

REPORT UPDATE

Application No: AW/336/13/

Reason for the Update / Changes

Reason for Update/Changes: Three further letters of objection have been received. The grounds of objection are as before - i.e. loss of the hotel, loss of the swimming pool, the money would be better spent on the existing Ashley House. One of the letters offers a comparison between The Russell Hotel and The Bradbury in Angmering and concludes that the Bradbury does not compare to the Russell.

Officers Comment: This takes the total of letters of objection from 32 to 35. There are no changes to the recommendation or conditions.

Notes: Changes to recommendations, conditions and / or reasons for refusal will always be reflected in the recommendation section of the attached Officer's Report/Recommendation.

AW/336/13/

Recommendation Report for Planning Permission

REF NO: AW/336/13/

LOCATION: The Russell Hotel
Kings Parade
Bognor Regis

PROPOSAL: Change of use from a hotel (C1 Hotel) to a residential care home (C2 Residential Institution) incorporating a new internal lift with a small external lift overrun.

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION As above.

The charity Livability are proposing to relocate their existing Ashley House operation to the hotel. This will provide the existing 14 disabled residents with a vastly improved set of facilities (including their own bathrooms) in a location close to their existing home whilst also providing scope for Liveability to expand their operation to cater for additional disabled people and to provide additional services to the local & wider community such as respite holiday care and day visits with learning opportunities.

As set out above, the only proposed external change is the addition of a small external lift overrun on the existing roof. This takes the form of a small (3.1m wide by 1.1m high by 2.4m deep) dormer on the east facing roof. The dormer

report

starts at a point 10.4m up from ground level.

Livability have confirmed in writing that they are committed to exploring all the options for retaining the swimming pool for use by residents, the local community and people referred for hydrotherapy treatment.

SITE AREA	Approximately 0.13 hectares.
TOPOGRAPHY	Predominantly flat.
TREES	No trees affected by the proposed development.
BOUNDARY TREATMENT	As existing.
SITE CHARACTERISTICS	The application site comprises a 3 storey hotel primarily available for the blind & partially sighted but also available for general guests. Parking is situated to the side off Wessex Avenue and comprises of 6 off street spaces with a couple of cycle spaces. There is also on street parking available on Kings Parade. There is a courtyard to the rear which is fully enclosed by the building and existing boundary treatment.
CHARACTER OF LOCALITY	This is a mixed area, close to the seafront but separated by Kings Parade, a Putting Green/Park and Marine Drive West. There is a mix of large hotels and residential properties, some large flatted buildings and some houses.

RELEVANT SITE HISTORY

AW/91/91	Sun Lounge, extended porch and waiting area on area of open paved terraces, as protection against inclement weather.	Approve Conditionally 05-08-1991
AW/71/92	Extension to managers office on ground floor within the confines of the existing building	Approve 12-05-1992
AW/224/00/	Proposed new hotel to replace the Russell Hotel. Demolition of existing hotel together with two adjoining houses.	Approve Conditionally 28-02-2001
AW/83/01/	Proposed new hotel to replace existing Russell Hotel. Demolition of hotel together with 2 adjoining houses (Beach House and Two Bays)	Approve Conditionally 22-06-2001
AW/126/02/A	1 no. externally illuminated hotel sign	Apprvd/Cond ADV 05-09-2002

None.

REPRESENTATIONS

Representations received:

Aldwick Parish Council

Aldwick Parish Council - Members have no objection to the application.

32 letters of objection have been received and their concerns are set out below:

- The hotel is a unique & irreplaceable establishment which offers first class facilities for blind (including their guide dogs), partially sighted, wheelchair bound and able bodied people;
- Bognor Regis has a declining number of hotels and an increasing number of care homes;
- No clear plan for additional usage of the hotel space;
- Impact of reduced/lost spending on local facilities & services;
- Over 75% of guests who reviewed the hotel on Tripadvisor rated it as either Very Good or Excellent;
- No appropriate alternative swimming pool facility in the Bognor Regis or surrounding area;
- There is already a surplus of care home places in the area;
- The swimming pool and gym equipment provide opportunities for Aldwick residents and assist with a healthy lifestyle (itself a Government aim) without the need to travel to Felpham or Bognor particularly as a bus to Felpham has been cancelled;
- Ashley House should relocate to a converted large house in Bognor Regis;
- The Russell Hotel is not currently struggling;
- The Russell Hotel just needs to promote the hotel more;
- Ashley House should be repaired or knocked down and rebuilt rather than taking over another charity's facilities;
- Ashley House could easily be extended and improved without too much upheaval;
- Loss of 30 jobs from the hotel;
- Request a condition to ensure that the swimming pool be properly maintained for the use of people and for future generations resident in Bognor Regis;
- Not everyone wants to stay in Butlins; and
- No other alternative hotel in the Bognor Regis area for blind or wheelchair bound people.

