

Appeal made against the refusal of planning permission

Appeal reference	APP/P1805/D/11/2154505
Planning Application	11/0192-SG
Proposal	Re submission of 09/0428 - First floor extension to side (as amended by plan received 13.04.2011)
Location	67 Blythesway, Alvechurch, B48 7NB
Ward	Alvechurch
Decision	Refused (Delegated decision) - 28th April 2011

The author of this report is Stacey Green who can be contacted on 01527 881342 (e-mail: s.green@bromsgrove.gov.uk) for more information.

Discussion

The proposal was for a first floor extension over an existing garage to the side of a semi-detached property. This was a resubmission of application 09/0428 for a two storey extension with ground floor utility and first floor bedroom and dressing room.

The application was determined under delegated powers and refused on the basis that it would lead to an over cramping / terracing effect between the application site and adjoining property which would be detrimental to the character of the existing building and the surrounding area. The reason for refusal is noted below:

1. The proposed extension at first floor level would lead to an over cramping / terracing effect between the application site and the adjoining property which is detrimental to the character of the streetscene. This is contrary to policy CTC.1 of the Worcestershire County Structure Plan, policies DS13 and S10 of the Bromsgrove District Local Plan 2004 and the guidance contained in SPG1, the Council's Residential Design Guidance.

Firstly, the Inspector considers the character of the surrounding area. The Inspector notes that while semi-detached houses predominate, the area also includes terraced houses, bungalows and detached houses, resulting in irregular spacing between buildings and providing a varied suburban character and appearance.

The Inspector has regard to the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance Note 1: *Residential Design Guide* and notes that the proposed extension would be subordinate to the existing building as it would be set down from the ridge line of the main building, and would be set off from the common boundary by about 1 metre. Although it would not be set back from the front wall of the main building, the Inspector considers that the extension would be set back from the front of the garage (forming the existing ground

floor of the proposal) as it would be set behind a lean to pitched roof extending over the front porch.

In accordance with the reason for refusal the Inspector pays particular regard to the advice provided in paragraph 4.2 of the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance Note 1: *Residential Design Guide* which recommends that, to prevent a terracing effect, 2 storey or first floor extensions should be set at least 1m off the common boundary. The Inspector observes that the adjacent semi-detached house, number 69, has also been extended to the side above the garage. Therefore, the proposed extension would result in the gap between the adjacent buildings at first floor level being reduced to 1.5m. While the Inspector acknowledges that this distance would be less than that between most of the other semi-detached houses in the area, it is considered that the gap would still be noticeable. The Inspector is satisfied that this gap, together with the variation in the building line on the street and the lean-to roof feature over the garage, would ensure that the proposal would not create an unacceptable terracing effect.

This view was further supported when the Inspector carried out the site visit, where it was observed that there are other semi-detached houses in the area that have been extended resulting in the gap between buildings being significantly reduced due to adjacent extensions over garages.

Taking the above observations into consideration the Inspector was satisfied that the proposed extension would not make the appeal building appear unacceptably cramped in relation to other buildings in the area and would be in keeping with the street scene. As such, it would not set a precedent that would result in harm to the character and appearance of the area.

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, it would accord with Worcestershire County Structure Plan policy CTC.1 and Bromsgrove District Local Plan policies DS13 and S10.

It was therefore determined that the appeal should succeed.

Costs application

No application for costs was made.

Appeal outcome

The appeal was **ALLOWED** (1st August 2011).

Recommendation

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