

Name of Applicant Type of Certificate	Proposal	Map/Plan Policy	Plan. Ref Expiry Date
Mr D Sikkam 'A'	Two storey side and rear extension (as amended by drawings received 15.04.2010) - 2 Thicknall Rise, Hagley	Residential	10/0206-MT 04.05.2010

Councillor Sherry has requested that this application be considered by the Committee, rather than being determined under delegated powers.

RECOMMENDATION: that permission is **APPROVED**.

Consultations

WH	No objection 12.04.2010
Clent PC	Comments received 19.04.2010: ' <i>The proposals are too large an extension to existing property and out of scale.</i> '
Publicity	2 Neighbour notification letters posted 16.03.2010; expire 06.04.2010

20 letters/emails received; concerns raised over the following:

- The extension would be tantamount to a new dwelling.
- The extension would be over dominant and out of scale with the existing building.
- The extension would be incongruous with the design of the existing dwelling and the other dwellings in the surrounding area.
- The extension would project beyond the building line.
- The extension would obstruct road visibility.
- The boundary fence would harm the character of the area.
- The extension would result in a loss of light and outlook to the adjacent dwelling.
- The windows in the extension would overlook the opposing property.

The site and its surroundings

The application site relates to an existing two storey detached dwelling and integral garage. The site occupies a corner plot at the junction of Thicknall Rise and Newfield Road. The site is located in a Residential Area as defined in the Bromsgrove District Local Plan 2004.

Proposal

This application proposes to demolish the integral garage to the side of the property and erect a two storey extension to the side and rear of the dwelling. The extension would accommodate three additional bedrooms, a bathroom, family room, games room and car garage.

Relevant Policies

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

Relevant Planning History

09/0403 2 Storey Side and Rear Extension - Refused 14.07.2009

Notes

The site is located in a designated Residential Area. As such I consider that the main issues to address are those arising from Policy S10 of the Bromsgrove District Local 2004. This provides that extensions will be considered favourably if they are in accordance with the following principles:

- a. extensions to dwellings should normally be of matching design in materials and detailing and should be built in a style similar to that of the original building which should always remain as the dominant feature of the resulting compound building;
- b. where applications are received which would result in an 'extension' becoming over-dominant and lead to significant changes in the basic character, floor plan and/or cubic content of the original building, other considerations will apply and the proposal will be treated as if it were a completely new dwelling rather than an extension;
- c. where it is proposed to add an extension to a building which has a pitched roof, and the extension will be of a similar height to the original building, then the extension should, in most circumstances, have a similar roof pitch. Flat roof extensions will not normally be permitted;
- d. the proposed extension should not adversely affect the existing amenities of adjoining occupiers.

It is considered that these criteria can be grouped together under two main headings; 'Design' and 'Residential Amenity'. I will consider each of these matters under separate headings below.

Further to the issues related to Policy S10, it is important to consider the impact of the extension on the character of the street scene and the visual amenity of the area. I also note the concerns raised by local residents over the proposal. I will address each of these matters under separate headings below.

Members will note that a planning application for a two storey side and rear extension was refused at this site in July 2009 (09/0403). That application was refused as it was considered that the extensions would be over dominant, out of scale and incongruous with the existing dwelling, thus causing harm to the character and appearance of both the

dwelling and the street scene. This application is essentially a resubmission of that scheme. The application proposals are however of a reduced scale and massing, and a fundamentally different design.

Members should also note that this application is in amended form. The design of the scheme has been revised following officer concerns over its impact on the street scene.

Design

The extension would be set down and set back from the main dwelling and I am of the view that it appears as the subordinate part of the resulting compound building. The pitched roofs and gable walls of the extension would match those on the main dwelling. Although dormer windows are not a feature of the main dwelling, I am of the view that these would reflect the gable wall at the front of the building. On the above basis I am of the view that the extension would respect the design and detailing of the main dwelling.

Although the extension would appear to use the same materials as the main dwelling, I would have concerns over the ratio of render to brickwork as this appears to be incongruous with the main dwelling. This need not however be an issue at this stage as material details can be addressed through the imposition of a condition on any planning permission granted.

