Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/1041/16 Recommendation APPROVE

Site: 6 Mill Hill, Shoreham-by-Sea, BN43 5TH

Proposal: Demolition of existing chimney and proposed front and side elevation

Date of site visit: 25.05.2016 (previous application)

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Site and Surroundings

The application relates to a detached house on raised ground, some 3m above the adjacent lane. Until approx.one year ago, the land in front of the house sloped down gently westwards to form a landscaped embankment abutting the back edge of Mill Hill. The latter has no pavements and the sense of enclosure created by the embankment contributed to its semi-rural character. The embankment has since been removed and the deep site frontage excavated, opening up views of the dwelling from the lane. The excavation of the land constituted an engineering operation for which planning permission should have been obtained and is currently the subject of an enforcement investigation (AWEN/0235/15). A planning application has also recently been submitted for the front landscaping works, and has yet to be determined.

Mill Hill slopes down from north to south so that the application site is lower than No. 8 to the north, and higher than No.4 to the south, a modest 1½-storey dwelling. The land at the site frontage directly abutted and was approximately level with the land height of the front garden area of No. 4, but the above mentioned unauthorised works have created a significant drop in ground level on the boundary with No. 4 into the site of No.6. No.4 has a stepped frontage mainly laid to lawn with shrubs and trees adjoining the boundary with No. 6. The main usable garden area of No.4 lies to the front of the property.

The application site and surroundings, are identified up as an ‘Amber’ ‘Archaeological Notification Area’

To the north Mill Hill continues to rise past the application site and the road crosses over and above the A27 trunk road. The properties within Mill Hill are different in design and size, and they are predominantly detached.

Proposal

The proposal seeks to provide a two storey extension, by extending to the side (south) and to the front (west). The side extension will be some 1.9m deep, and the front extension (excluding the chimney), will be approx. 1.7m deep.

The ridge height will remain the same at approx. 7.4m

The extensions will result in the loss of the chimney and the front porch.

On the ground floor, these extensions would provide a glazed loggia type building, glazed on the south east part of the side elevation with glazed double doors on the rear (east) elevation; the south west part of the side elevation together with part of the front (west) elevation, will afford an office, a covered porch/ entrance hall; the first floor side (south) extension will provide an en-suite bathroom; a dressing rooms; and an extended bedroom; whilst the front (west) elevation of the first floor extension would provide an extension to a bedroom.

To facilitate these extensions there will be internal re-ordering of rooms, including the loss of internal walls on the first floor.

Externally, the fenestration would change on the south (side) elevation to have rooflights within the roofslope and a partially glazed portion of the side extension.

Relevant Planning History:

ADC/0038/06 Ground and first floor extensions to front, north side and rear. Permitted 30.05.2006

AWDM/1611/15 Two storey front and side extension, detached double garage with glass balustrade, retaining walls and extended forecourt (part retrospective). Refused 15.12.2015

AWDM/0635/16 Two storey extension to front (west and side (south) elevations including rooflights and raising of ridge height. Refused 14.06.2016

Consultations:

West Sussex County Council:

No objection on archaeological grounds is raised to the proposal. No archaeological mitigation measures are required.

Southern Water:

If approved request an informative regarding connection to the public sewerage system and require the applicant to discuss existing on site sewers with Southern Water.

Representations: None received.

Relevant Planning Policies

Adopted Adur District Local Plan 1993-2006 (ADC 1996) (saved policies): AG1, AH7 and Appendix 11 'Supplementary Planning Guidance' comprising: Development Control Standard No.3 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings' National Planning Policy Framework (CLG 2012).

Planning Assessment

Principle

Planning law requires that applications for planning permission must be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

The NPPF does not change the statutory status of the development plan as the starting point for decision making. Proposed development that accords with an up-to-date Local Plan should be approved, and the proposed development that conflicts should be refused unless other material considerations indicate otherwise. The Council's own Conformity Assessment of the saved Local Plan policies indicates broad compliance with the National Planning Policy Framework, where relevant policies exist.

Visual amenity

The current application purely relates to the enlargement of the house. It does not seek to regularise the loss of all the soil and plants from the site frontage which in considering the former refused application the Council considered resulted in a harmful effect on streetscene and neighbouring properties, (this view has not altered).

The original gable-fronted house has been enlarged in the past by a part single-storey/part 2-storey front extension, resulting in a rather lopsided appearance although the original exposed chimney breast and balcony on the front elevation remain features of interest.

Both the chimney and the front balcony will be lost by this proposal, but the earlier, quirky two storey front extension will remain. The proposed extension will be to the south and west, i.e. the front and the side, which will further elongate the west roofline. However, the resultant front elevation of the current application will not be as busy as the previous two storey application. Further, the ridge of the property will not alter from the existing height, thereby presenting a much more appropriately proportioned dwelling frontage to the street.

The side (south) elevation will not be as dominant onto the neighbouring property, no. 4, as the previous refused application. It will not be as wide; as high; or as close to the neighbour as the previous application. The current application indicates a separation distance of some 2.4m, whereas before the

distance was 1.845m Although only some 550mm less, this increased distance, coupled with the lower height of the proposal and side length, on balance, makes the proposal acceptable in relation to the neighbour, no. 4.

Residential amenity

The most affected property is No.4. The existing dwelling at No.6 is already substantially higher than No.4 owing to the difference in ground levels. The effect of the existing property onto no. 4 is not excessively overbearing in view of the separation distance between them.

The proposal will not result in an increase of height of no. 6, but it will be closer to the boundary with no. 4 by approx. 1.8m. However, this will still leave some 2.3m space between the side extension and the boundary, which is, on balance, considered acceptable.

The side extension will include a large glazed section, facing onto no. 4, but because of the difference in topography between the two properties, no. 4 being lower, together with the fact that a boundary wall exists between the two properties at the point of the area of glazing, there will not be demonstrable overlooking resulting from the new glazing. Plus, the existing first floor windows will not be reintroduced within the proposed new extension, thus removing a source of overlooking.

No. 8 to the north will not be affected by the proposal, as the extension is to the south side and to the front, behind the existing extension.

Recommendation

APPROVE Subject to the following Conditions :-

1. Plans
2. Standard time limit
3. Materials to match existing
4. No additional windows on south elevation
5. At all times, the existing boundary wall shall be maintained alongside the proposed south extension at the minimum of the existing height

Informatives

1. Approved without amendment
2. This permission relates to the dwellinghouse only, and does not purport to grant consent for the frontage of the property whatsoever, which will need planning permission in its own right.
3. Application for connection to the public sewerage system
4. Sewer maybe on site

Is recommendation contrary to letter(s) of representation? N

Case Officer: Eve Hearsey Date: 06.09.2016

Authorised by: Jo Morin Date: 07.09.2016