Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/1105/20 Recommendation APPROVE

Site: 11 Mill Hill Gardens, Shoreham-by-Sea, BN43 5TN

Proposal: Single storey rear extension, raised terrace and steps to replace existing conservatory, patio and steps

Date of site visit: Assessment has been assisted using the Applicants plan and photos; Earthlight mapping; and Google 3D of the site

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Site and Surroundings:

The property is a semi-detached bungalow situated at the closed end of the cul-de-sac that is Mill Hill Gardens. The property has a vehicular access and hardstanding at the front for parking, a shared access drive continues past the dwelling to a detached garage located to the rear side of the dwelling.

The topography of the area is sloping as it is on a hill, and the rear garden of the application site, slopes down from the house.

Mill Hill Gardens comprises predominantly detached and semi-detached bungalows, most of whom have some form of extensions either single storey rear extension and/or roof extensions. The adjoin property at no.'s 12 has a single storey rear extension (ADC/0231/08 refers), is 3.5m deep, there is also a terrace to the front of the extension and steps down to the garden. The extension at no. 12 is 3.6m high measured from natural ground level.

The site is not within a Conservation Area and the property is not a Listed Building

Proposal

The application seeks permission to provide a single storey rear extension measuring approx. 6.4m wide x 5m deep x some 3.9m high

The patio area will measure some 3.7m wide x 4.4 m deep and steps will lead off of the patio down to the rear garden (the patio will be approx. 1.4m above natural ground level)

Relevant Planning History:

AWDM/1106/20 Application for Certificate of Lawfulness for proposed roof conversion including hip to gable roof extension with first floor window, rear dormer and front rooflight **Current**

Representations: 1 letter of objection from adjoining property

Daylight
Appearance
Loss of Amenity

- The proposed extension is excessive in scale and will dominate the rear of the property
- On inspecting the plans it is clearly evident that the proposed extension will project some 5.5m from the rear of the property
- Query the 45 degree ruling here
- The note on the drawing is based on assumption as I have not shared scale drawings of the back of my property
- I have not received nor agreed to any survey of the back of my property to allow an accurate interpretation of this ruling
- Due to the above I believe the not on the drawing to be misleading until such time as it is proven
- Additionally due to the proximity of the proposed structure, I also query the 45 degree rule in elevation, this is not noted on the drawings and as the sun rises to the east there will be detrimental reduction in light
- I believe to have clear detrimental effect on residential amenity as per section 2,2 of the DM Standard no. 2 Extensions & Alterations to Dwellings
- Concern with the appearance and size of the proposed extension
- The extension would be out of scale with the size of the bungalow (DM Standard no. 2), and also far exceeds the maximum advised depth of 3.5m as noted in the DM Standard no. 2
- The proposed extension clearly abuts the common side boundary
- My extension is 3.5m being the recommended maximum. Comments in the application that my property has a large extension, when in fact it meets the DM Standard
- I strongly feel that the proposal in question does not meet the correct standards as laid out within the DM Standard

Relevant Planning Policies

Adur Local Plan policies: 1, 15
DM Standard No.2 SPG - Extensions and alterations to dwellings
National Planning Policy Framework (2019)
National Planning Practice Guidance

Planning Assessment

There is no objection in principle to the proposed development to provide a rear extension and patio area.

The key concerns would be the effect on the character of the area and existing residential amenities of neighbouring properties.

The proposed extension will replace an existing conservatory which measures some 3m in depth x 3.5m wide x 3.5m high and currently the existing conservatory has its west elevation totally blocked by the neighbouring brick

rear extension which is constructed very close to the existing glazed elevation of the conservatory, and is approx. 500mm deeper than the conservatory.

The proposed extension will be 5.27m deep which will be some 1.77m deeper than the neighbouring extension at no. 12, and there will be some 150mm between the side wall of the proposal and the side wall of the neighbouring extension. From the approved planning permission for the extension at no. 12 (ADC/0231/08), it has glazed double doors with full size glazed wings, on its south elevation, and using the 45 degree rule from the centre point of the glazed doors, the proposed extension at no. 11 will be behind the line, thereby it will not result in material visual harm or loss of light to no. 12. There is also a standing platform to the rear of the neighbours' extension of approx. 1.3m in depth, which currently provides unlimited overlooking to the application site, however there is boundary planting which currently affords some screening.

Further, because the ground level of the rear garden slopes down and away from the existing dwelling the proposed extension will be some 3.9m high. On the planning application plans for the extension at no. 12, the height of their extension was stated as being 3.6m which is approx. 300mm lower than the proposed extension.

There may be marginal overshadowing from the proposal onto no.12 due to the sun orientation i.e. rising in the east, and the slight difference in height and depth between the two extensions, but it is considered the amount will not be material to result in any demonstrable harm to no. 12, particularly given the sun travels to the south and onto the west for the majority of the day.

Furthermore, as there are to be no windows in the west elevation of the proposed extension, a condition to restrict windows in the future would be reasonable, there will be no overlooking onto the neighbouring property no. 12. The window within the south elevation of the proposal will look down into its own garden, and any views into the neighbouring property if any, due to landscaping, will be oblique only and thereby will not result in a material loss of existing residential amenity to no. 12

The reference from the neighbour to the DM standard no. 2 is noted, but it is deliberated within the above analysis that in this instance the proposal balances the document with the circumstances of the proposal, and in line with Government advice, each application should be considered on its own merits; and in this case, it is considered that the proposal will not result in any material harm onto the existing residential amenities of the neighbouring property no. 12.

The raised terrace is to the east of the extension and will not overlook No.12. It will face the garage at No.11 and will not overlook the neighbour to the east.

Recommendation

APPROVE subject to the following condition(s)

1. Approved plans
2. Standard time limit
3. Materials

4. No windows in west elevation

Informative

1. Approved without amendment

Is recommendation contrary to letter(s) of representation Y

Case Officer: Eve Hearsey Date: 02.09.2020

Authorised by: Peter Barnett Date: 3 September 2020