Development Management – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/1741/17 Recommendation – APPROVE

Site: 2 Mill Hill Close, Shoreham-by-Sea, BN43 5TP

Proposal: Single storey rear extension with timber decking to south elevation

Date of site visit: 07.12.17

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Site, Surroundings and Proposal

The site is located on the south side of Mill Hill Close, Shoreham-by-Sea. It is a semi-detached bungalow and, due to the fact that the land is on rising ground, the rear garden is lower than the dwelling.

Neighbours have rear extensions, but they do not appear to be on the side closest to the application site.

The proposal seeks permission for a single storey extension across part of the rear elevation. It will partially cover the recessed section of the bungalow and come to approx. 3m from the neighbours (no. 2) side boundary. The extension will cover the existing kitchen window area, but stop at the existing bifold doors to the rear of the lounge.

The extension will measure some 7.2m wide x 2.2m to the existing lounge area, and 1.3m to the existing dining area. Its height will be some 3m measured on its outside edge, and will have a false pitch roof, with a flat roof centre, it will be lower than the existing roof over the existing rear extension section, which will be remaining.

Consultations: WSCC Archaeologist

The West Sussex Historic Environment Record (HER) identifies the site of a World War II anti-aircraft battery very close to this address. However, the proposed extension to the rear of 2, Mill Hill Close is a minor development. Taking into consideration the modest size of the proposed extension and the likelihood of pre-existing ground disturbance when the property was originally built I believe that these works can be treated as *de minimis* and do not require any archaeological investigation. No further action on archaeological grounds required.

Representations: None received

Relevant Planning Policies

Saved Local Plan policies (ADC 1996): AG1, AH7
Submission Adur Local Plan as modified in accordance with the Inspectors recommendations : Policy 15
Development Control Standard No.3 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings'
National Planning Policy Framework (CLG 2012)
National Planning Practice Guidance

Planning Assessment

There is no objection in principle to the proposed rear extension which would facilitate a more open plan living area. The upgrade is to an existing property within an established residential area. The key concerns are the effects on the residential and visual amenities of the locality.

Visual Amenity and Impact upon Character and Appearance of the Area

The proposed rear extension will also incorporate changes to the existing decking area, which currently is in two levels directly outside of the bungalow, and then goes down wide steps to get to the much lower garden area. The proposed decking is shown to be no higher or deeper at the side next to the neighbours (no.2) boundary than currently existing, and will run to the internal side wall of the new extension, thereby eliminating the trip hazard of the two levels.

Whilst the rear windows will be changing positions with the current situation, there will be no side windows, and a condition to cover this would be appropriate.

The height of the extension is such because of the lowering land levels to the rear.

The extension will be sited at a sufficient distance from both side neighbouring properties so as not to result in unacceptable harm. Although the extension will be closer to the property at the rear, it will still be some 7m to the rear boundary, which bearing in mind there will not be any increase in windows to the rear, is considered acceptable.

Residential Amenity
There will be no additional windows to the rear elevation to result in unacceptable overlooking to the property to the south, and a condition limiting the inclusion of windows to the side windows will prevent unacceptable loss of residential amenity to the side residential properties.

Recommendation

APPROVE subject to the following conditions

1. Approved plan
2. Standard time limit
3. Materials to match
4. No windows to side elevations

Informative

1. Approved without amendment

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

Case Officer: Eve Hearsey Date: 07.12.2017

Authorised by: Peter Barnett Date: 8/12/2017