

Name of Applicant	Proposal	Expiry Date	Plan Ref.
Mr Christian Rees-Cooke	Proposed extensions to dwelling 29 Newfield Road, Hagley, Stourbridge, Worcestershire, DY9 0JR	09.07.2021	21/00090/FUL

RECOMMENDATION: That planning permission be Granted

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

Consultations

Cllr Colella Consulted 22.02.2021

I wish to object for the following reasons:

The application is overbearing and out of keeping with the street scene The application adversely impacts on the neighbouring rear garden amenity. Neighbouring properties will lose important garden amenity and enjoyment of their private space.

I consider the application to breach the rear building line.

The application causes a terracing effect on the street scene; this goes against the original design and planning policy specified in the street scene design. The application is larger than the 40% extension threshold. The application is the latest proposal which has changed the property from what was a bungalow to the current dormer bungalow style dwelling to what would be a large family house. There is a shortage of bungalow/dormer bungalow properties and if approved would create a further shortfall.

Hagley Parish Council Consulted 22.02.2021

We object to this application. The extension is:

Over-large and overbearing

Not set down, so as to make it clear that the extension is subsidiary to the main dwelling.

Out of keeping with the area.

The extension will overlook and overshadow the adjacent house

Publicity

Neighbours consulted 22.02.2021

Neighbour Responses

Occupiers of 4 properties have objected to the application raising comments as summarised below:

- The proposed first floor bedrooms to be created will reduce the sunlight to adjacent / adjoining properties (overshadowing / loss of light)

- The proposed extensions are too large and not in keeping with the existing property, the local street scene and would harm the character and appearance of the local area
- The extensions would overlook our property to the detriment of residential amenity
- The extensions would be overbearing, overwhelming and would have a visually intimidating impact
- Insufficient parking on site
- Proposals do not comply with the Councils SPD on High Quality Design
- Extensions should be subordinate with ridge line lowered from that of the existing
- Foundation and exhaust flue concerns
- Loss of bungalow stock required for an ageing population

Occupiers of 2 properties support the application raising comments as summarised below:

- Many houses have been extended and refurbished to some degree in this and surrounding roads
- The proposals are sympathetic and will enhance and improve the appearance of the property providing a fine family home

Relevant Policies

Bromsgrove District Plan 2011-2030

BDP1 Sustainable Development Principles
BDP19 High Quality Design

Others

Bromsgrove High Quality Design SPD
NPPF National Planning Policy Framework (2019)

Relevant Planning History

B/115/1974	Garage	Approved	03.06.1974
B/8049/1980	Lounge extension and loft conversion for domestic purposes	Approved	27.10.1980

Assessment of Proposal

The site and its surroundings

This detached three bedroomed property is situated to the northern side of Newfield Road, Hagley. Adjoining No.29's boundary to the west is the semi-detached 2 storey dwelling No 27 Newfield Road and to the east, No.31 Newfield Road. The property has been extended in the past by means of a largely flat roofed garage extension and a later flat roofed lounge extension together with loft conversion. Existing floor plans and elevations submitted with the application also show a glazed conservatory to the rear although this has recently been removed.

The proposed development

It is proposed, at ground floor level, on the site of a recently removed conservatory to extend the original rear wall of the property out to the rear by 4.54 metres to form a kitchen extension. In order to accommodate the extension, a small flat roofed extension, currently forming part of the existing kitchen area would be demolished. The extension to the rear would extend out to the furthest part of the existing lounge area, itself, as extended under application B/8049/1980. Above this area it proposed to create an additional bedroom.

Further, it is proposed to erect a first-floor extension to the side of the dwelling over the existing garage in order to create further bedroom accommodation. Within the existing first floor area which exists, bedroom 1 would remain, with the remainder of the space being converted to a dressing area and ensuite bathroom.

Materials proposed for use would match those of the existing dwelling.

Assessment

Character and appearance

Policy BDP.19 of the Bromsgrove District Plan (BDP) requires development to be of high-quality design. This is re-enforced within the Councils High Quality Design SPD.

