

Name of Applicant Type of Certificate	Proposal	Map/Plan Policy	Plan. Ref Expiry Date
J. Whittall 'A'	First floor extension over existing garage, rear kitchen extension, addition of pitched roof to existing ground floor rear extension and other alterations - 31 Hanbury Road, Stoke Heath, Bromsgrove	RES	B/2007/0940 15.10.2007

RECOMMENDATION: that planning permission be **GRANTED**.

Councillor D. W. P. Booth has requested that this application be considered by the Planning Committee, rather than being determined under delegated powers.

Consultations

WCC(HP)	Consulted - view received 03.09.2007 - No objection
Stoke PC	Consulted - No objection. A useful enhancement to the property.
Publicity	5 letters sent 21.08.2007 (expired 11.09.2007) 1 letter of objection received by the occupiers of 29A Hanbury Road - It is considered that the extension, by reason of its proximity to number 29A, would be intrusive and intimidating.

The site and its surroundings

This application relates to a detached property located to the east side of Hanbury Road close to the junction with the A38. The property is accessed by a service road which runs along the main highway. The property is set back from the road with a substantial front boundary hedge. To the left hand-side a driveway leads up to an attached garage. The garage is set back from the front of the house and extends out into the rear garden. To the rear elevation the main roof drops down below the main eaves level and has a half dormer window. The property has a single storey rear extension. The site is located in a recognised residential area.

Proposal

This application relates to a first floor extension above the existing garage. The existing rear extension will be extended next to the garage to remove an existing step in its rear building line. The main roof will be extended down over the existing flat roof of the extension and a new dormer window will replace the existing in a more forward position. The proposal will increase the number of bedrooms to the property from 3 to 4.

Relevant Policies

WMSS	QE3
WCSP	SD.2, CTC.1, T.1
BDLP	DS3, DS13, S10
Others	PPS1, SPG1

Relevant Planning History

B/2007/0687 Part ground and first floor side extension; withdrawn 17.08.2007

Notes

The main considerations are whether the proposal complies with policy S10 of the Bromsgrove District Local Plan and SPG1 and the effect the proposal will have on the amenity of the neighbouring properties and the surrounding area.

Street scene issues

Policy S10 of the BDLP relates to extensions to dwellings outside the Green Belt. This policy states that extensions should be in scale with and well related to the original building and should not have a detrimental affect on the street scene or locality. Further guidance on domestic extensions is provided in Supplementary Planning Guidance Note 1: Residential Design Guide. SPG1 suggests that first floor side extensions should be set down from the height of the roof of the original dwelling, set back from the front wall and set at least 1.0 metre off the common boundary.

Set down: The ridgeline to the proposed first floor side extension will be set 0.4m down from that of the existing dwelling.

Set back: The first floor side extension will be set 4.4m back from the front of the existing dwelling.

I am therefore satisfied the extension will appear visually subordinate to the main house.

Set off: The proposed first floor side extension will be set 0.7m off the boundary with number 29A at the front. Due to the tapered nature of the side boundary, this distance will reduce to 0.5m at the rear of the extension.

The submitted plans show the existing garage set off the boundary with number 29A. On site there is no boundary treatment between the two buildings. However, the agent has confirmed that the applicant does own a strip land down the side of the garage. I will therefore consider the application on this basis.

The properties to the south of the application site follow the road as it bends round into the A38. These properties are detached and are generally set off the boundary at first floor level though the extent of gaps between the houses does vary. To the north are more modern houses. These are also detached though the level of spacing is less generous. To the side of the proposed extension, a gap of approximately 2.3 metres would remain between numbers 29A and 31. I am of the opinion that the reduced gap at first floor level would not be of harm to the pattern of development to this section of Hanbury Road. In being set 0.7m to 0.5m off the common boundary the proposed extension fails to comply with the provisions of SPG1. However, it would appear unlikely that it would be possible to add an extension to the approximately 1.5 metre wide gap to the side of number 29A. As such, I am satisfied that the extension will not create an over-cramping or terracing effect in the street scene.

The roof to the proposed side extension will not form a continuation of the existing roof. However, it is of a form, which reflects the existing roof and I do not consider that it will be of harm to the appearance of the property.

The proposed alterations to the existing rear extension will not be visible from the road. The addition of a pitched roof to the existing rear extension, in my opinion, will bring a visual improvement to the building. The increased footprint of the extension and the new dormer window will have a neutral impact on the property's appearance.

Amenity issues

Number 29A to the north is set back from the front of number 31. The proposed first floor side extension will be positioned to the side of this property. Number 29A has two small ground floor windows to its side elevation. These windows are both secondary sources of light to habitable rooms. I acknowledge the concerns raised by the occupants of number 29A and consider that the extension will cause loss of light to these windows and would dominate their views. However, given the secondary nature of the windows, I am of the opinion that extension's impact on the windows would not harm the amenities of the occupants to an extent that would justify the refusal of the application. SPG1 notes that the 45-degree code only applies where the nearest side of the extension is perpendicular to the window; that is, it is not valid for windows which directly face the extension. It is therefore not appropriate to use the 45-degree code to assess the impact of the extension on these side windows. The extension will be so positioned to not affect the front windows to number 29A.

Number 33 lies to the south east and faces in towards the rear garden of the application site. The proposed dormer window complies with the 45-degree code. Whilst the first floor extension over the garage will not apply with the 45-degree code it will be set approximately 12m from the nearest window to number 33. By reason of this distance and the position of number 29A, I am satisfied that the extension will not cause loss of light to this window.

The proposed plans show the insertion of a ground floor door and window in the original side elevation of the dwelling facing number 33 and a first floor window in the side elevation facing number 29A. These windows and door can be inserted under the property's permitted development rights given under Class A, Part 1, Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995. A condition will be used to prevent the insertion of windows in the north facing side elevation of the proposed first floor side extension as such windows would significantly affect the privacy to the occupiers of number 29A.

Conclusion

Given all material considerations, I am of the view that the proposal is acceptable in planning terms.

RECOMMENDATION: that planning permission be **GRANTED**.

1. C38

B/2007/0940-CE - First floor extension over existing garage, rear kitchen extension, addition of pitched roof to existing ground floor rear extension and other alterations - 31 Hanbury Road, Stoke Heath, Bromsgrove - J. Whittall

2. Notwithstanding the provisions of Article 3, Schedule 2, Part 1 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or any order revoking or re-enacting that order with or without modifications), no at first floor level or above to the north facing elevation of the first floor side extension hereby approved shall be inserted without the prior written consent of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: R030