Expires.
03-04-09

Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: ADC/0049/09 Recommendation - Permit

Site: **1A Mill Hill Shoreham-by-Sea West Sussex BN43 5TG**

Proposal: **Two-storey south side extension including integral garage to replace existing garage (converted to room) and associated alterations**

The Application

The application property is a large 1970's detached house located on the west side of Mill Hill, directly opposite the junction with Mill Hill Drive. The site is located on land that has a steep gradient going northwards, with No.1 Mill Hill to the south on significantly lower ground. The existing house has a shallow centrally ridged roof with north side front projecting lounge (with a matching roof line), and a south side flat roof side extension. The first floor is currently clad in uPVC, with a ground-floor of dark brickwork.

The proposals is to demolish the existing south side extension and erect a two-storey extension which would be (as amended), 4.5m in width, by 9.5m in depth, by 5.3m in height. The extension would serve as a new garage with study to the rear on ground floor, and a master bedroom and family bathroom at first floor level. The proposals also include the extension of an existing rear first-floor balcony, and the conversion of the existing internal double garage into a dining room.

To the south is No.1 Mill Hill, a detached house recently extended on the north side, with a roof extension over an attached garage. To the north is No. 3 a detached house with rear projecting extension with south facing picture windows.

Consultations and Representations

Third Parties: There has been one letter of objection from the owners of No.1 directly to the south. The main points of concern are that:-

- There is only 0.95m gap to the boundary of the site
- The proposal will be overbearing given the difference in height of the sites and the height of the proposed south elevation
- The design is not in keeping with the existing lines and design of the property
- The windows will overlook our front entrance / door and hall windows

[NB: The objector has requested to view the original planning permission for 1A Mill Hill SU/382/7, which has now been done]

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 areas, requiring high standards of design, layout and construction (DEV1). Policy AH7 of the Local Plan, relation specifically to extensions and alterations to dwellings, states that they should be designed so as not to result in an unacceptable loss of light or privacy or have an overbearing effect on the neighbouring dwelling and be sympathetic to the original dwelling. Supplementary Planning Guidance in DC Standard No. 3 'Extension and Alteration to Dwellings' states that two-storey extensions on semi-detached or terraced properties that are within 1 metre of a side boundary with an attached dwelling should normally be no deeper than 2 metres. Two-storey extensions should also have a pitched roof to match the existing house.

Visual amenity
The application dwelling sits on a steeply sloping site and as a result there is a step of approximately 2m between the driveway of the adjacent property (No.1) and where the extension is to be sited. The land on the south side of the site does appear to have been 'made-up' slightly higher than natural ground level so that the existing side extension could be level with the existing building. The site is graduated from east to west with the house being sited on higher ground level than the main road to the east. The house is well set back within the site by 14m.

It was considered that as originally submitted the design of the extension did not relate sympathetically to that of the original building. The amended plans now show a garage that is set into the ground by 0.8m, which results in the roof plane of the original house following over the extension without deviating in angle. The first floor window has been redesigned and now is considered to be sympathetic with the others in the building, and the proposals have been moved away from the south side boundary and reduced in depth by 1.2m.

It is considered that the amendments to the scheme will result in an extension which is sympathetic to the design of the original house, and would be subservient enough to prevent it from appearing cramped within the plot or over developed.

Residential amenity

The neighbouring site has recently had a north side extension built which includes a new attached garage located 9.3 to the west of the front elevation, above that is located a bedroom with east and west facing windows. The entrance to the dwelling is sited to the east of the attached garage and sits at the bottom of a double height internal staircase/hallway. The first floor windows to the hallway are all obscurely glazed. There are no north facing windows in the north side roof or walls of the garage / bedroom.

The proposals were originally proposed to be located 1.6m from the boundary with the property to the south, and due to the design having it's own ridged roof, the flank wall would have been 5.2m in height. This would have resulted in a south elevation that would have appeared 7.2m in height to the neighbouring site. The proposals have been reduced in scale and now the southern elevation would have a flank wall which would be 4.5m in height (from natural ground level), giving the appearance of being 6.5m from the driveway of No.1. This is still quite an imposing height, but given that the proposed extension has been moved further from the common boundary so that it would be 8m from the entrance to the neighbouring site, and that there would be no direct outlook from main habitable rooms of No.1 towards the extension, and that the extension only overlaps the objectors garage by 2m, it is considered that the effect on the outlook would not be so significant to warrant refusal.

The view from the proposed first-floor bathroom windows would be so oblique as to not have an effect on the privacy of No.1 to the south.

The rear Juliette balcony serving the proposed bedroom would have views directly over the A27 towards Lancing College westwards, and it is thought that it would not result in overlooking of the rear patio area of No.1 which is set back behind a flat-roofed side extension / conservatory 10m away.

Recommendation

APPROVE for reason that :-
1PPii

1. C1Ci. .. revised plans AL103A & AL104A rec'd on
2. C14A3 – (20.03.09 – AH7 of the ADLP and DEV1 of the WSSP)
3. C12Eii
4. C18Eiv – south

PB 26/3/09

Case Officer: [redacted]
Date: 25.03.09

Planning Services Manager: [redacted]
Date: 25/3/09

Development Control Committee Chairman:
Date: [redacted] 26/03/09