expires 30.07.

Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: ADC/0290/08 **Recommendation - Permit**

Site: **24 Mill Hill Shoreham-by-Sea West Sussex BN43 5TH**

Proposal: **Single-storey rear extension**

The Application

The application property is a detached 1930's style house located on the east side of Mill Hill in the built-up area of Shoreham. The property is mainly of white painted render with a 0.8m high brick plinth (also painted white) with a plain clay tile roof. The road is located on sloping ground with neighbours to the north and south with a ground level approximately 0.3m in difference.

The proposal is for a rear flat-roof extension across the whole rear of the property. It would be 9.3m in width, by 4.4m in depth, by 2.6m in height. The extension would provide space for enlarged kitchen, dining and utility rooms. In addition the applicant seeks to convert the existing integral garage into a downstairs bedroom.

To the south is a large chalet bungalow (No.22) separated from the site by a driveway. It has a newly built large pitched roof extension which projects to the rear by 8.0m and is 1.0m away from the boundary with the site. To the north (No.26) is a chalet bungalow set well back from the road which projects past the application property by 8.0m. It is sited on higher ground with a high brick wall at the boundary between the two properties.

Consultations and Representations

Third Parties: There have been no objections from the surrounding neighbours.

Relevant Planning Policies and Guidance

Adopted West Sussex Structure Plan 2001-2016 (WSCC 2005) (saved policies): LOC1, DEV1
Adopted Adur District Local Plan 1993-2006 (ADC 1996) (saved policies): AG1, AH7 and Appendix II 'Supplementary Planning Guidance' comprising: Development Control Standard No.3 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings.'
PPS 1 'Delivering Sustainable Development' (ODPM 2005)

Planning Assessment

Policies

Structure Plan policies seek to protect, and where possible, enhance the character and distinctiveness of an area, requiring high standards of design, layout and construction (DEV1). Policy AH7 of the Local Plan states that extensions and alterations should be designed so as not to result in an unacceptable degree of overlooking, a loss of natural light or an overbearing effect on neighbouring dwellings. They should be of sympathetic design and materials to the original dwelling and the area in general.

Visual amenity

The application house is well set back from the road with a mature front garden and hardstanding which can accommodate a number of cars. The proposed extension would project from the rear of the house by 4.4m however due to the large set-back of the house it would not be particularly visible from the street, and therefore would not affect the streetscene.

The large flat roof obviously is not ideal given the surface area of the roof, but a sloping roof would be too high and would cover the windows at first floor level even with a minimum of angle. The extension would maintain the building line at the side of the building and due to the large plot would not feel overbearing or unneighbourly to the adjacent neighbours.

The proposals show a minimal brick plinth as apposed to the 0.8m plinth of the original house to which it would abut, however it is considered that as the whole exterior of the building is painted white (including the 0.8m plinth) that it would not be necessary to insist on this detail being followed through into the new extension.

The conversion of the garage to a habitable room would usually not require planning permission as it would be 'permitted development', and in this case it is considered that the conversion would be sympathetically done with a matching brick plinth and a window in keeping with the design of the rest of the house.

Residential amenity

The proposals would not have any windows in either the north or south elevations and would therefore would not result in any overlooking or loss of privacy to No's 22 or 26. The garden of the site is mature and a length of well over the minimum 11m would be retained to ensure privacy for properties to the east.

The height differential between the site and that of its neighbour to the north (no.26) would ensure that there would not be a significant loss of daylight or outlook from south facing windows. The property to the south would not be

adversely affected in terms of the levels of natural daylight or the outlook available.

The proposals are considered to be acceptable, with there being no effect on the residential amenity of the adjacent dwellings and no significant loss of visual amenity to the streetscene.

Recommendation

APPROVE for reason that :-

1PPii.

1. C1Ci.
2. C12Eii - delete reference to roof.
3. C18Eiv – north or south side

Case Officer:
Date: 4/7/08

3/7/08