

Name of Applicant Type of Certificate	Proposal	Map/Plan Policy	Plan. Ref Expiry Date
Mr. K. Neale 'A'	Kitchen extension, garage conversion to utility/WC, bedroom/en-suite extension (re-submission of B/2006/1094) at 5 Sandhills Lane, Barnt Green	RES	B/2007/0263 06/06/2007

RECOMMENDATION: that permission be **REFUSED**.

Councillor Mrs. A. E. Doyle has requested that this application is not dealt with under delegated powers, and that it be submitted to the Planning Committee for determination.

Consultations

WCC (HP)	Consulted - Views received 23/04/2007: No objection
Barnt Green PC	Consulted - Views received 02/05/2007: No objection
Publicity	Three letters sent 11/04/2007 (expires 02/05/2005): No responses received

The site and its surroundings

The application site relates to a semi-detached dwelling located on the northern side of the highway within an established run of development in the residential area of Barnt Green. The streetscene is characterised by a variety of dwelling types with different architectural styles.

Proposal

Planning permission is sought for a first floor/two-storey side extension to this semi-detached property. The extension will be 2.7 metres wide reducing down to 2.4 metres wide some 4.8 metres in from the front elevation. The overall depth of the extension will be 7.1 metres set back 300mm from the front main wall and projecting 1-metre beyond the rear main wall. The gable end roof will be subordinate to the main ridge by some 100mm, although this is incorrectly shown on the front and rear elevations as 200mm and 300mm respectively.

Relevant Policies

WMSS	QE3
WCSP	CTC.1
BDLP	DS13, S10
Others	SPG1, PPS1

Relevant Planning History

B/2006/1094 Bedroom/en-suite extension - permission refused 29.11.2007

Notes

Design / Impact upon the streetscene:

The proposal is a resubmission of B/2006/1094, which was refused due to the proposed extension's non-subordinate design and terracing impact. The current proposal will therefore have to successfully overcome previous refusal reasons.

The proposed extension originally submitted under application B/2006/1094 was located within some 800mm of the common boundary at a pinch point due to the boundary taper. In this re-submission part of the flank wall has been stepped in at the rear to achieve a minimum gap of 1-metre from the boundary. I note that this amendment has resulted in a contrived flank wall design with an exaggerated eaves overhang that will still encroach upon the gap between properties. In this instance the adjoining property No.7 is located on the boundary and the current first floor gap between dwellings will be reduced from 3.7 metres to just 1 metre between flank walls and even less in reality as No.7's eaves overhang and chimney breast also encroach into this space. The loss of gap is exacerbated further by the change in levels making the proposed gable end extension loom over the neighbouring property.

In terms of avoiding terracing SPG1 states in paragraph 4.2(d) that two-storey or first floor extensions should be set at least one metre off the common boundary. I believe that the spirit of this policy is intended to ensure that if two neighbouring properties extend at least two metres will be retained between dwellings at first floor, although I note that greater distances can be sought for more spacious plots. Furthermore paragraph 4.2 of SPG1 states that the appropriate size of an extension depends upon its position and on the individual circumstances of the site, including factors such as the proximity of the next house, changes in ground level and visual dominance, which are all relevant factors in this case. With this in mind I consider that the proposed 1-metre gap will be insufficient to avoid a terracing effect and the extension will subsequently appear cramped and 'squeezed' into the streetscene to the detriment of the visual amenity of the area.

The previous application was also refused on the insufficient set down and set back, which is sought by SPG1 to create a design break between old and new. The current proposal remains unaltered following the refusal of B/2006/1094 and will be set 300mm back from the front main wall, which will result in a drop of some 100mm in the ridge. I would consider that this insufficient drop in the ridge will make the extension appear poorly designed when viewed from street level and will unbalance the symmetry of the semi-detached property to the detriment of the building's existing style and character. Given the difference in levels and insufficient gap I would consider that a more generous set down and set back that usually required would be of particular importance in this instance to reduce the extension's prominence and help mitigate the visual impact upon the streetscene. Although the side gable wall will have an awkward step and eaves overhang this element will be largely screened from the highway given the close proximity of the neighbouring property.

In conclusion I consider that the proposed extension has totally failed to overcome previous refusal reasons and will therefore have a negative impact upon the character of the dwellinghouse and the visual amenity of the streetscene.

Residential amenity issues:

The proposed extension will be located largely within the established run of development and will not breach the 45-degree code. The flank wall of the adjacent neighbour No.7 is blank with the exception of a small obscure glaze window. I am content that the proposed extension will not be overbearing and will not cause any significant loss of light or amenity to surrounding neighbours.

RECOMMENDATION: that permission be **REFUSED**.

1. The proposed development by reason of its size and siting would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the area due to the loss of gap at first floor between the dwelling and the boundary and would introduce a bulky and incongruous feature into the streetscene. The result would be to create a terracing effect in the streetscene to the detriment of the visual amenities of the locality contrary to the Council's SPG1, Bromsgrove District Local Plan Policy DS13 and the aims and objectives of PPS1.
2. The design of the proposed extension does not create a sufficient design break between old and new failing to be visually subordinate, unbalancing the symmetry of the to the semi-detached dwelling and exacerbating the extension's cramped effect within the streetscene to the detriment of the character of the dwellinghouse and the visual amenities of the area. The proposal is therefore contrary to the Council's adopted SPG1 and Policy S10 of the Bromsgrove District Local Plan 2004.