

Appeal made against the refusal of planning permission

Appeal reference	APP/P1805/D/11/2148870
Planning Application	10/1046-TC
Proposal	2 storey side extension
Location	32 Rowan Close, Hollywood, B47 5RW
Ward	Hollywood and Majors Green
Decision	Refused; 21st December 2010

The author of this report is Tim Collard who can be contacted on 01527 881334 (e-mail: t.collard@bromsgrove.gov.uk) for more information.

Discussion

The proposal was to develop a two storey side extension, to the front and side at ground level and a first floor extension to the side, creating two bedrooms.

The Inspector firstly noted that following a site visit a single storey extension has been substantially completed at first floor ground level. This was due to a revised application which received permission on 31.01.2011 for a single storey side extension at ground floor level (B/2011/0009). The Planning Inspector thus determined this appeal on the basis of the proposed development being a ground and first floor extension, as detailed on the application.

The Inspector considered that the main issue was the effect of the proposed extension on the character and appearance of the existing building and the surrounding area.

It was noted that the appeal building is a semi-detached house that is located within a row of houses at the end of a cul-de-sac. The surrounding area is predominantly residential and the dwellings within the cul-de-sac consist mainly of a mix of semi-detached and detached houses that are linked to adjacent houses by a garage. Where the houses are not linked, there is generally a relatively narrow gap between them, but the differences in front building line and the design features on the houses prevent an unacceptable terracing effect.

The Inspector noted that the first floor of the proposed extension would be in line with the front of the first floor of the main house, which would be contrary to the advice in the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance Note 1: *Residential Design Guide* (SPG). However, it would have a lower ridgeline and would be set back from the existing single storey porch and front of the ground floor extension

behind a pitched roof. As such, it would appear subordinate to the main building and would not detract from its overall appearance.

The Inspector noted the proposed extension would be closer than 1m from the boundary with No 34, which is the minimum distance that the SPG advises is required to prevent a terracing effect. However, the dwelling at No 34 includes a garage that is set forward of the main building line and has a pitched roof at the side that extends beyond the side of the first floor of that building. This, combined with the remaining gap between the buildings, would ensure that the proposal would not result in an unacceptable terracing effect. The gap at first floor level between the appeal building and the building at No 34 would be similar to that between other buildings in the area. As such, the extended house would not appear unduly cramped and would be in keeping with the street scene.

The Inspector noted the Council's reference to a recent appeal decision regarding a development at 22 Moorfield Drive and expressed concern that, by permitting the extension, it would make it difficult to resist other similar proposals which would give rise to a terracing appearance. Nonetheless, the Inspector found that the current appeal proposal would not result in a terracing effect. Furthermore, each case should be determined on its own individual planning merits in the light of prevailing policies and guidance.

In conclusion, the Inspector found that the proposed extension would not have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the existing building or the surrounding area. As such, the proposal would accord with Bromsgrove District Local Plan policy DS13, as it would protect the area's essential character; and policy S10, as the original building would remain the dominant feature. Therefore, having regard to all matters raised, the Inspector concluded that the appeal should succeed.

The Inspector considered the conditions suggested by the Council should the appeal be allowed, including the standard time for commencement of development. A condition to ensure compliance with the approved plans is necessary for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning. A condition regarding materials is necessary to protect the character and appearance of the building and the area. The Inspector was satisfied that these conditions are reasonable and necessary and I have worded them to reflect the advice in Circular 11/95: *The Use of Conditions in Planning Permissions*.

The appeal was therefore allowed.

Costs application

No application for costs was made.

Appeal outcome

The appeal was **ALLOWED**.

Recommendation

The Committee is asked to RESOLVE that the item of information be noted.