

Name of Applicant	Proposal	Expiry Date	Plan Ref.
Mr & Mrs Stuart and Zia Kitching	Two storey side extension, garage and amended drive access. 1 Highfields, Bromsgrove, B61 7BZ	01.03.2019	18/01393/FUL

RECOMMENDATION: That planning permission be **REFUSED**

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

Consultations

Worcestershire Regulatory Services – Contaminated Land

No objection. The proposed development is sited within 250m of a registered landfill or a significant area of unknown filled ground which potentially could produce landfill gas.

The applicant is advised to consider incorporating matching landfill gas protection measures within the foundations of the proposed extension(s), so as not to compromise any existing gas protection measures which may have been installed in the existing building. If the existing building has no protection measures currently there is no need to install gas protection measures within the proposed extension. In informative to this effect is recommended for inclusion in the case of planning permission being granted in order to ensure that the risks to buildings and their occupants from landfill sites are adequately addressed.

Publicity

Five neighbours consulted 04.01.2019. Expired 28.01.2019

Neighbour Responses

1 response received in support of the application, raising comments as summarised below:

We live directly opposite the proposed extension and consider that this eco-friendly, contemporary design will enhance the immediate area. We fully support this application.

Councillor Luke Mallett

I have met with the residents regarding their application and I am extremely supportive of the scheme they are putting forward.

The main issue has been about the contrast between the old and the proposed. I have seen examples including within Bromsgrove of such schemes and I actually think it accentuates the old (within an area that is pretty mixed in terms of build dates etc). I understand the immediate neighbours are also supportive of the scheme.

Relevant Policies

Bromsgrove District Plan 2011-2030

BDP1 Sustainable Development Principles
BDP19 High Quality Design

Others

SPG1 Residential Design Guide
NPPF National Planning Policy Framework (2018)

Relevant Planning History

B/6147/1979	Erection of side extension to form kitchen	Approved	02.07.1979
-------------	--	----------	------------

Assessment of Proposal

The site and its surroundings

The property is situated at the corner of Highfields and Millfield Road within the Hill Top ward. Access to the site is via the eastern boundary of the site onto Highfields. The site lies within a residential area comprised of houses dating from varying periods, although dwellings within this part of Highfields are generally older. Houses are predominately constructed using traditional red brick (walls) under either a plain clay tile or slate roof. Features such as chimneys are commonplace within the Highfields street scene. No.1 Highfields is semi-detached and formed of red brick (walls) under a clay tiled roof. The attached property, No. 3 Highfields is similar to the host property in terms of design, proportions and materials used in its construction.

The proposed development

The proposed development encompasses a two storey side extension to accommodate a larger kitchen, breakfast and dining room to the ground floor with new (fourth) double bedroom together with ensuite bathroom above. Further, a new detached single garage is proposed to be erected within the side garden area between the proposed side extension and the host dwellings' boundary onto Millfield Road. Minor amendments to the existing drive access are proposed to accommodate the above changes.

Assessment

Policy 19 of the Bromsgrove District Plan (BDP) requires development to be of high quality design and Supplementary Planning Guidance note 1 (SPG1), Section 4, 4.1 requires extensions to be subordinate to the original dwelling in order to provide a design break between old and new and to retain the character of the original dwelling. Whilst the front wall to the proposed two storey extension would be set-back from that of the existing principal elevation of the dwelling, the set-back distance would be small, at approximately 220mm (approximately the length of a brick). This, together with only a very modest reduction in the ridge height serving the proposed two storey extension

results in a visually dominant and discordant form of development which is not considered to be policy compliant owing to its non-subordinate design.

Section 3, 3.0 taken from the Council's SPG1 comments that:

'Bromsgrove District is predominantly a "red brick" area, because of the minerals in the local clays. Lighter, more orange coloured bricks reflecting the local variation in chalk content are more appropriate towards the Warwickshire border for example in the Alvechurch and Beoley areas. Brick buildings are generally roofed with tiles or slates; plain clay red tiles are suitable or Welsh grey/blue slates. Generally, development will be expected to reinforce this local distinctiveness. Facing materials should be carefully selected so as to be sympathetic to those found locally.'

Section 3, 3.2 taken from the above SPG1 comments that:

'In the case of extensions to existing dwellings it is important that all materials including doors and windows match the existing.'

In this case the applicant's choice of materials for the external walls is reinforced fibre cement horizontal boarding, slate grey in colour. The roof serving the proposed extension is a fibre cement slate. The same materials are proposed for use in the construction of the detached single garage.

Whilst no objections are raised to the proposed scale and location of the proposed garage, the proposed choice of materials for use in the construction of the garage, together with the proposed choice of materials to be used in the construction of the two storey extension are considered to be wholly inappropriate given that the existing property is constructed using a traditional red brick (walls) under a clay tiled roof.

I have noted that windows proposed in the construction of the extension would not align with the head and sill positions present on the existing dwelling, notably the first floor bedroom window to the proposed front elevation. Although shrubs are proposed to be planted to the front elevation of the dwelling, I consider that this treatment is unlikely to represent an appropriate substitute for a ground floor window/s where none are proposed. The size and design of the proposed windows would not match with those found in the existing dwelling. This, along with other concerns set out above has led me to the conclusion that the harmony of the building would be disrupted and harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling would result.

Policy BDP19 also requires extensions to respect and or enhance the character and distinctiveness of the local area. Paragraph 130 of the Framework states that permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions. The existing dwelling has an aesthetically pleasing scale and proportions which complements the form of surrounding dwellings. The property is situated on a prominent corner plot where land levels rise from Millfield Road (to the south) towards Highfields further north, accentuating the prominence of this location. I have concluded that the design and appearance of the proposed two storey extension together with the appearance of the proposed detached garage would not respect the distinctiveness of the local area and would therefore harm and detract from the character of the local area. The scheme would

therefore not satisfy the criteria set out in Paragraph 127 of the NPPF and would amount to poor design under Paragraph 130.

The letter written in support of the application refers to the design of the extension being 'eco-friendly'. No information has been submitted that demonstrates that the extension has any sustainable qualities and therefore this carries no weight in the determination of the application.

RECOMMENDATION: That planning permission be REFUSED

Reasons for Refusal

1. The proposed extension by reason of its scale and design would represent an overly large and discordant addition to the dwelling. The development is therefore harmful to the character of the original dwelling failing to comply with Policy BDP19 (High Quality Design), the Councils Residential Design Guide SPG 1 and Section 12 of the NPPF.
2. The proposed two storey extension and detached garage, by reason of their appearance would represent an incongruous feature in the street scene harming the visual amenities of the area. The development therefore fails to comply with Policy BDP19 (High Quality Design), the Councils SPG 1 and Section 12 of the NPPF.

Case Officer: Steven Edden Tel: 01527 548474
Email: steve.edden@bromsgroveandredditch.gov.uk