

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

<b>Appeal reference</b>	APP/P1805/D/11/2163922
<b>Planning Application</b>	11/0663-HR
<b>Proposal</b>	Two storey side extension and single storey front extension (re-submission of 11/0270)
<b>Location</b>	4 Tintern Close, Bromsgrove, B61 7PH
<b>Ward</b>	Whitford
<b>Decision</b>	Refused (Delegated decision) - 23rd September 2011

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

**The Proposal**

The side extension would incorporate a utility room on the ground floor. On the first floor there would be a new bedroom and an extension to an existing small bedroom. At the front of the property a small extension is proposed to the lounge. This extension would have a pitched roof that would continue over the existing porch.

**Discussion**

The proposal was for a two storey extension (over an existing garage) and a single storey front extension.

The application was determined under delegated powers and refused due to the following reason 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 to be the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

The Inspector refers to the Council's SPG1 Residential Design Guidance. It is noted that the proposal is to be constructed in matching materials. The ridge of the extension would be some 0.3m lower than the existing ridgeline and the proposal would be set back about 0.5m from the front wall. In terms of design and the relationship to the house, the proposed extension would be subordinate and would complement the design of the dwelling. However, the extension would be sited on the boundary of the property which would be contrary to the guidance in SPG1 which says the proposal should also

be set off the boundary line by 1m. The purpose of this piece of guidance is to prevent semi-detached or detached houses appearing as if they are terraced.

Although the Inspector agrees with the Council's reasoning for this guidance and appreciates its concerns regarding setting a precedent, it is acknowledged that there are particular circumstances that warrant an exception being made to the guidance.

In this instance the appeal property and its semi-detached neighbour, no.6, are set slightly forward of the detached dwelling at No.2, a corner property. This would thus mitigate the effects of any reduction in distance between the detached house and No. 4. Secondly, the garage at the detached property is about 1m away from the common boundary. Therefore, should the detached property be extended over its garage, a gap would still remain. Taking both factors into consideration the Inspector considers that the proposed scheme would not result in an undesirable terracing effect and would not have a deleterious effect on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

With regard to loss of light and privacy, the Inspector notes that the front extension to the lounge would comply with the 45 degree rule as stated in SPG1. In addition the flank wall would contain no windows, thus overlooking would not occur.

### **In conclusion**

On the basis of the above the Inspector resolved to allow the appeal.

### **Costs application**

No application for costs was made.

### **Appeal outcome**

The appeal was **ALLOWED** (21st December 2011) subject to the following conditions:

1. The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Drawing Number 1: Location Plan; Site Plan; Existing Elevations and Floor Plans received by the local planning authority on 29th July 2011; Drawing Number 2A: Proposed Elevations and Floor Plans received by the local planning authority on 29th July 2011.
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.

### **Recommendation**

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