However, there have also been 13 letters of support with the arguments put forward as follows:

- Distinct lack of residential care for young adults with physical disabilities;
- Ashley House is no longer suitable, is a health risk to staff and residents and money spent on maintaining it would be better spent on the residents;
- Ashley House does not have enough bathrooms/toilets. 15 residents share 3 usable bathrooms. The Russell Hotel has en-suite rooms;
- Ashley House residents are looking forward to larger rooms, more privacy and a far better building;
- Unacceptable that residents of Ashley House have to share bathrooms & that bedrooms are not big enough for wheelchairs;
- The upstairs at Ashley House is not suitable for wheelchairs and is therefore inaccessible;
- Ashley House is not energy efficient and money is being wasted on heating it;
- The existing residents of Ashley House are settled in the local area and need to relocate to somewhere nearby;
- The hotel is semi-adapted and suitable for the disabled; and
- Ashley House's 30 staff and residents all contribute to spending on local goods & services.

Comments on Representations received:

The planning agent has submitted the following in respect of the objections that have been received:

Ashley House - is it fit for purpose?

As explained in the statement submitted with the application, Ashley House cannot accommodate its residents' needs because it is an obsolete Victorian property. Large parts of the building cannot be made accessible to residents and we do not therefore have the space to upgrade it even to relatively modest modern standards - such as to provide private en-suite bathing facilities. Ashley House is therefore no longer fit for purpose and due to this will be forced to close. Livability has been seeking alternative accommodation for many years. The need is now very pressing. Russell Hotel is a near perfect turnkey solution.

Will the Russell Hotel be underutilised by Livability?

This is a phased conversion development proposal. The most urgent need for the hotel building is to accommodate the Ashley House residents and ensure that they can all remain as one community as close as possible to their current home. Once this is completed, Livability will move on to convert and refurbish other areas. Livability will certainly use all space available and plans to use the hotel building to provide:

- Space for new residents waiting for accommodation. Livability has regular enquiries from disabled adults interested in moving to the Ashley House service. The current building means they have to look elsewhere. There is only one other suitable resource in the town.
- Support for disabled people in the wider community.
- Learning opportunities for disabled adults.
- Support towards employment and self-employment for disabled adults.
- Respite holiday care."

Could Livability buy a residential property and convert it?

This option is one that has been considered during the long search for an alternative site for the residents of Ashley House who require a wheelchair accessible building fully compliant with the regulations that apply to new residential care homes. These requirements, combined with the scale of a replacement facility for Ashley House mean that conversion of an existing dwelling was very unlikely ever to be feasible. We have looked at the possibility of developing other sites in partnership with other organisations without success and in addition, we have looked at redeveloping the existing site on a phased basis so as to avoid the need for decanting but this is not feasible. The Russell Hotel already exists, has many suitable design features and offers an ideal turnkey solution in an accessible location that is also close to Ashley House. A new home can therefore be provided quickly which is a huge positive for the residents and meets a requirement which is now very urgent.

Are there too many care homes in Bognor Regis?

The homes referred to in various letters of objection are for elderly residents. The Livability home provides specialist care for disabled adults for which there is very little provision in Bognor Regis, as confirmed by the representation from the local social worker. The proposed change of use relates to re provision of a larger facility to replace Ashley House and not a new care home so there would be no change in the number of care homes in the town.

Are there other hotels that provide specialist holiday accommodation for blind or visually impaired people?

Yes - as well as the other Action for the Blind Hotels, there is another specialist hotel in

Littlehampton called The Bradbury, accessible in under an hour by car or train.

The Swimming Pool

As explained in the planning application documents - Livability has committed to explore all the options for retaining the pool for use by residents, the local community and people referred for hydrotherapy treatment.

Employment

The proposed newly provided Livability home will offer new local employment opportunities. The loss of hotel jobs will in time be balanced by the provision of new Livability jobs as the phased development of services from the hotel takes place. The existing jobs at Ashley House will be preserved if we can relocate to the Russell Hotel. These jobs are at risk unless we can find suitable alternative accommodation, the need for which is now very pressing. There are 25 'Full Time Equivalent' posts at Ashley House that will be safeguarded by this re provision.

