Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/1772/16 Recommendation – APPROVE

Site: 24 Mill Hill Shoreham-by-Sea West Sussex BN43 5TH

Proposal: Part single and part two-storey rear extension to east elevation

Date of site visit: 21.12.2016

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Site and Surroundings

The application property comprises a mid C20, 2-storey detached house occupying a position midway on the east side of Mill Hill. It has previously been enlarged by a rear dormer, rear conservatory and modest lean-to porch/stores on either side. It has a rendered exterior with plain tiled, roof with 'bonnet' hips.

The dwelling is set well-back from the edge of the road carriageway on raised ground. The road is relatively narrow in width with no pavements. The dwelling frontages on this side are typically characterised by mature planted gardens which contributes towards the semi-rural character of the road. Surrounding land slopes up steeply to the north. No.26, the adjoining dwelling to the north, comprises a chalet-style detached set further back into its plot than No.24 and built on raised ground approximately 1.0 metre higher. No.22 occupies lower ground to the south. It also consists of a chalet style house and extends deeper into its plot than No.24.

The whole of Mill Hill is located within an archaeologically sensitive area.

Proposal

Permission is sought to remove the existing rear conservatory and erect a part single-part 2-storey rear extension. The ground-floor element of the extension would extend the full width of the original dwelling (9.5m) and extend 5m rearwards (east). The 2-storey element would be 5.4m wide, located to the south side of the rear elevation and extending to the same depth as the proposed ground-floor. It would have a hipped and pitched roof with a new 5m long ridge extending eastwards, positioned marginally below the existing roof ridge. The external walls would be painted render and the roof covered in plain tiles with bonnet hips, all to match the existing.

The extensions would provide an additional sitting room and 'breakfast room' on the ground-floor and third bedroom with en-suite shower-room on the first-floor.

Consultations:

WSCC: The Senior Archaeologist has raised no objection commenting:-

"In 1946, from the evidence of aerial photographs, there were buildings in military use to the rear of and possibly upon the site of present-day 24 Mill Hill. It is very unlikely that any remains of these buildings, if still surviving below ground within the footprint of the proposed new extensions, are in any way uniquely distinctive or significant, in terms of the military archaeology of World War 2. Accordingly, the potential archaeological impact of the new build is assessed as very low, not requiring any mitigation measures."

Representations: None received.

Relevant Planning Policies

Saved Local Plan policies (ADC 1996): AG1, AH7
SPG Development Control Standard No.3 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings'
Submission Adur Local Plan 2016 : Policies 2, 15
National Planning Policy Framework (CLG 2012)
National Planning Practice Guidance

Planning Assessment

There is no objection in principle to the proposed extension which would upgrade 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

The proposed extension would almost double the footprint of the existing dwelling which is unusually shallow in depth. However, the dwelling plots on this side of the road are relatively deep and it is considered an extension of this scale can be accommodated satisfactorily without resulting in an over-developed appearance.

Despite its location to the rear of the house, southern flank of the proposed extension would be visible in public views through the gap between the application site and the neighbouring property further down the hill, No.22. Although the extension is relatively deep at 5 metres, the roof of the 2-storey element has been designed to harmonise with the style and appearance of the existing dwelling, and overall the extension would not appear out-of-scale either in relation to the existing house or neighbouring dwellings which extend deeper into their plots than the existing house at No.24.

Residential Amenity

The most affected properties are those on either side to the north and south, Nos 22 and 26. The proposed extension is sufficiently well separated from properties to the rear in Mill Hill Close which are unaffected.

No.22 consists of a chalet house with an east-west ridge and part-hipped front and rear gables. The submitted Block Plan shows the siting of No.22 incorrectly since the main rear wall of No.22 is sited further east than the rear of the existing conservatory at No.24. There is a drive to the north side of the dwelling beyond which is single-storey pitched roof building (possibly a former garage) which has been converted into living accommodation and enlarged. There is a clear-glazed ground-floor window in the north side of No.22 located roughly opposite the lean-to store attached to the south side of No.24. There is also a clear-glazed window in the west elevation of the single-storey rear building (former garage) facing onto the drive. Both windows appear to serve habitable accommodation. The height and depth of the proposed extension on raised ground in relation to No.22 will have an enclosing effect on the outlook from both windows. However, a separation distance consisting of the drive belonging to No.22 and a 1m wide margin between the flank of the extension and the site boundary will help avoid an unduly oppressive or overbearing impact. Similarly, the large 'bulk' of the extension will have some impact on receipt of daylight to both windows. However, in view of their orientation and position in relation to existing buildings and boundary treatments the rooms in question are already likely to be relatively dark such that the proposed extension would not be materially worsen the existing situation.

A new first-floor window in the south side of No.24 is shown as obscurely glazed and this can be controlled by a condition.

No.26 consists of a chalet house with a north-south ridge and front and rear dormers. It occupies notably higher ground than No.24 and is sited further east in its plot. There is a brick retaining wall on the boundary approximately 2.6 to 2.8 metres high from built ground level of No.24. There are at least 4 ground-floor windows plus a glazed door and 2 first-floor windows in the south gable wall of No.26, all of which face onto and overlook the garden and patio to the rear of No.24. The single-storey element of the proposed rear extension closest to the common boundary would have no adverse impact on the receipt of daylight/sunlight to these windows owing to the difference in ground levels between the properties. The proposed 2-storey element would be sited 6 metres from the windows in the south elevation of No.26. The existing brick boundary wall will have some limited impact on the receipt of daylight/sunlight by the ground-floor windows in the south flank of No.26 although the upper parts of the windows are clearly visible above the wall. The hipped roof of the 2-storey element would impinge into the line of a 25 degree angle taken from a point roughly adjacent to the top of the boundary wall indicating that there would be some loss of daylight to the ground-floor windows. However the effect would not be severe as to justify refusal on this ground, nor would the effect on outlook be so oppressively intrusive as to warrant refusal on grounds of overbearing impact.

There are no windows proposed in the north flank of the extensions and this can be controlled by a condition.

Recommendation

APPROVE subject to conditions:-

1. Approved drawings
2. Standard time limit
3. Matching Materials including bonnet hip tiles
4. No additional side windows
5. First-floor window in south side to be obscure-glazed and fixed shut except fanlight

Informative

1. Pro-active no amendment

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

Case Officer: Jo Morin Date: 05.01.2017

Authorised by: Gary Peck Date: 5 January 2017