

Appeal made against the refusal of planning permission

Appeal reference	APP/P1805/D/12/2169177
Planning Application	11/0753-HR
Proposal	Proposed single storey rear extension, two storey side extension and garage roof replacement
Location	35 Marlborough Avenue, Bromsgrove, B60 2PH
Ward	Slideslow
Decision	Refused (Delegated decision) - 3rd November 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 single-storey rear extension, two-storey side extension and garage roof replacement.

Discussion

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

1. Due to the terracing effect and resultant cramping effect that would be caused by the proposed extension, the scheme would detrimentally affect the street scene 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 street scene.

Main Issues

The character of the east side of Marlborough Avenue, within which No. 35 is sited, is that of mainly two-storey houses (detached and semi-detached) set back from the footway behind low walls / hedges and gardens with vehicle crossovers providing access to garages and / or hard standings used for car parking. The area is residential.

Most of the houses on this stretch of the road have been built to or extended towards the side boundaries; however, this is generally only at ground floor level. The Inspector considers this fortunate as it has retained the undeveloped gaps to the side of some properties or the space at first floor level between adjacent dwellings, maintaining a pleasing sense of spaciousness.

There is a substantial gap between the existing staggered side elevation of No. 35 and the hedge that divides No. 35 from No. 37. The proposal, in so far as it is relevant to the refusal of planning permission, is to build a part single-storey and part two-storey extension to the side of No. 35 leaving a very small gap to the common boundary with No. 37.

The Inspector gives substantial weight to the Council's Residential Design Guide SPG1 which explains that it is important that detached houses should not appear to become terraced. For this reason two storey extensions should be set at least one metre off the common boundary.

The Inspector notes that there would not be a 1m gap to the common boundary with No. 37, but is aware that there would be a 2m gap between the side elevation of No. 37 and the proposed side elevation of the extension. The Inspector is mindful that it would be difficult for the Council to resist a similar type of extension at No. 37 and this would have a detrimental impact on the street scene and would result in a terracing effect.

In conclusion

The Inspector concludes that the space between No.s 35 and 37 at first floor level would be below that generally found elsewhere in Marlborough Avenue. The proposal would therefore materially harm the character and appearance of the street scene in this part of Marlborough Avenue.

The Inspector dismissed the appeal.

Costs application

No application for costs was made.

Appeal outcome

The appeal was **DISMISSED** (5th March 2012).

Recommendation

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