Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/1330/16 Recommendation – REFUSE

Site: 9 Rooksacre Cottages, West Street, Sompting

Proposal: First-floor side extension to east elevation.

Date of site visit: 15.09.2016

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Site Surroundings and Proposal

The application site is located on the northerly side of West Street and forms a two storey end of terrace property within a row of three terrace properties comprising 3, 4-5 and 6 Rooksacre Cottages. The property is one of the smallest of the three properties and has been previously extended with a single storey garage and link extension to the eastern side of the property.

The site is located within the Sompting Conservation Area. This section of the road is characterised by a mixture of large detached two storey properties and two storey terrace properties and flint/mortar walls along property frontages.

The proposal seeks planning permission for a first floor extension to the eastern side of the property over the existing single storey garage and link extension. The proposed extension would measure 7 metres in height and incorporate a pitched roof above the existing garage with a flat roofed link extension above the existing front entrance. The proposed extension would sit 0.8 metres below the ridge line of the higher roof of the original property. The extension would incorporate a smooth rendered finish to the exterior walls and slate roof tiles to match the original property. The extension would provide two additional bedrooms and a bathroom at the first floor level.

Relevant Planning History

ADC/0116/08 – Planning permission was granted in 2008 for conversion of garage to study and new entrance portico.

S/47/98 – Planning permission was granted in 1998 for a single storey extension to provide a garage and dinning room.

S/34/98 – Planning permission was refused in 1998 for single storey extension to provide a garage and dining room. The application was refused as the scale and design of the extension was considered to be out of keeping with the Cottages and detrimental to the Conservation Area.

Consultations:

The **Council's Design & Conservation Officer** has raised concern regarding the scale, design and appearance of the proposed extension which he considers would not remain sympathetic to the existing property or group of properties comprising Rooksacre Cottages. He considers that the proposed extension would adversely impact the character and appearance of the Sompting Conservation Area.

Sompting Parish Council have objected to the application on the basis of the design of the roof line of the extension which they consider to be unattractive and out of character with the neighbourhood and adjoining property. The Parish Council suggest a continuous ridge across the building instead of two separate roofs.

Southern Water have raised no objection to the application yet have asked for informatives relating to SW approval to the public sewerage system to be added to any recommendation for approval.

Representations:

One letter of objection has been received from the occupier of Trelawneys Cottage to the east of the application property. The neighbouring occupier considers that the proposed extension would not be in keeping with the rest of Rooksacre Cottages and would affect the natural light to their kitchen/diner, entrance hall and two upstairs bedrooms.

Relevant Planning Policies

Adopted Adur District Local Plan 1993-2006 (ADC 1996) (saved policies): AG1, AB4, 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

Saved policy AH7 of the Adur Local Plan requires extensions to existing dwelling 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 side extensions specifying that they should be designed to closely match the existing dwelling with a setback of ideally 1 metre from the front of the dwelling and a roof to match the existing property. The SPG specifies that very wide side extensions should be avoided as they would usually be out of scale with the existing dwelling and spoil its proportions.

The principle of an extension to an existing residential property is acceptable; however in this case it would be subject to the proposed extension having no

adverse impact on the visual amenities of the area, the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and the amenities of nearby neighbouring residential occupiers.

Visual Amenity & Impact on the Character & Appearance of the Conservation Area

The property comprises one of the smaller end properties in a group of three terrace properties comprising 3, 4-5 and 6 Rooksacre Cottages. The middle property is the largest of the three which has the central entrance porch feature. Other window openings on the front elevations of this group of properties are of similar proportion and predominantly symmetrically in nature. Whilst it is recognised that the three properties are not completely uniform in terms of their appearance as 3 Rooksacre Cottages has extended with a two storey extension to the rear and partial side and the application property has a single storey extension to the east, the traditional proportions and appearance of this group of properties from the street scene perspective has mostly been retained. As a result the group of buildings contribute to the general character and appearance of the Sompting Conservation Area.

