

Appeal made against the refusal of planning permission

Appeal reference	APP/P1805/D/12/2168968
Planning Application	11/0907-HR
Proposal	Bedroom extension over garage
Location	71 Lodge Crescent, Hagley, DY9 0ND
Ward	Hagley
Decision	Refused (Delegated decision) - 23rd December 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 proposal is for a first floor bedroom extension over an existing garage. A front porch extension and a ground floor rear elevation kitchen extension is also proposed.

Discussion

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

1. The proposed extension would be detrimental to the form and character of the existing dwelling and the street scene by virtue of its siting in front of the building line and would therefore represent a dominant and incongruous feature contrary to policy CTC.1 of the Worcester County Structure Plan, Bromsgrove District Council's Residential Design Guide SPG1, and policies DS13 and S10 of the Bromsgrove District Local Plan.

The Inspector found the main issue to be the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the existing property and the street scene.

Main Issues

The Inspector notes the characteristics of the existing street scene. The surrounding area is predominantly residential and the properties are generally two-storey detached and semi-detached dwellings of varying design. Properties exist with projecting front gables which are subservient to the host building and there are several examples of large bay windows projecting beyond the front elevation. The predominant characteristics of the street scene are the dwellings being set back from the road to the rear of open front gardens, the spacing between the dwellings and the generally tiled gabled roof forms of the dwellings. Some of the dwellings have been extended to the side above garages, but have not been set back from the front elevations or set down from the ridgeline.

Although the proposed first floor side extension would not be set back or set down, the Inspector considers that the extension would still be in scale with, and well related to, the original dwelling and would not have a detrimental effect on the street scene or its locality. In this case the Inspector attached little weight to the guidance contained in the Council's SPG1: Residential Design Guide.

The apex of the projecting front gable's roof would be at a lower level and, in conjunction with its width, would be visually and physically subordinate to the dwelling and would not be an over-dominant feature. It would retain the basic character of a two-storey detached dwelling.

The proposed projection of the first floor extension would not protrude any further into the open front garden as it would follow the footprint of the existing garage. The existing visual and physical gap between the extended property and No. 60 would be retained, maintaining the characteristic of the street scene.

In conclusion

Overall the proposed development, including the mono-pitched roof at ground floor level, would not cause material harm to the character and appearance of the existing property and the street scene. It would result in a sympathetic and cohesive design which would improve the appearance of both the property and its contribution to the street scene.

The Inspector allowed the appeal.

Costs application

No application for costs was made.

Appeal outcome

The appeal was **ALLOWED** 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: Site Location Plan; Block Plan and Job No. 18/10/2011 Drawing No. 01.
3. The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match those in the existing building.
4. Before the first occupation of the extension hereby permitted the window to the en-suite at the first floor of the side (south) elevation shall be fitted with obscured glass and any opening lights shall be at high level and top hinged only. The window shall be permanently retained in that condition.

Recommendation

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