We note that there is considerable support from Ashley House residents and their families and also from a local social worker. Ashley House is well respected within the local community as providing an excellent service for its residents. As the manager of Ashley House advised at the local Parish Council meeting: "If we cannot move to the Russell Hotel site and the Ashley House care home closes, our vulnerable residents will lose their homes, our staff their jobs and Bognor Regis will see a thriving, growing business disappear.

With regard to the suggestion of a condition to protect the use of the swimming pool by local residents, it is not considered that this would meet the tests sets out in Circular 11/95 "Use of conditions in planning permission" in that it would not be reasonable. The hotel could close down, sell to a new operator who might decide not to allow use by non-guests, or simply stop making the pool available to non-guests. The swimming pool could then either be lost for good or reserved solely for hotel guests. It is only reasonable that Liveability are able to take the same actions in respect of the swimming pool as the hotel is able to currently.

CONSULTATIONS

Environmental Health
Engineering Services Manager
Engineers (Coastal Protection)
WSCC Strategic Planning
Economic Regeneration

Consultations responses received:

WSCC Highways - Consider that the potential C1 (hotel) movements would be 140 movements per day and that there would be 90 movements per day for a C2 (residential care home) use. Therefore in principle there would be a reduction in the overall number of movements to/from the site. It is not anticipated that the proposed development will represent an intensification in vehicular movements and, as such, the site access will continue to operate safely. Furthermore, the property is not anticipated to result in a greater demand for parking in this location when compared to the previous usage. There are in any case enforceable parking restrictions within the surrounding area. In addition, the site is sustainably located with regard to bus routes and proximity to Bognor Regis railway station. Consider that the site would benefit from the provision

of some cycle parking in line with the WSCC standards. No objection. Recommend conditions in respect of covered & secure cycle parking spaces and the retention of existing parking spaces.

Arun DC Economic Development - Comments received on 19/02/14 stated that:

We have found it difficult to come to a conclusion regarding our support or otherwise for this application.

As a seaside town we clearly need to protect C1 uses wherever possible. Action for Blind People, state that the Hotel is no longer viable. We have been presented with documents that show an average occupancy of between 70 - 78% over the past 3 years. We have taken the period April - September 2013 and measured this against statistics published by Visit England.

National Average - 74%

Regional Average (South East) - 75.5%

Russell Hotel - 70.1%

Whilst we acknowledge the small drop in occupancy levels we have seen no evidence to show how the hotel is being marketed as a destination for visitors.

We have asked to see evidence that the Hotel has been placed onto the open market as a going concern but are aware that this was not requested as part of pre-application discussions and therefore has not happened.

From the information we hold we note that there will be an increase in job numbers and employment opportunities will be made available for those with disabilities, which we welcome. Additionally respite care will be available and we are aware that this is an increasing visitor market.

Given that the owners have indicated they can no longer subsidise the operation we have no wish to see the decline of Russell Hotel to the point where it is no longer viable for visitors of any type and is completely lost as visitor accommodation.

Therefore, on balance we do not object to this application.

Comments on Consultation responses:

The WSCC Highways and Economic Development comments are noted.

The applicant has provided a copy of the written and agreed minutes of the pre-application meeting held in February 2013 which confirms that they were advised that it was not necessary to provide details of how the hotel was marketed for sale on the open market.

POLICY CONTEXT

Designations applicable to site:

Within Built Up Area Boundary; and
No Public Sewer.

DEVELOPMENT PLAN POLICIES

Arun District Local Plan 2003: [GEN7](#)
[GEN12](#)

The Form of New Development
Parking in New Development

DEV36

Change of Use of Hotel and Guest House
Accommodation

Publication Version of the
Local Plan - Excluding the
Spatial Portrait, Employment,
Housing Allocations,
Transport, Monitoring and
Implementation sections
(February 2014):

D DM1 Aspects of Form and Quality
TOU DM1 Tourism Related Development
H DM2 Independent Living & Care Homes

PLANNING POLICY GUIDANCE

NPPF

National Planning Policy Framework

POLICY COMMENTARY

The above policies combine to describe the criteria against which the application will be assessed particularly with regard to visual and residential amenity.

The Development Plan consists of the Arun District Local Plan 2003.

Paragraph 215 of the NPPF ensures that specific policies in Arun District Local Plan 2003 can carry weight. The weight afforded to the policies with Local Plan policies can be assessed according to their level of consistency of the various policies with the National Planning Policy Framework. It should be noted that the NPPF states that weight is given to individual policies and not to the plan as a whole.

