Development Management – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/0813/24 Recommendation: APPROVE

Site: 22 Mill Hill, Shoreham-By-Sea, West Sussex

Proposal: Demolition of side return and rear conservatory. Construction of new flat roofed canopy to south side, infill extension to north side and enlargement of existing rear extension. Roof alterations including barn hip to gable extension to front and rear, alterations to side dormer to south and construction of new side dormer to north, new roof lights and front facing balcony. Replacement external materials, windows and doors throughout. Alterations to property frontage.

Date of Site Visit: 10th September 2024

Neighbours Checked: Y

Additional neighbour notification: N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

The application site is a detached gabled roof chalet bungalow with front bays, a dormer on the south roof slope and various single storey rear additions. The planning history of the site is set out below. The dwelling is set back from the highway with a driveway to the front, ground levels increase from south to north along Mill Hill and properties within the street vary in design and appearance and many have been altered and extended.

SU/219/90/TP –Approved - Two storey extension to rear.
SU/43/96/TP – Approved - Room in roof with dormer on south side.
SU/19/05/TP – Refused –Rear extension with rooms in roof.
SU/90/05/TP – Approved – Single storey rear extension.
SU/10/06/TP – Approved – Single storey rear extension with pitched roof plus attached conservatory.
AWDM/0812/20 – Withdrawn - Ground floor rear extension, Juliet balcony to east elevation, covered way to south.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.)
AWDM/1180/20 – Withdrawn - Certificate of lawfulness for proposed enlargement of existing south dormer with additional 1no. dormer to north and south roof slopes.
AWDM/1983/20 - Approved - Roof extension, raising ridge and eaves height, enlarged barn ends and ground floor infill extension to north and south elevations (amended resubmission of AWDM/0812/20.)

The most recent permission was to raise the ridge and eaves of the building and to enlarge the barn ends of the building in width, widening the first floor of the building. A ground floor extension on the north side was permitted infilling the area between the main house and the existing rear projection. The ground floor was also widened on the south side and a covered side access was permitted to the south. This permission has not been implemented and the current application seeks permission for a development which incorporates much of these proposals whilst remodelling the building as a whole with the use of contemporary materials and the introduction of a front balcony and dormer to the north.

The proposals as originally submitted here have been amended to reduce the scheme in line with discussions and advice from officers, the amended plans show the following: -

- The existing barn hip roof of the chalet bungalow will be extended to a full gable to the front and rear.
- A new dormer is to be added to the north roof slope and the southern dormer is to be retained with a new gable roof to match that to the north.
- The existing rear ground floor extension is to be increased in width with an infill to the south and a new gabled roof. The amended plans have lowered the roof from that originally submitted with a shallower pitch and removal of side roof light.
- A single storey infill extension is proposed to the north and covered canopy entrance to the south.
- Rooflights are proposed to the main roof and the rear extension.
- A front balcony is proposed above the existing front bays with enlarged glazing into the gable
- The rear first floor window is also increased in size.
- Changes to the driveway to include increased width of access and reduction of hedging on front boundary.

The materials to be used as described in the Design and Access Statement are brick slips of white brick with white mortar throughout. The main house is to have grey tiles to the roof and dormers with the rear extension having a standing seam, zinc roof and timber cladding. Black soffits and fascias are proposed throughout. Timber vertical sliding louvres are proposed to the southern elevation of the rear extension. Black aluminium doors and windows are proposed throughout.

Representations

Received in relation to the **Original Plans** 5 objections from the owner/occupiers of nos. 20, 24, 26, 5 Mill Hill and a representation written on behalf of the occupiers of no. 20 Mill Hill.

- Object to design and scale of works and adverse impact on surrounding area, street scene and amenities of the neighbours.
- Overlooking loss of privacy.
- Alter the shape and form of the bungalow in contrast to the previous approvals.
- Side dormer extends beyond the roof slope.
- Cramped terracing effect.
- Large amount of bulk erodes character of original bungalow.
- The rear extension is oversized and bulky and would result in overdevelopment of the plot.
- Materials out of keeping.
- Flue causes concern.
- Change in ground levels leads to increased impact.
- Views from roof lights, windows and balcony harm to amenity. Overlooking to front and rear garden.
- Roof lights should be obscurely glazed and fixed shut as with previous application.
- No side openings as with previous application.
- Vegetation on plans misleading.
- Redesign required in line with previous consent.
- The roof of the rear extension would overhang the existing footprint of the building and be higher.
- Materials appear as an industrial unit.
- Enlarged windows to front too large and intrusive. Existing tree has been removed so no screening.
- Application should be referred to planning committee.
- Roof of extension will be unsightly, result in loss of light and will be visible.
- Obscure glazing to any windows facing north.
- Overlooking from balcony.
- Contrary to Development Management Standard No. 2.

