

Name of Appellant	Plan Ref/Proposal/Decision
Mrs Franchesca Stone	11/1015– HR – Proposed First Floor Extension Appeal Decision: Allowed – 14.05.12

Report for information

Appeal made against the refusal of planning permission

Appeal Reference	APP/P1805/D/12/2172929
Planning application	11/1015
Proposal	Proposed First Floor Extension

Location	7 South Road Hagley Stourbridge DY9 0JT
----------	--

Ward	Furlongs Ward
Refused	27/01/12

The author of this report is Harjap Rajwanshi who can be contacted on 01527 881399.

Discussion

The **main issue** in this appeal is the effect of the proposed extension on the character and appearance of the South Road street scene. The Council officers' report acknowledges that the first floor side extension, proposed above an existing single storey element, would satisfy various criteria in Policy S10 of the Council's Local Plan and in the further guidance set out in its adopted SPG. The sole matter at issue is whether it would create a harmful terracing effect, because the gap from the side wall to the common boundary with no. 9 would be only some 0.7m, rather than the 1.0m minimum recommended in the SPG.

However, as reflected in the SPG, individual circumstances will also be relevant. In this case, although nos. 1-3 and 5-7 are semi-detached dwellings which appear to have originally been of the same design, the majority of other buildings in the street are detached houses of varying sizes, shapes and detailing. Thus there are significant differences between no. 9 and nos. 5-7. No. 9 is a detached red brick house with a gable roof, set at a slightly higher level than nos. 5-7 and roughly 2m off the side boundary. In contrast, nos. 5-7 are a white-rendered pair of semis with a lower and shallower hipped roof. The proposed first floor extension at no. 7 would be set back from its main front wall and set down below its main roof ridge. This combination of factors would more than adequately minimise any impression of terracing.

In these particular site-specific circumstances, therefore, I find that the proposed extension would not have any appreciable adverse impact on the street scene's character and appearance, despite a small shortfall in the recommended gap to the side boundary. There would therefore be no material conflict with relevant development plan policy, most notably LP Policy S10.

I have had regard to all other matters raised, but have found nothing sufficient to alter my conclusion that the appeal should succeed. A condition specifying the approved plans is needed for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning. A requirement for matching materials is necessary in the interests of visual amenity. However, whilst the appellant may choose to fit the front bathroom window with obscure glazing, there is no need to require this by condition as the window would be further away from the dwelling opposite than the existing first floor windows.

Therefore, having regard to all matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Costs of application

No application for costs was made.