NPPF Paragraph 216 confirms that weight can be given to policies in emerging plans following publication. The Council agreed the majority of the Arun Local Plan in February 2014 (Publication Version) and this is a material consideration in the determination of this planning application. The remaining chapters of the Local Plan namely: the Spatial Portrait, Employment & Enterprise, Housing Allocations, Transport, Monitoring and Implementation will be considered for publication at a later meeting of Full Council. Following 'publication' of the Local Plan a formal public consultation, examination and adoption process takes place. The chapters that have been published will undergo public consultation alongside the remaining chapters when they have been agreed. The weight given to the current published policies can be significant depending:

- ? the stage of preparation of the emerging plan (the more advanced the preparation, the greater the weight that may be given);
- ? the extent to which there are unresolved objections to relevant policies (the less significant the unresolved objections, the greater the weight that may be given);
- ? the degree of consistency of the relevant policies in the emerging plan to the policies in the NPPF (the closer the policies in the emerging plan to the policies in the Framework, the greater the weight that may be given).

The policies within this published version of the plan are at an advanced stage as they have been agreed by Full Council for regulation 19 consultation, they have been subject to independent audit and are considered to meet the NPPF and there are no known significant unresolved issues arising from regulation 18 consultation for the published policies.

The policies are published under Regulations 19 and 35 of the Town and Country Planning (Local

Planning) (England) Regulations 2012. The statement of representations procedure and statement of fact produced by the Council under regulation 19 explains that the consultation will take place once the remaining chapters / policies have been published.

DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND/OR LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND

Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 states:-

"If regard is to be had to the development plan for the purpose of any determination to be made under the planning Acts the determination must be made in accordance with the plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise."

The proposal is considered to comply with relevant Development Plan policies in that it would have no materially adverse effect on the visual amenities of the locality or the residential amenities of the adjoining properties, nor would it have an adverse impact upon the established character of the surrounding area. The loss of a hotel would impact on the tourism offer of the town but the replacement use is not without economic or social advantage.

OTHER MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS

It is considered that there are no other material considerations to warrant a decision otherwise than in accordance with the Development Plan and/or legislative background.

CONCLUSIONS

THE PROPOSAL

As set out at the top of this report, the proposal is to relocate the existing Liveability setup at Ashley House to the Russell Hotel. Ashley House currently provides facilities for 14 disabled residents and these residents would be accommodated at the Russell Hotel but in the long run, Liveability would be looking to expand the provision to accommodate additional disabled people, day visits and respite holiday care. Liveability are willing to investigate whether the swimming pool can be retained for use by the local community.

THE CURRENT SITUATION AT ASHLEY HOUSE

It is clear from the responses from residents set out above that there are many problems with the existing Ashley House accommodation including lack of privacy, too few bathrooms, bedrooms not big enough to cater for wheelchairs, first floor accommodation not capable of being used, and that the building is not energy efficient. A site visit of Ashley House was carried out on 20/01/14 and this confirmed a number of these issues. It is noted that local residents have picked up on Liveability's comments about the facilities at Ashley House being of a good modern standard but it is not considered that this is the case on the ground. Conversely, it was apparent that the accommodation available at the Russell Hotel is exactly what the residents of Ashley House are looking for - a safe & dry building, accommodation across three floors, en suite bedrooms (many with existing wet rooms), modern facilities, a good sized outdoor space and a swimming pool.

THE FINANCIAL SITUATION REGARDING THE HOTEL

Action for Blind People has now released confidential financial information regarding the hotel

which has been appraised by economic development officers. However, this information was only released on the basis that it would be treated in a confidential manner and not available for public inspection. Notwithstanding, they did agree to release the following short statement which summarises the financial situation with regard to the Russell Hotel:

"Information has been provided by the applicant regarding the non-viability of the Russell Hotel. This makes clear that overall the Russell Hotel has required ?2.3 million of charitable funds over the eight year period from 2005 to 2013. Action for Blind People point out that in order to provide a hotel service for blind and partially sighted people all of their hotels have required a subsidy from charitable funds. However, patronage of the Russell Hotel by blind and partially sighted people has always been disappointing and this number is falling.

