

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, DY9 0LQ	Res	10/0206 04.05.2010

Councillor Mrs. M. A. Sherrey JP 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; expired 06.04.2010. 21 letters.emails received; concerns raised over the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The extension would be too large. ▪ 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

Relevant Policies (cont'd)

BDLP DS13, S10
Others PPS1, SPG1

Relevant Planning History

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

Notes

Members will note that this application was deferred at the meeting of the Planning Committee on 17th May 2010 in order for further information to be gathered on the floorspace / volume increases of the proposals over that of the original dwelling, and related information concerning previous applications. This report will present only the further information requested by the Committee. A full assessment of the application can be found in the case officer's report to Committee dated 17th May 2010. A copy of that report is attached at Appendix 1.

The table below shows the floor area and volume of the original dwelling, the proposed extension, the extension proposed under refused application ref. 09/0403, and the extension approved at 9 Woodchester. The extension approved under 08/0900 was selected as an example of other large extensions in the area. The table also shows the percentage increase of each extension over and above the original dwelling.

Table 1: Floor Area and Volume of Proposed Extension

	Floor Area		Volume	
	m ²	%	m ³	%
Original Dwelling	187.36	N/A	580.2	N/A
Proposed Extension	117.96	63	363.08	63
Refused Application ref. 09/0403	153.2	82	570.38	98
Original Dwelling 9 Woodchester	214.05	N/A	776.55	N/A
Extension at 9 Woodchester	107.19	50	442.76	57

Members will note from the table that the floor area and volume of the proposed extension has been significantly reduced from that of the refused scheme. Members will also note that the volume of the proposed extension is only slightly larger than the volume of the extension recently approved at the nearby dwelling 9 Woodchester. This highlights the fact that the proposal is a significant improvement on the original proposal at the site, and that there is precedence for equally large extensions within the vicinity.

Members are reminded that there is no limit on the size of an extension to a dwelling in this non Green Belt location. Instead regard should be paid to the scale, bulk and massing of the extension in relation to the existing property. Policy S10 of the BDLP requires that the original building should always remain as the dominant feature of the resulting compound building. It should be noted that the volume of the proposed extension would be less than two thirds of the original dwelling. The extension would be

set down from the main dwelling by 0.9 metres and set back from the front elevation of the main dwelling by 0.8 metres. The width of the front elevation of the proposed extension would be approximately 74% of the main dwelling. Taking these points into consideration it is clear that the original dwelling would remain as the dominant feature of the resulting compound building and I would not have any concerns in this respect.

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.