Objections received comment that the proposed side extensions would harm the character of the existing dwelling and the character and appearance of the street-scene. The Councils SPD comments that extensions should enhance the dwelling and give consideration to any impact of the development on the existing dwelling. Alterations and extensions should complement the scale and general massing of the existing building and remain subservient to it. Matching bricks, roof tiles or other facing materials in form, colour and texture should be used.

With respect to roof treatment, the SPD comments that the roof form (type and angle of pitch) should match that of the original development, (particularly where a two-storey extension is proposed) which contributes to the harmony of the building and avoids the long-term maintenance problems associated with flat roofs.

In this case, the proposed side extension is considered to represent a visual enhancement to the existing garage, erected in the mid 1970's and the proposals are not considered to harm the character and appearance of the existing street. The hipped roof arrangement would match the angle of pitch of the existing dwelling as advised in the Councils SPD. Whilst noting that the side extension would be extended to the boundary, this would only be to approximately 3.7m in height with a first-floor gap remaining between No.29 and 27 Newfield Road. It is not considered uncommon for properties in this area to be built on or very near to a shared side boundary and I have noted that both number 27 and 31 Newfield Road present two storey flank gables on or near to the shared boundary to the host property. Whilst noting that the ridge line serving the side extension is not lower than the ridge line serving the host property, I have noted the SPD's guidance at 3.3.1 which comments that each application should be considered on its merits to ensure that the design of the side extension is appropriate to that property and its surroundings. The ridge line serving the side extension would meet the ridge line serving the existing property towards the centre point of the existing dwelling and thus the roofslope would be largely 'set back' from the front face of the dwelling reducing the prominence of the extension.

I have also noted that No.27 Newfield Road, whose occupiers object to the application, were granted permission for a two-storey side extension – ref B/1994/0097 approved 05.05.1994 where the ridge line serving the extension has not been lowered from that of the original dwelling.

A small dormer window is proposed to the front elevation of No.29 which is considered to add relief to the (south facing) roofslope. Other examples of dormer windows exist within the street, notably at No.31, and considered as a whole, the design of the proposed development having regards to its impact upon the character and appearance of the dwelling and the wider area is considered to be appropriate.

Residential amenity

Objections have been received from nos. 25, 27, 31 and 36 Newfield Road which have been summarised above.

Within the presentation which will accompany this report, diagrams have been provided to show the extent of extensions which could be added to the property both to the rear and to the side (as single storey extensions) without the occupier needing to apply for planning permission. These rights exist under the terms of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015.

With respect to the proposed side extension, the lowest part of the extension would measure 3.7 metres from ground level, rising to 7.15 metres (the highest point of the existing dwelling). A single storey extension could be erected to the side of the dwelling to a maximum height of 4 metres.

With respect to the proposed rear extension, members should note that a single storey extension measuring no more than 4 metres in height and by 4 metres in depth could be erected in the same area as that as shown on the proposed ground floor plan, albeit the proposed rear extension would extend to 4.54 metres in depth.

The Councils SPD advises that two storey extension proposals (excluding single storey extension proposals) be assessed against the 45 degree line guidance.

The 45 degree line guidance derives from the Building Research Establishment (BRE) guidelines "Site Layout Planning for daylight and sunlight".

It must be stressed that where non-compliance with the 45 degree line (guidance) exists, it should not necessarily follow that planning permission should be refused. Distance between dwellings, height and massing of the development are also relevant factors as are average daylight hours and light distribution throughout the day.