It is noted that the proposal would involve a large extension to the property but I do not consider that it would be tantamount to a new dwelling. The extension would be subordinate in design and there would clearly be a physical and functional relationship with the main dwelling. I do not therefore have any concerns in this respect. Members should also note that there are examples of extensions of a similar scale to the proposal at 9 Orchard Close and 9 Woodchester Close. Large extensions are not therefore unprecedented in this area.

Impact on Street Scene

Given the site's corner location it is considered that the proposed extension would fall within two street scene contexts (Thicknall Rise and Newfield Road). It is considered that both street scenes are defined by similar characteristics. They both contain detached dwellings of a simple pitched roof form. The majority of the dwellings have gable walls within their front elevation and there are a number of examples of dormer windows. The design and detailing of the dwelling would reflect these characteristics and I am of the view that the extension would assimilate well within both street scenes.

It is acknowledged that corner plots can be more sensitive to new development given their prominence in the street scene. It is however considered that the proposed extension is set a sufficient enough distance away from the site boundary to not appear as an obtrusive or dominant feature of the street scene. Members should note that the grass verge between the site boundary and the highway serves to further reduce the prominence of the extension, and retain a sense of openness.

Residential Amenity

The proposed extension would involve a number of new windows in its rear elevation. These would not however overlook the windows or private garden in the adjacent dwelling, no .53 Newfield Road. I do not therefore consider that any loss of privacy would result.

Third party representations

I note the concerns raised by local residents over the proposed development. These can be summarised as follows:

- The extension would be tantamount to a new dwelling.
- The extension would be over dominant and out of scale with the existing building.
- The extension would be incongruous with the design of the existing dwelling and the other dwellings in the surrounding area.
- The extension would project beyond the building line.
- The extension would obstruct road visibility.
- The boundary fence would harm the character of the area.
- The extension would result in a loss of light and outlook to the adjacent dwelling.
- The windows in the extension would overlook the opposing property.

I will consider each of these points in the order they are presented above.

It is considered that the first three of these concerns have been duly considered in the 'Design' and 'Impact on Street Scene' section of this report. I will not therefore reiterate these considerations here.

It is noted that the extension would project beyond the building line set by the dwellings along Newfield Road. I do not however consider that any visual harm would result due to the distance between the extension and these properties.

I note residents' concerns over the extension obstructing road visibility but I am also mindful of the lack of objection from the County Council's Highways Engineer on this matter. Having regard to this specialist advice I consider this not to be an issue.

Members should note that the 1 metre high fence shown on the submitted site plan is an existing feature of the site. Schedule 2, Part 2, Class A of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (as amended) allows the applicant to erect a fence adjacent to the highway up to a height of 1 metre above ground level without the need for planning permission. The fence shown on the submitted Site Plan would therefore constitute permitted development and it does not form part of this application.

The concerns raised in relation to the extension causing a loss of light and outlook to the adjacent dwelling (number 53 Newfield Road) are found to be unjustified. The proposed extension would be set some distance away from the nearest dwelling no. 53 Newfield Road. This distance is considered to be too great for any loss of light or outlook to result.

I note that the occupier of no. 68 Newfield Road raises concerns over the new windows in the side of the extension overlooking their property. These windows would however be located around 40 metres away from this property. The Council's Residential Design Guide (SPG1) advises that a 21 metre distance should be provided between such windows. Having regard to this guidance, I do not consider that any loss of privacy would result.

Conclusion

It is considered that the extension would be of an acceptable design and no harm to the character of the street scene would result. The extension would cause no harm to the amenity of the occupiers of the nearby dwellings. The concerns raised by local residents are noted but I do consider there to be any valid issues that would justify the refusal of the application. Taking these points into consideration I am of the view that the proposal is in accordance with the relevant policies of the adopted Development Plan and I recommend that planning permission is approved.

RECOMMENDATION: that permission is **APPROVED**.

Conditions:

1. The development must be begun not later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date of this permission.
2. Notwithstanding the approved elevation drawings contained on Drawing Number MC/206/01 (received 15.04.2010), details of the form, colour and finish of the materials to be used externally on the walls and roofs shall be subject to the approval, in writing, of the local planning authority before any work on the site commences.