordance with the Governments objectives contained within Planning Policy Statement 9.

## The site and its surroundings

The application site relates to a large detached building within the Princess of Wales Hospital complex. It is located to the south of the main part of the hospital and adjoins properties on All Saints Place to the south. The unit has a dedicated access road which continues around the north elevation of the building. There are allotments located to the west of the application site and the boundary with these consists of mature birch trees.

## Proposal

The proposal is for the refurbishment and extension of the existing mental health unit. The unit will provide services for Worcestershire. The proposed accommodation will consist of 30 bedrooms all of which will be ensuite. There will also be a new lounge and dining area. The building will also contain a physiotherapy room, laundry, linen store, waiting areas, bathrooms, interview rooms and a manager's office. The building will include 5 enclosed courtyard spaces. The application is accompanied by a Design and Access Statement, Arboricultural Report and Flood Risk Assessment.

## Relevant Policies

WMSS	QE3
WCSP	SD3, CTC5, D13, T3, T4.
BDLP	DS13, S6, S28, S29, C17, ES14A, TR11.
DCS2	SO1, SO6, SO7, CP23.
Others	PPS1, PPS3, SPG1.

## Relevant Planning History

B/2010/0498	Providing new pedestrian access route to lower end of Princess of Wales Community Hospital site by forming new path to edge of Spadesbourne House boundary. Erection of new fencing with access gates and providing new lighting. Granted 23.07.2010.
-------------	---

## Notes

This is a proposal for the refurbishment and enlargement of 'Brook Haven' within the Princess of Wales hospital. The existing floorspace is 1440sqm and this will be increased by 1160sqm (A total of 2600sqm) or an 80% increase above the size of the original unit.

The site is located entirely within the urban area and within the curtilage of the hospital site. I consider that policies DS13 and S28 of the BDLP are most relevant in determining the application. Policy S28 supports the provision of new or enhanced community facilities and the retention of existing ones provided that there are no conflicts with the other policies of the Development Plan.

The plans show that most of the alterations and extensions to the building are concentrated to the west side and the front range to the eastern elevation remains largely the same. The position of the main entrance to the facility will change to the NE elevation, where an improved service area than currently exists is proposed. The modifications to

the west side of the building essentially involve the provision of three new ranges to the west, north and south of the existing structure. The width and scale of these ranges are greater than for the existing building. The resulting building will be closer to the boundaries on the western and southern side than is currently the case (10m in the case of the boundary to the south and 7m on average to the boundary on the west).

Members should note that the Design and Access Statement sets out clearly the need for the facility and the design concept behind it. The existing building was built in the 1990's as an Older Adult Mental Health Hospital and the unit is not being used to its full capacity. The development will seek to address this issue and create an improved environment for those with mental health difficulties.

### Design

In terms of the planning merits of the proposal, the improvements for the provision of care at the facility are an important material consideration in favour of the scheme. However, the proposal must be considered in the context of its impact on the character of the area and on the residential amenity of adjoining occupiers.

The extension is physically distinctive in terms of its scale and design compared with the original part of the building which is largely retained to the front. The new part will contain features such as timber columns on the corners, rooflights and louvres to provide ventilation. I note that the new part of the building is bulkier than the original, but this must be observed in the context of site forming part of a hospital complex. I note that the position of the proposal is on land substantially set down from the rest of the community hospital and in an enclosed position in respect of public vantage points. Subject to the use of appropriate materials, I do not consider that the proposal would be detrimental to the character of the area.

### Residential Amenity

In terms of the amenity of adjoining occupiers, the residents closest to the proposal are located in the new build properties (to the side of Nos. 29-40, 47) and to the rear of Nos. 41 – 46 All Saints Place. I would have limited concerns about No. 47, the side of which would face the open space and service area to the front of the building, which is the same as at present. Similarly, a substantial portion of the range from 41 to 46 All Saints Place would be oriented to the open space or to the original part of the building which is 14 – 17m within the boundary.

The extension to the building will face the side of Nos. 36/37 All Saints Place but there are no windows facing this direction and the loss of residential amenity is not significant given the present situation. I would have concerns about the apartments at Nos. 29 – 36 and there are windows facing to the north. There is a separation distance of approximately 15 -20m depending part of the extension considered. I consider that a combination of the fencing proposed (1.8m) and a condition on the glazing materials for part of the elevation would prevent a loss of privacy to either party. Members should note that all of these residents have been consulted on the application and the comment received was supportive of the enhanced landscaping. The site adjoins allotments to the west and the existing hospital complex to the north and south. Overall, I do not consider that a significant loss of residential amenity would arise.

### Other Issues

The application is accompanied by a Flood Risk Assessment in accordance with PPS25. The proposal is located in Flood Zone 1 with less than a 1/1000 annual probability of flooding. The comments from the Drainage Engineer and Economic Development Officer are noted and those of WH are awaited.

### Conclusion

The proposal is a necessary medical facility and would make more beneficial use of the site. There are no overriding objections in terms of the character of the area or the privacy of adjoining occupiers. Permission should be granted.

**RECOMMENDATION** that permission be **GRANTED** subject to the satisfactory views of WH, the following conditions and any conditions required by WH,

1. C1
2. C1A
3. C3
4. C5 (Modified)
5. C7
6. C10
7. C13 (Modified)