The proposed first floor extension would extend over the existing single storey garage and link extension to the eastern side of the property which was approved by the Council in 1998. The proposed extension would incorporate a substantial width, extending 5.3 metres wide in comparison to the 5.4 metre width of the existing property. Whilst the first floor extension would extend over an existing single storey structure, it is considered that a first floor extension of this width would be significantly more prominent and out of keeping with the modest proportions of this end of terrace property. The proposed extension would be set back from the front wall of the original property, yet the sizable width and lower flat roof link design would not remain in keeping with the scale, design or appearance of the original dwelling or the group of properties from the street scene perspective.

The neighbouring property 3 Rooksacre Cottages has a two storey extension to the rear and partial western side which was granted on appeal in 1994 (S/25/93 relates). However, this side extension is relatively narrow and is set back from the front original wall of the building and would not alter the harmful impact that the proposed extension would have on the appearance of this group of terrace properties and the character of the Conservation Area given its sizable width and unsympathetic design.

These concerns have been discussed with the Agent and Applicant and whilst it would be usually preferable to negotiate amendments where possible for example by re-locating the proposed extension in a less visually prominent location to the rear of the property, scope would be limited in this case due to the staggered site boundary to the west which would restrict any extensions to the rear of the property and significantly reduce the existing small rear garden space serving the property.

Residential amenity

The neighbouring occupiers that would be most affected by the proposed extension are located to the west 5-6, Rooksacre Cottages, to the north, 1-2 Rooksacre Cottages and to the east, Trelawneys Cottage.

The easterly end section of the first floor extension would extend over the existing garage and therefore 1.4 metres further in length than the first floor rear wall of the original part of the dwelling. The projecting rear section of the first floor extension would be distanced to the closest first floor window within the easterly attached neighbouring property by 7.5 metres. Given the separation distance it is considered that the proposed extension would be unlikely to cause any harmful loss of light to the rear windows in the westerly neighbouring property. No windows would be incorporated in the easterly side wall of the first floor extension and therefore the proposed extension would cause no loss of amenity to the westerly neighbouring occupiers.

To the north, the proposed first floor bedroom window within the projecting rear elevation of the proposed extension would be distanced to the rear garden of the northerly neighbouring property by approximately 10 metres. At this distance it is considered that the proposed first floor windows in the rear elevation of the proposed first floor extension would not cause any harmful loss of amenity to the occupiers in the northerly neighbouring property.

To the east the neighbouring property Trelawyneys Cottage is a taller two storey property in comparison to the application property. The neighbouring property has two ground floor and two first floor windows in the western side elevation, two of which in the higher front section of the building would directly face the proposed extension.

The proposed first floor extension would be located approximately 3.5 metres from the windows in the easterly neighbouring property. The extension would incorporate a total height of 7 metres and would sit lower than the height of the easterly neighbouring property. Given the lower nature of the proposed first floor extension in comparison to the easterly neighbouring building and the separation distance between the flank eastern side wall of the proposed extension and side windows in the easterly neighbouring property it is considered that the proposed extension would not cause any harmful loss of light to the occupiers of the easterly neighbouring property. There are no windows proposed in the easterly side wall of the proposed extension and therefore there would be no loss of privacy caused to the easterly neighbouring occupiers.

Recommendation

REFUSE for the following reason:

The proposal is unacceptable in that the scale, design and appearance of the proposed first floor side extension would be unsympathetic to the proportion of the terrace property and the group of terrace properties comprising 3, 4-5 and 6 Rooksacre Cottages. The proposed extension would appear prominent when viewed from West Street to the south and would detract from the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. The proposal is

therefore contrary to saved policies AB4 and AH7 of the Adur District Local Plan and the NPPF.

Informative

Refused Plans

Proactive Statement –Refusal with discussion

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

Case Officer: Rebecca Tier Date: 17.10.2016

Authorised by: Jo Morin Date: 18.10.2016