Representations received in relation to the **amended plans** from owner/occupiers of no. 20 Mill Hill. Objecting to the amended plans.

- Objections as submitted already.
- Scale of rear extension competes with the scale of host dwelling.
- The side windows are too close to the boundary, overlooking
- Overlooking at a higher level.
- Side roof lights unnecessary and cause overlooking.
- Previous application stated no side windows and obscurely glazed and non opening only this is not the case here.
- Further amendments are required.
- Overdevelopment and impact upon residential amenity.

Relevant Planning Policies

Adur Local Plan 2017 Policy 15
'Supplementary Planning Guidance' comprising: Development Management Standard No.2 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings''
National Planning Policy Framework (December 2023)
WSCC Guidance on Parking at New Developments (Sept 2020).

Planning Assessment

Principle

The relevant issues are the effects on the amenities of neighbouring residential occupiers and the effect on the character and appearance of the area.

Visual amenity

In terms of the street scene there is a variety of property styles within Mill Hill. Buildings vary in design, scale and appearance. The change in ground levels also contributes to the variation in building heights. Many have been remodelled and have a contemporary finish. There are other examples of front balconies therefore this feature is not considered to be out of keeping in this case.

Similarly the increased bulk and scale of the development including increased footprint, as amended, do not give rise to a building which, within the context of the existing street scene and built environment, would be too large, bulky or represent overdevelopment in this case. It does represent a larger scale development than already exists and that which was approved under AWDM/1983/20 however this does not deem it unacceptable. Each case is judged on its own merits and as amended the development is appropriately scaled for the site. The changes will not cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the dwelling or street scene to warrant a refusal. The side dormers are balanced, do not over dominate the roof slopes and are lower than the ridge and set in from the eaves. They are sympathetically designed in relation to the rest of the building which is simplistic in form and contemporary in appearance. The larger openings contribute positively to the updated design.

It is noted that the single storey development at the site projects to the rear to a significant degree. This is as a result of historic, piecemeal development at the site. However when considering the changes here, the footprint is increased with an infill section to the south but the projection to the rear does not increase. The roof form as amended has been lowered and limited to an acceptable degree. On balance the changes would not be detrimental or significantly harmful here.

The changes at the rear and side including the infill and covered access are minor in terms of the impact upon the character and appearance of the locality. Although the changes in materials, roof form and bulk to the single storey extension represent a variation to existing they are not visible within the street scene. The building has been considered as a holistic development and would be a positive addition in the street scene adding interest whilst not being overly dominant.

The front balcony is not a feature that would be out of keeping in this case, there are other examples within Mill Hill both in new and historic built form. No harm would occur as a result of this addition in terms of street scene and character impact.

The changes to the property frontage are noted and include the widening of the vehicular access and the reduction of hedging to the front boundary. These changes will not be harmful to the street scene and soft landscaping and the front grass verge will remain to the front of the property. The large conifer to the property frontage has been removed, this was overly large and there would be no requirement to retain this tree in this case.

Residential amenity

The main properties to be affected are those either side of the site, no 24 to the north and 20 to the south. Both have made representations objecting to the proposals. To the north the neighbouring property has a ground floor glazed corridor which at the time of visiting was used as a greenhouse. The infill section of single storey extension on this side will face onto the side fence of the neighbouring property. Ground floor windows will not result in any overlooking in this case. The proposed dormer will face toward the side on no. 24. There is a first floor secondary, obscurely glazed side window here. The dormer window will have an obscurely glazed window serving a shower room, therefore no overlooking will occur between the dwellings on this side.

There are two clear glazed roof lights on the north side which serve bedrooms, (amended plans show the removal of one rooflight on each roof slope.) These will be conditioned to be non opening unless above 2.1 metres finished floor level to avoid any possible overlooking in this case.

