

Name of Applicant Type of Certificate	Proposal	Map/Plan Policy	Plan Ref. Expiry Date
MR. & MRS. D. WALTERS 'A'	Two storey extension to side, to replace current single storey extension and original garage - 22 Dark Lane, Hollywood	Res	B/2007/1205 31.12.2007

RECOMMENDATION: that permission be **REFUSED**.

Councillor Peters has requested that this application be considered by Planning Committee rather than being determined under delegated powers.

Consultations

Wythall PC	Consulted 07.11.2007; views awaited.
WCC(HP)	Consulted 07.11.2007; views awaited.
ENG	Consulted 07.11.2007; views awaited.
Publicity	Seven neighbour notification letters sent 08.11.2007 (expires 29.11.2007). No comments received to date.

The site and its surroundings

This application relates to a two storey detached property set in a relatively spacious plot, with a large open plan garden to the front, and a long garden to the rear. The property has a detached garage to the right-hand side with a driveway providing parking for several cars. The property is located in a road that is characterised by mainly detached or semi-detached properties.

Proposal

This is a full application proposing the demolition of the existing garage and single storey flat roof extension to the rear, and the erection of a two storey front and side extension and a single storey rear extension.

Relevant Policies

WMSS	QE3
WCSP	CTC.1
BDLP	DS13, S10
Others	SPG1, PPS1

Relevant Planning History

B/2006/0859	Two storey extension to side and single storey extension to rear; refused 28.09.06
B/2007/0409	Resubmission of B/2006/0859 - two storey extension to side and single storey extension to rear; approved 14.06.2007

Notes

This application is very similar to the scheme that was refused planning permission under application number B/2006/0859 in September 2006. Since then, a revised submission has been granted permission under B/2007/0409.

Planning permission is currently being sought for a two-storey front / side and single storey rear extension. The front / side extension will be 3.85 metres wide and 9.3 metres deep, projecting 2.2 metres ahead of the front main wall and set in 1.8 metres from the rear main wall. The roof will match the main dwelling with the hip over the forward projection subservient to the main ridge by 1.5 metres. The single storey element will be 3.85 metres wide by 3.9 metres deep with the roof reaching 3.8 metres high. The extensions will be set 200mm off the common boundary.

Design / Impact upon the visual amenity of the streetscene

The property sits within a well separated run of development and the proposed extension will be located just 200mm off the common boundary creating a cramped, terracing impact within the streetscene, which is exacerbated further by the extensions non-subservient design. The forward projection will be largely unobtrusive within the streetscene due to a step in the building line; however, the property sits on higher ground to the road and this forward element will be easily viewed by passers-by heading east. The proposed forward projection is considered to be an unsympathetic design, which visually competes with the host dwelling, overwhelming its existing proportions and character. The front / side extension will therefore have a detrimental impact upon the character of the dwellinghouse and the visual amenity of the streetscene.

SPG1 states that side extensions should be subordinate to the main dwellinghouse; however, a non-subservient extension exists on a similar property at 24 Dark Lane and, given the proportions of the semi-detached property to the east, a subservient design would appear incongruous within this particular run of development.

Residential amenity issues

The first floor front / side extension will be set largely adjacent to the flank wall of 20 Dark Lane, which has no side windows. The extension will project approximately 3 metres beyond the rear main wall of 20 Dark Lane but should remain within the 45-degree code. The existing single storey utility/WC element located behind the garage will be demolished and replaced by a new element, which will be 1.7 metres smaller in depth. The replacement extension will be 3.9 metres high, 900mm higher than the existing flat roof; however, the roof will hip away from the boundary at an eaves height of 2.5 metres and, given its reduced depth, it is not expected to create any additional impact. The proposed extensions are not, therefore, expected to be overbearing or create any significant impact upon the amenity of surrounding neighbours.

However, given the detrimental impact upon the character of the dwellinghouse and the visual amenity of the streetscene, I still find this proposal unacceptable.

RECOMMENDATION: that permission be **REFUSED**.

1. The proposed development, by reason of its size and siting, would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the area due to the loss of the gap at first floor between the dwelling and the boundary and would introduce a bulky and incongruous feature into the streetscene. The result would be disruptive to the rhythm of development in the locality and the cumulative effect of similar proposals, which would be all the more difficult to resist, would be to create a terracing effect in the streetscene to the detriment of the visual amenities of the locality contrary to the Council's SPG1, Bromsgrove District Local Plan policy DS13 and the aims and objectives of PPS1.
2. The proposed extension, which projects forward of the front main wall, would introduce an over-dominant feature, which visually competes with the host dwelling, failing to respect the buildings style and character. The proposed extension will appear as a later addition 'tacked-on' to the dwellinghouse and is therefore contrary to the Council's SPG1, Bromsgrove District Local Plan 2004 policies DS13 and S10 and the aims and objectives of PPS1.