Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/0635/16 **Recommendation REFUSE**

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

Proposal: **Two-storey extension to front (west) and side (south) elevations including rooflights and raising of ridge height (re-submission of AWDM/1611/15)**

Date of site visit: 25.05.2016

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 last year 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).

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 extend the existing property by increasing the height of the main dwelling to above the height of the existing chimney stack; providing

a tall 2 storey extension with high eaves to the south; and providing a 2 storey extension to the front elevation (west) of the dwelling.

The side (south) extension would measure 2.2m deep x 12.77m wide and a height of approx. 5.3m to its eaves with a ridge height of approx. 7.5m high. The front (west) extension would measure 3.47m deep x 7.49m wide x approx. 7.4m to the ridge.

On the ground floor, these extensions would provide a glazed loggia type building, glazed on the south east part of the side elevation with it being open 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 and an entrance hall; the first floor side (south) extension will provide an en-suite bathroom, his and her dressing rooms, and a walk in wardrobe; 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. The changes will ultimately result in the provision of 3no. enlarged bedrooms one with built in wardrobe and dressing rooms, and 3no. bathrooms on the first floor.

Externally, the fenestration would change on the south (side) elevation to have no first floor windows and only a glazed portion of the side extension being glazed (east side), whilst the remaining part of the side extension would have no glazing.

The side roofslope (south) would have 2no. rows of 5no. rooflights, the 5no. lower ones would be smaller than the 5no. higher ones. The 5no. lower rooflights would serve the en-suite bathroom; dressing rooms; and wardrobe, whilst the 5no. higher ones would serve 2no. of the extended/re-ordered bedrooms. Both of these bedrooms would also have a window within the rooms.

The front, (west) elevation will have 2no. new windows either side of the new entrance door, and an additional 2no. ground floor windows. The first floor existing windows would be replaced with 2no. large windows and 1no. small window together with a new door to serve the platform balcony above the main entrance door, a small Juliet balcony will be positioned at this point.

The side elevation facing no. 8 Mill Hill (north), would have a new roof lantern over the existing kitchen; and 2no. new rooflights within the north roofslope; finally the east (rear elevation) would keep the existing ground floor fenestration but change the first floor fenestration to one large window, one smaller and another smaller again.

Relevant Planning History:

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 on the following grounds:-

1. *The excessive amount of hard surfacing proposed would result in a visually alien, bleak and unsympathetic form of development for this downland edge location and would detract from the semi-rural character and appearance of the locality. The proposal is therefore contrary to Adur District Local Plan saved policy AH7, SPG Development Control Standard No. 3 and National Planning Policy Framework.*

2. *The volume of excavation involving the removal of the landscaped embankment and opening up of the site frontage has resulted in vastly denuded land levels and a loss of green enclosure that is out of keeping with, and seriously harmful to the distinctive semi-rural character of this road and is detrimental to the visual amenities of the wider locality. It thereby conflicts with Adur District Local Plan saved policy AH7, SPG Development Control Standard No. 3 and National Planning Policy Framework.*

3. *By reason of its poor design and massing the proposed extension to the dwelling will result in an unsympathetic composition and one that does not respect the proportions of the existing dwelling in this elevated situation and would detract from the visual amenities of the locality. It is therefore contrary to Adur District Local Plan saved policy AH7, SPG Development Control Standard No. 3 and National Planning Policy Framework.*

4. *The scale, massing and position of the proposed extension, together with the number of proposed windows to the south elevation, will give rise to an unacceptable degree of overbearing and overlooking onto the neighbouring residential property, no. 4 Mill Hill, resulting in a loss of residential amenities of that property. The proposal is thereby contrary to Adur District Local Plan saved policy AH7, SPG Development Control Standard No. 3 and National Planning Policy Framework.*

5. *Having regard to the excessive amount of hardstanding proposed combined with the topography of surrounding land the Council is not satisfied that the proposal makes adequate provision for draining surface water run-off within the site and will result in surface water discharging onto the public highway, which would likely lead to increased risk of flooding to residents further to the south in Mill Hill. The proposal is thereby contrary to Adur District Local Plan saved policy AP4 and National Planning Policy Framework.*

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

Consultations:

West Sussex County Council:

The County Archaeologist has no objection.

Representations:

Objections from 26 Mill Hill Drive and 1B Mill Hill

Have lived in Mill hill for 44 years and have never seen it looking such a mess.

Shocked to see the bank of trees being removed.

How long can Mill Hill go on looking like a building site?

No objection to the house extension.

Note that questions 5, 7 and 8 on application form are ticked 'No', is this an oversight or due to the fact that the entire frontage had already been excavated and all trees and shrubs removed (front and back) prior to the refused original plans submitted last year.

Our main concern is the frontage and current parking of the households many vehicles are unscreened.

Will we be given the opportunity to view and comment when the frontage plans are submitted as concerned the current amount of household parking is detrimental to the green area of Mill Hill.

As work to the frontage already undertaken, is there a time limit for submitting a planning application?

If no planning received, will enforcement be used to reinstate?

You mentioned enforcement to replace what has been excavated…why is this?

When an application is made for the frontage, will I be notified?

The amount of cars parked on the frontage looks like a car lot.

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.

The proposed extension will align with and subsume the existing front projection, replacing the above features as part of a wider remodelling to create a more rationalised architectural composition involving the creation of a new, taller and re-positioned ridge and raised eaves on the south side.

The main concern relates to the effect of the proposed extensions and alterations within the surrounding context, particularly in relation to No.4, a chalet bungalow on lower ground to the south.

The proposed 2 storey enlargement would be sited only 1.8m from the southern site boundary (some 2.6m away from the neighbouring dwelling itself), having an eaves height of 5m. It would be 12.7m deep on this side, projecting some 8m in front of (west) of the nearest front part of No.4. It would as a result have an unduly dominant and overpowering visual relationship to No.4.

The harmful effect on the street-scene would be further compounded by the loss of enclosure that has resulted from the excavation of the site frontage and opening up of views from the lane.

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. However, the effect is not excessively overbearing in view of the separation distance between them. The effect on outlook from No.4 would be significantly worsened if the proposed development were to go ahead, having an imposing and overwhelming effect on the amenity of this dwelling. It is acknowledged that the omission of first-floor windows from the south side of the proposed extension may offer some improvement in terms of overlooking from existing first-floor windows in the side of No.6, but this does not outweigh the substantial harm caused to the outlook from this dwelling.

No. 8 to the north will not be greatly affected by the proposal, as the extension is to the south, and the increase in height will be far enough away as to not unacceptably impinge on their amenities.

Recommendation

REFUSE

Subject to the following Reasons:-

1. By reason of its height, scale, massing, and depth in proximity to the site boundary the proposed extension would have an unacceptably overbearing and oppressive effect on the outlook of the neighbouring dwelling to the south, No. 4 Mill Hill, to the detriment of residential amenity. The proposal is thereby contrary to Adur District Local Plan saved policy AH7, SPG Development Control Standard No. 3 and National Planning Policy Framework.

2. By reason of its large scale and massing the proposed extension would constitute an unduly conspicuous and imposing form of development that fails to respond to the topography of surrounding land and would appear unduly dominant and visually overwhelming in relation to the neighbouring dwelling to the south and harmful to the street-scene. It is therefore contrary to Adur District Local Plan saved policy AH7, SPG Development Control Standard No. 3 and National Planning Policy Framework.

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

Case Officer: Eve Hearsey Date: 08.06.2016

Authorised by: Jo Morin Date: 14.06.2016