In the case of the rear two storey extension, the extension complies with the 45 degree line guidance in so far as the impact upon the occupier of No.31 Newfield Road is concerned. In terms of the impact upon No.27 Newfield Road, both the two-storey rear extension and the first-floor extension above the existing flat roofed garage would not comply with the 45 degree line guidance. However, the shape and pitch of the roof proposed are key in understanding the true impact upon residential amenity including overshadowing and overbearance. In this case, the existing dwelling and the proposed ridge height serving the development would measure 7.15 metres from ground level. However, due to the steeply pitched roof, height to eaves is only 2.8 metres rising to a maximum of 3.7 metres. By comparison, the eaves height serving the property to the immediate West (31 Newfield Road) measures 5 metres. The roof serving both the side extension and the rear extension rises as it reaches the centre point of the dwelling rather than having significant height at the shared boundary.

In terms of sunlight distribution, numbers 25 to 31 have north facing rear gardens. It is likely that any early morning light reaching number 27 (from the east) will be partially obscured by existing built development. Given the shape of the roof proposed to the side extension any loss of light would not be considered to be material.

In terms of privacy issues raised, no first-floor habitable room windows directly overlook neighbours to the west and to the east. A rooflight serving a landing area would be positioned in the east facing elevation and an obscurely glazed window serving an ensuite bathroom would be positioned in the west facing elevation. A single flat roofed dormer window serving a bathroom already exists to the west facing elevation which would be replaced by the new ensuite bathroom window and no additional windows are proposed to west facing elevation when compared to that of the existing. The other windows to the rear would face north directly down the host dwellings rear garden.

An element of overlooking from habitable rear windows serving numbers 25 to 31 Newfield Road, into adjacent rear gardens already exists and would continue to exist. It is for the decision maker to consider whether the impact caused by any additional overlooking impact would be material. The impact is not considered to be material in this case. I have taken into consideration that the windows serving the proposed rear bedroom would be glazed 'french doors' behind which would be an internal safety guard rail. An external balcony / raised platform is not proposed.

I am therefore satisfied that the proposal would not harm the amenities enjoyed by the occupiers of adjoining residents having taken into consideration the provisions of Policies

BDP.1 and BDP.19 of the Bromsgrove District Plan (BDP) and the Councils High Quality Design SPD.

Other matters

The property is not situated within the Green Belt and therefore the 40% threshold which applies under Policy BDP.4 of the District Plan does not apply. No percentage limits apply to dwellings which are located outside the Green Belt.

The property is not a bungalow, rather a dormer bungalow with existing stairs leading to first floor bedrooms and therefore the proposal would not result in the loss of a bungalow or a property which would necessarily be any more attractive to elderly persons. Newfield Road is currently considered to be characterised by that of two storey dwellings rather than that of bungalows and in that respect, I have noted that No.31 Newfield Road was once a bungalow before being replaced by that of a two-storey dwelling (ref B/1992/0540, granted 10.08.1992).

Concerns raised regarding foundation design / depth together with matters concerning the flue are not planning considerations in this case and are matters covered by other legislation including that covered by the Building Regulations and Regulatory Services.

Parking concerns have been raised. Current County Highway parking standards require that three car parking spaces be provided within the curtilage of any dwelling providing four or more bedrooms. Parking for a minimum of three cars can be accommodated within the frontage and therefore approval of the proposals is unlikely to lead to additional on-street parking demand.

Conclusion

The extensions proposed are considered to be in accordance with the Council's SPD: High Quality Design; Policies BDP.1 and BDP.19 of the Bromsgrove District Plan and the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework and would not cause harm to residential or visual amenity. As such the application can be supported.

RECOMMENDATION: That planning permission be **GRANTED**

Conditions:

- 1) The development to which this permission relates must be begun not later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date of the grant of this permission.

Reason: In accordance with the requirements of Section 91(1) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

- 2) The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the following plans and drawings:

Drawing number BP64590 revision A: Proposed floorplans, elevations, site plan and location plan: AMENDED dated 2nd March 2021

Reason: To provide certainty to the extent of the development hereby approved in the interests of proper planning.

- 3) All new external walls and roofs shall be finished in materials to match in colour, form and texture those on the existing building.

Reason:- To ensure that the development is satisfactory in appearance, to safeguard the visual amenities of the area and in accordance with Policies in the Local Plan.

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