Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/0154/15 **Recommendation – Refuse**

Site: **17 Whiterock Place, Southwick**

Proposal: **Rear extension at second-floor level with Juliet balcony over existing flat-roofed rear extension.**

Date of site visit: 17.03.2015

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

The application site is situated on the northerly side of Whiterock Place and comprises a mid-terrace two storey dwelling. The property is located within a long row of terrace properties which are relatively uniform in appearance to their frontages and predominantly comprise smooth rendered painted exteriors with ground floor bay window features. To the rear the terrace properties have two storey projecting elements and some of the properties have converted their roof spaces and created dormer extensions to the rear.

To the rear of the application property the original two storey projecting element appears to have been altered at some point to create an enlarged single storey extension with a staggered back first floor extension with a balcony extending over the flat roof of the ground floor extension. The planning history shows that planning permission was granted in 2003 under planning application SW/52/03 for the formation of a flat roof over the ground floor extension to replace a pitched roof. A planning condition was attached to this approval which specified that no part of the roof of the single storey extension shall be converted into or used as a balcony or terrace and access onto the flat roof was also restricted. A balcony has been formed on the flat roof which enclosed by metal railings and there is a single access door on the rear elevation of the first floor extension onto the balcony. The Applicant has advised that the balcony has been in place since 2003; however there is no record of planning permission being granted for the proposed balcony. This matter is now being investigated by the Council's Planning Enforcement department and does not therefore form part of the consideration of this application.

This application seeks planning permission for the creation of an extension to the second floor level of the existing dwelling. The proposed extension would extend above the existing first floor addition to the rear and would project 6.4 metres outwards from the ridge line of the existing roof and 3 metres from the eaves line of the existing roof. The rear wall of the extension would be staggered back 0.65 metres from the rear wall

of the first floor addition below and a Juliet balcony would be formed in the northerly rear wall of the extension. The extension would be built up against the wall of the neighbouring two storey extension and the addition would incorporate a flat roof that would sit just below the ride line of the original dwelling. The extension would have smooth rendered exterior walls to match the existing dwelling.

Consultations: None received.

Representations

One letter of objection has been received from the occupiers of 19 Whiterock Place who have raised concerns that the proposed extension would significantly reduce light into their kitchen and dining room windows.

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

The proposal comprises the erection of an extension to an existing dwelling house located within the built up area and can therefore be supported in principle. However, the issues that need to be considered are the effects on the amenities of neighbouring residential occupiers and the effect on the character and appearance of the dwelling and its surroundings.

Residential amenity

The occupiers of neighbouring properties that would be most affected by the proposed extension are located in the attached terrace properties to the east and west of the application property.

The neighbouring property to the east, 19 Whiterock Place has previously been extended with a rear dormer extension which was considered by the Council under Certificate of Lawfulness application AWDM/1494/12 and has therefore been constructed under the property's permitted development rights. The nearest dormer window and first floor window which sit adjacent to the application property serve two bedrooms and at the ground floor level the rear window serves a kitchen. The proposed roof extension would extend 3 metres beyond the profile of the easterly neighbouring dormer and despite there being some separation distance at this level of projection there is concern that the proposed second floor extension would create a loss of light to

the nearest neighbouring bedroom windows on the first floor and within the dormer extension. The solid flank wall of the extension would also provide the easterly neighbouring occupiers with a limited outlook in particular from the first floor and dormer bedroom windows.

The neighbouring property to the west, 15 Whiterock Place has extended the height of the two storey addition to the rear and the proposed extension would be built up against the wall of the neighbouring extension. The proposed extension would therefore be mostly screened by the neighbouring two storey structure to the rear and would therefore have no direct impact on the westerly neighbouring occupiers in terms of loss of light.

There would be no windows in the westerly or easterly walls of the proposed extension and therefore the addition would cause no loss of privacy to the occupiers of the westerly or easterly neighbouring properties.

Visual amenity

Saved policy AH7 of the Adur Local Plan requires extensions to existing houses and bungalows to be designed to be sympathetic to both the original dwelling and area in general. The Council's SPG Development Control Standard 3: 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings' gives further guidance in relation to proposed roof extensions specifying that they should not be so large that they over-dominate the dwelling, resulting in a top heavy 'box-like' appearance. Dormer and roof extensions should also be kept well below the ridge level of the existing roof and a large amount of the original roof should still be clearly visible.

Many of the terrace properties within the row have altered the original two storey projecting features to the rear and have also added single storey extensions or dormer extensions to the roof. It is therefore acknowledged that when viewed from the railway line to the rear the row of terrace properties have lost their original proportions and uniform appearance to the rear. The proposed roof extension would however comprise a large box-like flat roofed extension that would extend below the eaves line of the original roof and would sit just below the ridge line of the existing house. In terms of scale the proposed extension would therefore exceed the size of a traditional dormer and the increased bulk of the proposed extension over the existing rear additions would appear unsympathetic to the modest proportions of this mid-terrace property. The creation of an additional second floor extension over the existing two storey rear addition would create further unbalance to the extensions at rear of the property and as the proposal would clearly conflict with saved policy AH7 of the Adur Local Plan Officers are unable to lend support to this proposal.

Recommendation

REFUSE for the reason:-

The proposal is unacceptable in that the scale, design and increased bulk of the proposed extension over the existing rear additions would relate unsympathetically to the modest proportions of this mid-terrace property and create further unbalance to the extensions at the rear of the property. The extension would also cause harm to the amenity of the occupiers of the neighbouring property 19 Whiterock Place by having an overbearing effect and causing a loss of light and outlook to the adjacent windows. The proposal is therefore contrary to saved policy AH7 of the Adur District Local Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Informative

1. Proactive Statement - Refusal (discussion)

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

Case Officer: Rebecca Tier Date: 2nd April 2015
Authorised by: Jo Morin Date: 02.04.2015