The charity's Trustees set a new strategy for the hotels in 2009 such that they should become cost-neutral over a five year term. There was no prospect for achieving that goal without sighted people taking up unused capacity. For the past four years the hotel has therefore also operated as a general needs hotel and while its financial performance has improved, it is still being underpinned by charitable funds. The published accounts for year ending 31 March 2013 for Action for Blind People reveal that cost-neutrality for the hotels had not been achieved. The reported overall net cost of hotels to the charity was ?1.48 million and during the same period, the overall number of 'guest nights' declined by 5%.

In common with most other UK charities in the current economic environment, Action for Blind People has dwindling resources available to it and its Trustees have decided that there is no budget to support hotels in the strategy period 2014 to 2019. A financial projection for the Russell Hotel for this period indicates that further significant calls on charitable income will be required. Given that the hotel is under-utilised by the beneficiary group, Action for Blind People has concluded that the hotel is not viable."

It is also quite clear from the 2012/13 Financial Review which is freely available from the Action for Blind People's website that the trading position for the whole hotel group (4 hotels) overall has worsened since the 2012 figures were published. While income has gone up, costs have risen even faster resulting in a deficit that is ?132k worse than the previous year. At an operating level before overheads overall it appears the Action for Blind People's Hotel group lost ?457k in 2012/13 illustrating the challenging nature of the market place.

PRINCIPLE & HOTEL PROTECTION POLICIES

The hotel lies in an urban area where the principle of development is considered acceptable. The Government's National Planning Policy Framework further supports the effective and efficient use of land for residential accommodation.

Policy DEV36 "Change of Use of Hotel and Guest House Accommodation" is the relevant adopted Local Plan policy. It requires that a viability study is submitted to demonstrate that the current hotel use is no longer viable. The relevant policy in the emerging Local Plan is TOU DM1 expands on this and lists requirements as a viability appraisal, a clear demonstration of the marketing undertaken, an exploration of alternative visitor uses and an assessment of the suitability of the premises to accommodate the alternative use. The applicant has provided all of the requested information except for details of marketing having been advised at the pre-application stage that an exception could be made to Policy in respect of marketing on the basis of the community

benefit involved.

Arun DC Economic Development Officers have appraised the information that has been provided and have stated that this was not a clear cut case, that it was necessary to balance the loss of the hotel with the desire not to see the Russell Hotel decline to the point where it is no longer viable and is completely lost and that the proposals to provide employment to disabled people & to provide respite care holidays are welcomed. On balance, economic development officer do not object to the application.

The NPPF does not contain any hotel specific policies but does state at paragraph 22 that: "Where there is no reasonable prospect of a site being used for the allocated employment use, applications for alternative uses of land or buildings should be treated on their merits having regard to market signals and the relative need for different land uses to support sustainable local communities". Whilst the Hotel is currently in use, information has been received that suggests that it is not currently viable and it is considered that it could be lost in the future. Therefore regard should be had to potential alternative uses particularly those which have the needs of the community in mind.

The NPPF is also particularly strong in its support for the needs of the community. Paragraph 50 requires that local authorities: "plan for a mix of housing based on current and future demographic trends, market trends and the needs of different groups in the community (such as but not limited to ... people with disabilities ...)". Furthermore, paragraph 70 requires that local authorities deliver the social, recreational and cultural facilities & services that the community needs.

Emerging Policy H DM2 "Independent Living and Care Homes" encourages specialist care type accommodation in appropriate urban sustainable locations and also where the scheme is able to support & encourage a healthy and active lifestyle. The residents of Ashley House do not currently have access to an on-site swimming pool and they are currently located in an urban area whereas the Russell Hotel is adjacent to a public park and within closer proximity to the beach.

Clearly, the existing hotel provides a service to the needs of one group of people with disabilities, however, there is considered to be a particularly strong need for Livability to relocate their operation from Ashley House to more modern and more comfortable facilities. It is considered that on balance given that there are three other Action for the Blind hotels around the country (Teignmouth in Devon, Weston-super-Mare in North Somerset & Windermere in Cumbria) and also suitable accommodation in Littlehampton (The Bradbury Hotel), that the needs of the Ashley House residents are more pressing and given that the Russell Hotel is able to satisfy this need without the need for any extensive conversion works, that the proposed change of use is in the community interest.

THE SWIMMING POOL

The swimming pool is a leisure facility which is located within and is an ancillary part of a private hotel. It is accepted that it has been available to non-guests for a considerable amount of time but the local authority has no control over this and the hotel could decide to stop this service or close the pool altogether. On this basis, it is not considered that any objection can be raised by the local authority on the grounds of protecting a community facility. However, it is clear from written statements made by the applicant that they appreciate the value of the swimming pool to nearby residents and that they are committed to exploring options for the retention of the pool for use by

non-residents of the building.

