

**Appeal made against the refusal of planning permission**

<b>Appeal reference</b>	APP/P1805/D/11/2159287
<b>Planning Application</b>	11/0504-HR
<b>Proposal</b>	Proposed new extension
<b>Location</b>	70 Kidderminster Road, Hagley, DY9 0QL
<b>Ward</b>	Hagley
<b>Decision</b>	Refused (Delegated decision) - 4th August 2011

The author of this report is Harjap Rajwanshi who can be contacted on 01527 881399 (e-mail: [h.rajwanshi@bromsgrove.gov.uk](mailto:h.rajwanshi@bromsgrove.gov.uk)) for more information.

**Discussion**

The proposal is for a two storey side extension.

The application was determined under delegated powers and refused due to the following reasons as detailed below:

1. Due to the resulting built up appearance and loss of gap that would be caused by the proposed extension, the proposal would detrimentally affect the streetscene and character of the area. 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.

The Inspector found the main issue of the appeal to be:

The effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area.

The detached house fronts onto a busy dual carriageway. It is in a short row of properties comprising another detached dwelling and 2 pairs of semi-detached houses. Although there are broad similarities in their scale and their relationship to the highway, the Inspector notes there are 6 properties which have been built to differing designs and they have each been altered over time. Consequently there is a notable variation in their appearance.

The Inspector acknowledges the extension would be set back from the front elevation of the dwelling, with a ridge height of that on the existing building. In terms of design it would relate well to the character of the house. Therefore, the Inspector felt if built using matching materials it would constitute as a subservient addition of a suitable and sympathetic appearance. Moreover, given the variety of housing in this row the resultant building would not be visually incongruous.

As the proposed extension would substantially fill the space between the side of the dwelling and the fence line with 72 Kidderminster Road, the Council raised this as an issue. They stated the gaps separating the houses in the row, fulfill a strategic function. However, this row is quite short, and beyond the break in the built frontage that is next to 74 Kidderminster Road the arrangement of the houses changes and their boundaries are of varying sizes. After consideration the Inspector noted that some properties have single storey side extensions, which maintain a sense of openness above. Moreover, what can be seen between the houses does not make a significant positive contribution to the character of the area, and the appreciation of the gaps is limited when travelling along the road due to the nature and siting of the buildings. Consequently for these reasons the gaps separating these houses do not create an established pattern or an important feature in the street scene and, on the evidence submitted, the Inspector deemed the gaps to not have a strategic function.

The extension would be some distance from the carriageway, thereby reducing its dominance. The space to the side of no. 72 would also remain, and so a separation between the buildings would be maintained. Finally the set back of 1m from the boundary at first floor level would accord with the advice in Supplementary Planning Guidance Note 1 *Residential Design Guide* (SPG) concerning the avoidance of terracing.

## **Conclusion**

The Inspector concluded that the loss of this gap would not cause unacceptable harm to the streetscape or the character of the area. As such the extension would not conflict with policies DS13 and S10 in the Bromsgrove District Local Plan or advice in the Council's SPG1.

Therefore the Inspector allowed the appeal.

## **Costs application**

No application for costs was made.

## **Appeal outcome**

The appeal was **ALLOWED** (29th September 2011), subject to the following conditions:

- 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision;
- 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with approved drawings SHDC/11/21/02 and 03A, together with the Block Plan (1:500) and the Location Plan (1:1250);

- 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building;
- 4) The window on the north-east elevation shall at all times be fitted with obscured glazing and any opening lights shall, at all times, be at high level and top-hinged only.

**Recommendation**

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