The existing single storey rear projection is currently adjacent to the boundary with no. 24 and the roof is visible from the garden and rear of the house at first and ground floor. The roof will be increased in bulk with the gable addition to front and rear; however the amended plans show limited height and the rooflight on this side has been removed. The roof will remain visible however there will be no loss of light, privacy or overbearing impact as a result.

The enlarged rear, first floor windows will overlook the rear garden however this is not unusual within residential areas such as this and the rear windows currently result in the same overlooking. The increased window sizes cannot be resisted here.

To the south the existing dormer will remain, the enlarged dormer has been removed from the plans. So, there will be no change to the current overlooking to the south at first floor; this serves a bedroom currently and will remain as such. This side window faces onto the blank elevation of the neighbouring dwelling. The ground floor side access will face onto the side boundary fence and will therefore have no adverse impact.

The occupiers to the south have objected to the proposals and are particularly concerned with regards to the side glazing in the proposed rear extension. They consider this to overlook their rear first floor windows and to be too close to the boundary. They also have expressed concern with regards to how this contradicts the previous consent which limited openings on the south side. As stated above each case is judged on its own merits. Consideration must be given to the amended plan as submitted and if the proposals warrant a refusal in this case. Looking at the existing relationship, there is a conservatory with glazing as existing on the south side. The proposed glazing will be closer, however slightly reduced. The glazing will overlook the side boundary fence. No overlooking will be directly to the south either onto the rear garden or directly into any habitable rooms. There still remains 3.5 metres to the boundary. The objectors have submitted photos to show their concerns with regards to overlooking between their first floor rear bedroom and the side of the new extension. There may be oblique views from the rear bedroom towards the new windows and vice versa however this would not be directly into the room and this relationship would not be such to warrant a refusal. Such overlooking between neighbouring residential properties is not unusual.

It is noted that there is a tree and vegetation on the southern boundary which offers screening and is identified on the submitted proposed block plan. A condition is attached to ensure that this is retained.

The objectors have referred to Development Management Standard No.2. This states that principal windows on the side elevation of rear extensions should be a minimum of 6.1 metres from any solid obstruction or boundary by 22 metres from facing principal windows. The 6.1 metre distance is stipulated as guidance and for the benefit of the occupiers to gain suitable outlook and light if this is their principal window. To avoid the sole window to a room looking directly onto a fence or ‘solid obstruction.’ This is not a criteria relevant in this case. There are other windows serving the room facing east and there would be sufficient outlook and light to the occupiers of this room as extended. The 22 metre distance is of relevance here and there should not be less than 22 metres between two directly facing windows serving

habitable rooms. In this case the side windows do not face towards other windows and no direct overlooking will occur.

Rooflights are proposed on the north and south roof slopes. The adjacent occupiers have objected to these as there are concerns they will overlook. A photo has been submitted showing overlooking from a roof light to the front bedroom at no. 20. The applicant's agent has stated that the roof lights will be non opening unless they are above 2.1 metres finished floor level. However they will be clearly glazed. Although the previous consent had a condition attached to ensure that roof lights were obscurely glazed and non opening in this case, again we must assess the proposals before us. The view is taken that the rooflights will not result in direct overlooking to adjacent habitable rooms. It is not deemed possible that direct overlooking would occur between these windows to result in significant loss of privacy in this case. It is also noted that amended plans have been submitted removing one of the roof lights from each side.

The balcony to the front will overlook the driveways and front of properties either side and opposite the site. The direct overlooking opposite will be in excess of 22 metres and being to the property frontages will not be greater than any overlooking which already exists between front windows. Property frontages are not private amenity spaces and are overlooked by the street and adjacent properties therefore there would be no ground for refusal in this case. As stated above other balconies exist within the vicinity of the site this relationship is therefore not unusual.

The plans as amended are considered acceptable for the reasons set out above. There would be no justification for a refusal in this case and therefore the development is deemed acceptable subject to the conditions set out below.

Recommendation

APPROVE

Subject to Conditions:-

1. Approved Plans
2. Standard 3 year time limit
3. Materials as shown on approved plans.
4. The rooflights shall be non opening unless above 2.1 metres finished floor level.
5. No additional windows on the north or south elevation of the building or roof slope.
6. Retention of the vegetation on southern boundary.

Is recommendation contrary to letter(s) of representation Y

1. Proactive with amendments.

Case Officer: Hannah Barker Date: 26th November 2024

Authorised by: Peter Barnett Date: 26 November 2024