

Report for Information

APPENDIX 2

Appeal made against the refusal of planning permission

Appeal reference	APP/P1805/D/11/2151966
Planning Application	10/1222-SC
Proposal	Two storey side and rear extension
Location	2 Thicknall Rise, Hagley, DY9 0LQ
Ward	Furlongs
Decision	Refused (under delegated authority) - 4th February 2011

The author of this report is Stuart Castle who can be contacted on 01527 881339 (e-mail: s.castle@bromsgrove.gov.uk) for more information.

Discussion

The main issue of consideration was the effect of the proposed extension on the character and appearance of the area.

Background

Two previous applications have been refused for larger extensions, the latter being dismissed on appeal (Ref APP/P1805/A/10/2129612). In that case the Inspector was concerned that because of its size, the extension would significantly alter the character of the original dwelling and would result in an over-dominant building in this location. He also considered that as the extension would project beyond the building line of the dwellings on Newfield Road, it would be a dominant feature on this prominent corner site.

Key Reasons

The extension has been reduced in width so that it would be less than half the width of the existing dwelling, compared to almost three-quarters of its width previously. The rearward projection of the extension has also been reduced by one metre. It would be set further back from the existing front elevation with a further lowering of the roof ridge line. With these changes, the Inspector was satisfied that, although the extension would stand forward of the irregular building line of dwellings on Newfield Road, it would be less so than in the previous appeal case.

The appeal dwelling is also set down below the property at the rear, 53 Newfield Road and would be partially screened by existing planting when viewed along Newfield Road from the east. In addition, a significant distance would remain

between the side elevation of the proposed extension and the rear of the footway on Newfield Road.

The Inspector was satisfied that for these reasons, when taken together with the reduction in size of the proposed extension, that it would not appear as a dominant feature on the site and that the general spaciousness of the area and the visual appearance of the street scene would not be harmed.

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.