RESIDENTIAL AMENITY

It is not considered that the proposed development would result in any material impact to the residential amenities of neighbouring properties because aside from the additional lift housing on the roof, there are no external alterations to the building and no significant alterations to the internal layout.

HIGHWAY IMPACTS

It is clear from the response of WSCC Highways that they are unconcerned with the change of use. This is on the basis that the proposed use will result in less traffic movements and require less vehicle parking. It is also noted that none of the objections from local residents were on the basis of parking or highway safety.

CONCLUSION

On balance, it is considered that the need from the local community for new specialised accommodation for the residents of Ashley House and the proposals by Livability to provide further services to the community outweighs the harm to the visitor economy arising from the loss of the hotel. It is also considered that regard should be had to the potential for the hotel to close if this change of use does not occur particularly considering the statement by Action for the Blind regarding the hotel group's finances. It is therefore recommended that permission be granted subject to the following conditions.

HUMAN RIGHTS ACT

The Council in making a decision should be aware of and take into account any implications that may arise from the Human Rights Act 1998. Under the Act, it is unlawful for a public authority such as Arun District Council to act in a manner, which is incompatible with the European Convention on Human Rights.

Consideration has been specifically given to Article 8 (right to respect private and family life) and Article 1 of the First Protocol (protection of property). It is not considered that the recommendation for approval of the grant of permission in this case interferes unreasonably with any local residents' right to respect for their private and family life and home, except insofar as it is necessary to protect the rights and freedoms of others (in this case, the rights of the applicant). The Council is also permitted to control the use of property in accordance with the general interest and the recommendation for approval is considered to be a proportionate response to the submitted application based on the considerations set out in this report.

DUTY UNDER THE EQUALITIES ACT 2010

Duty under the Equalities Act 2010

In assessing this proposal the following impacts have been identified upon those people with the following protected characteristics (age & disability).

It is considered that the proposal would have a beneficial impact on the needs of those severely disabled people currently living at Ashley House but a potentially negative impact on the needs of those people who have other disabilities and visit the hotel and who live in either the Bognor Regis area or are from elsewhere. The proposal may also have an impact on older people living nearby should the swimming pool no longer be available for their use.

Overall, the proposal is considered to have a part positive and part negative impact on the protected characteristics.

RECOMMENDATION

APPROVE CONDITIONALLY

- 1 The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of 3 years from the date of this permission.

Reason: To comply with Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).

- 2 The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:

Site Location Plan;
Existing Ground Floor Plan - 100 Rev A;
Existing First Floor Plan - 101;
Existing Second Floor Plan - 102;
Existing Roof Plan - 103;
Existing Elevations - 104;
Existing Elevations - 105;
Proposed Ground Floor Plan - 200 Rev B;
Proposed First Floor Plan - 201 Rev B;
Proposed Second Floor Plan - 202 Rev B;
Proposed Roof Plan - 203;
Proposed Elevations 2 of 2 - P205; and
Proposed Elevations 1 of 2 - P204.

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of amenity and the environment in accordance with GEN7 of the Arun District Local Plan.

- 3 The building shall be used as a residential care home and for no other purpose (including any other purpose in Class C2 (Residential Institutions) of the Schedule to the Town & Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987 or in any provision equivalent to that Class in any other Statutory Instrument revoking and re-enacting that Order).

Reason: To enable the Local Planning Authority to maintain control of the property in the interest of the local community and the needs of disadvantaged groups in accordance with Arun District Local Plan policy GEN7 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

- 4 No part of the development shall be first occupied until covered and secure cycle parking

spaces have been provided in accordance with plans and details submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To provide alternative travel options to the use of the car in accordance with policies GEN7 and GEN12 of the Arun District Local Plan.

- 5 The 6 car parking spaces located within the site curtilage and accessed from Wessex Avenue shall hereafter be retained at all times for their designated use.

Reason: To provide car-parking spaces for the new use in accordance with policies GEN7 and GEN12 of the Arun District Local Plan.

- 6 INFORMATIVE: Statement pursuant to Article 31 of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure)(England) (Amendment No. 2) Order 2012. The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by assessing the proposal against all material considerations, including planning policies and any representations that may have been received and subsequently determining to grant planning permission in accordance with the presumption in favour of sustainable development, as set out within the National Planning Policy Framework.