Planning Objection

Re: Planning Application AWDM/0812/20 as amended:
Ground floor rear extension, Juliet balcony to east elevation, covered way to south. (Porch and verandah to north side and south and north side dormer windows to be constructed under permitted development.)
22 Mill Hill Shoreham-by-Sea West Sussex BN43 5TH

With this amended application, we would like the council to consider the previous objection submitted by Laura Bourke the Senior Planning Officer for Dowsett Mayhew Planning Services.

We would also like the council to consider the following material considerations to amplify the previous Dowsett Mayhew report.

Ground floor rear extension, Juliet balcony to east elevation, covered way to south

Appearance: The amended proposal seeks to reduce the depth of the ground floor rear extension on the southern elevation into its garden space to circa 5.4 metres from the previous 8.4 metres.
As designed, this would still extend up to the boundary with a minimal gap, of circa 1.3m to the southern boundary. It is considered that this amendment is not sufficient to withdraw this objection because the reduced size is still projecting close to the southern boundary and the extension is still considered bulky and over-sized in relation to the host dwelling.
In light of such a substantial extension to the rear it is submitted the proposal would have an overbearing impact on the adjacent neighbours which would adversely affect residential amenity.

Privacy: The proposed rear extension would include full-length windows in the south elevation. Additional full-length folding sliding doors have now been added on the south-facing wall of the existing ground floor extension.
The only viewpoint from these windows and doors is across the rear of No20 and overlooking the rear principal windows of No20.
We regard this as highly intrusive and inconsistent with the council's previous decision as follows:

Referring to the existing ground floor rear extension at No22 Mill Hill:
Application (SU/10/06/TP) Single Storey Rear Extension with Pitched Roof plus Attached Conservatory.

The planning report stipulated a 4 metre distance from the conservatory to the south boundary.
The reason to avoid any adverse effect on the neighbouring property to the south.
Referring to the submitted plans for application (SU/10/06/TP).
Although we had no objection in principal to the application, we requested that the shape of the conservatory be altered from the plan to maintain the 4 metre distance to the south boundary.
We also requested that the window adjacent to the conservatory on the south-facing wall be removed to reduce the amount of overlooking of No20.
Please see Figures 8 and 9 of the Dowsett Mayhew report showing the existing rear extension at No22 Mill Hill as seen from the rear of No20 Mill Hill.
Please see Figure 10 below showing the proposed rear extension superimposed as seen from the rear of No 20 Mill Hill.

By moving the proposed rear extension back to 4 metres from the south boundary, the combined extensions will still cover an area 7 metres by 8.37 metres.
This will still create a large kitchen/dining/living room that is more in scale with the host dwelling.
It will significantly reduce the overbearing impact on the adjacent neighbours and also achieve the applicant's objective for applying for planning permission in the first place.
It will also be consistent with the council's previous decision to maintain a 4 metre distance to the south boundary.
The full length folding sliding doors added on the existing south-facing wall should again be removed, as there would be sufficient light entering the room from the other folding sliding doors and windows.
This again would be consistent with the council's previous decision.

(Porch and verandah to north side and south and north side dormer windows to be constructed under permitted development.)

South and North Side Dormers:
No22 Mill Hill is a detached chalet bungalow consisting of a main ground floor level with a roof containing habitable rooms.

The original chalet bungalow has been previously extended with additional roof space enlargements as follows:

- Two Storey Rear Extension under application (SU/219/90/TP/6628)
- Dormer to Roof Slope on South Side under application SU/43/96/TP/16307
- Ground Floor Rear Extension and Attached Conservatory under application (SU/10/06/TP)

Referring to the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local government, Permitted development rights for householders, Technical Guidance.

Page 34: To be permitted development any additional roof space created must not increase the volume of the original roof space of the house by more than 50 cubic metres for semi-detached and detached houses.
Any previous enlargement to the original roof space in any part of the house must be included in this volume allowance.

Referring to the planning portal volume calculator the external dimensions are as follows:

Application SU/219/90/TP/16307 Two Storey Rear Extension. (see photo on page 5 below)
The roof of the chalet bungalow was extended circa 4 metres to the rear with a span of circa 8 metres and height of circa 4.5 metres. Using the calculator the following additional roof space is calculated as:

- Width 8m by length 4m by roof height 4.5m giving additional roofspace volume of circa 72m3.

- Application SU/43/96/TP/16307. Dormer to Roof Slope on South Side.
  2.8m height by 2.1m depth by 4.4m length giving additional volume of 12.9m3
  (Measurements taken from the original planning assessment 10/06/1996)

- Application SU/10/06/TP Ground Floor Rear Extension plus Attached Conservatory.
  Roof area Circa 4.5m wide by 7.5m length, A =2m B=2.25m C=3m Total Volume = circa 27m3

- From theses calculations it can be seen that previous roof space enlargements have increased the volume of the original roof space by circa 72m3 + 12.9m3 + 27m3 = 111.9 cubic metres.

We respectfully ask the council to consider the following reason for not approving permitted development for the north and south side dormers:

- The previous extensions outlined above have increased the volume of the original roof space of the chalet bungalow by more than 50 cubic metres.
  The volume allowance under permitted development has already been exceeded.

Page 36: Any window inserted on a wall or roof slope forming a side elevation of the dwelling house shall be obscure-glazed and non-opening unless the parts of the window which can be opened are more than 1.7 metres above the floor of the room in which the window is installed.
Where such a window is on a staircase or landing (ie not in a room) the 1.7 metres measurement should be made from the stair or point on a landing immediately below the centre of the window, upwards to the opening part of the window.
Glazing to provide privacy is normally rated on a scale of 1-5, with 5 providing the most privacy.
To be permitted development, windows should be obscure glazed to minimum of level 3.

We respectfully ask the council to consider the following reason for not approving permitted development for the dormer windows:

- The windows on the dormers as shown on the plans do not comply with the strict criteria to be permitted development.
- The windows as shown on the sloping roof of the south elevation over the staircase and landing do not comply with the strict criteria to be permitted development.

Appearance: The extent and scale of the proposed dormers would completely undermine the form and shape of the bungalow, adding a large amount of bulk into the roof space. The bulky dormers bear no relationship to the pitch and form of the existing roof and would fundamentally erode its character.

As stated in the Dowsett Mayhew report: With respect to the southern elevation, planning permission has previously been granted for a room in the roof with dormer on south side (SU/43/96/TP/16307). The existing side facing dormer extends to circa 4m with a false pitched roof. The accompanying assessment of the application confirmed the dormer was reduced in scale during the application confirming a larger dormer was previously unacceptable to the Council. In addition, the assessment confirmed the proposed dormer would face the side wall of No.20 Mill Hill and only over look part of its rear garden at an oblique angle. It was also confirmed the dormer was set back 5.2 metres from the front eaves line so as not to have any significant effect on public views from the road.

Privacy: As stated in the Dowsett Mayhew report:
No22 Mill Hill is on higher ground than its adjacent neighbour at No 20 and its neighbour at No20 sits further back in the plot. There are no facing windows at first floor level on the north side of No.20 (a condition was imposed previously to remove permitted development rights). This would indicate new openings here are unacceptable in principle.
On the south elevation, an additional dormer is proposed in the western part of the roof as well as an extension to the existing dormer. Given the adjacent property at No20 Mill Hill sits further back, the proposed dormer in the western part of the roof would provide direct views into the first floor bedroom of No.20 Mill Hill and would result in increased overlooking and loss of privacy. The dormer would have an adverse impact on the outlook of a principal window and adversely impact the privacy of its neighbour.
Please see images 1 to 7 in the Dowsett Mayhew report which illustrate the view of the existing roof slope as viewed from No20 Mill Hill and a superimposed extension to the dormer at the rear as viewed from No20 Mill Hill.
Figure 5 is taken from the actual bed in the first floor bedroom of No20 Mill Hill.

Porch and Verandah to North Side: Class D – porches. This provides permitted development rights for the erection of a porch outside any external door of a house. The ground area (measured externally) of the structure should not exceed 3 square metres
The porch and verandah outlined on the plan for permitted development, consists of a side extension to the entrance hall and an outside covered porch. From the plan, the total external ground area covered by this structure is circa 11 square metres (extension = 5.95m2, porch = 5.05m2).
We respectfully ask the council to consider the structure outlined on the plan for porch and verandah to north side does not meet the criteria for permitted development under Class D – Porches.

As stated in the Dowsett Mayhew report: The application proposes alterations and extensions to the rear, the roof, additional dormers, a porch, verandah and covered walkway. In combination, it is considered these works would substantially increase the scale, bulk, and massing of the existing chalet bungalow and in our view would result in the overdevelopment of the plot.
It is submitted the application requires a significant redesign of the scheme in order to facilitate an extension at the site.

We respectfully ask that the present planning application be refused

From:
Mr and Mrs R Brand
20 Mill Hill,
Shoreham By Sea, BN43 5TH



FIGURE 10: Superimposed Rear Extention at No22 Mill Hill as seen from the rear of No 20 Mill Hill



No 22 Mill Hill showing additional roofspace added under application SU/219/90/TP/6628 Two Storey Rear Extension

NB: Photo taken prior to 1996 before current dormer constructed