# PLANNING APPLICATION NUMBER:P07/1736

Type of approval sought		Full Planning Permission	
Ward		ST JAMESS	
Applicant		Castle and Crystal Credit Union	
Location:	25, NEW STREET, DUDLEY, WEST MIDLANDS, DY1 1LT		
Proposal	INSTALLATION OF CHILLER UNIT AND EXTENDED SECURITY SCREEN TO FIRE ESCAPE (RETROSPECTIVE)		
Recommendation Summary:	REFUSE		

## SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

 The application site is the Castle & Crystal Credit Union premises at no. 25 New Street. At the rear is a yard enclosed by a high wall and the yard enables access to the rear of the unit. There is also a narrow passageway at the rear which acts as an access way/fire escape for the flats located at first floor level.

## PROPOSAL

- 2. The application is retrospective and involves the installation of a chiller unit larger than the one approved under P06/1669, and a security screen to obscure the chiller unit as installed.
- 3. The application is accompanied by a design and access statement.

#### **HISTORY**

4.

APPLICATION No.	PROPOSAL	DECISION	DATE
P06/1669	Single storey rear extension	Granted	13.10.06
	and installation of chiller unit		

## PUBLIC CONSULTATION

- 5. Five letters and one email of objection (from a Ward Councillor) have been received, raising the following issues:
  - Installed without planning permission
  - Intrusive, ugly and obstructive
  - Site in a passageway used by occupiers of flats above existing shops

The Ward Councillor has requested that the application be considered by the Development Control Committee.

## OTHER CONSULTATION

6. Head of Public Protection: No objection subject to a condition relating to noise levels.

## RELEVANT PLANNING POLICY

- 7. <u>Dudley UDP 2005</u>
  - DD1 Urban Design
  - DD4 Development in Residential Areas
  - CR5 Regeneration and Development of Centres
  - HE4 Conservation Areas
  - HE5 Buildings of Local Historic Importance
  - HE6 Listed Buildings

#### ASSESSMENT

- 8. The key issues for consideration in this application are as follows:
  - Principle
  - Impact on Visual Amenity

## 9. Principle

The principle of installing a chiller unit at the rear of the premises was accepted in the previously approved application (P06/1669) subject to satisfying criteria such as size, height, siting, visual amenity, character of the conservation area and impact on locally listed and listed buildings.

### 10. <u>Impact on Visual Amenity</u>

The chiller unit approved in the previous application was relatively discreet, slim, had dimensions of 0.8m (height) x 0.9m (width) x 0.25m (depth) and was sited no higher than the highest part of the rear wall. The unit as approved in application P06/1669 was also described in the manufacturers supporting information as 'ultra-compact and lightweight design'.

11. The chiller unit as installed is deeper and higher than the chiller unit as approved. The unit is 1.35m high x 0.30m deep and no longer adjoins the rear wall but is set on a support bracket and the unit is now located 0.25m from the wall. The setting of the chiller unit away from the wall only exacerbates its visual presence. The unit now projects 0.5m above the top of the side wall on which it is positioned and only highlights the visual impact of the chiller unit particularly when viewed from the passageway, the adjacent first floor residential flats and the chillers setting against the Grade II List Building at 59/60 Tower Street.

#### CONCLUSION

12. It is considered that the siting and size of the installed chiller unit and security screen has an adverse visual impact detrimental to visual amenity, the character of

the Dudley Town Centre Conservation Area and the setting of the Grade II Listed Building at 59/60 Tower Street.

## RECOMMENDATION

13. It is recommended that the application be refused for the following reasons:

#### Conditions and/or reasons:

1. It is considered that the siting and size of the installed chiller unit and security screen has an adverse visual impact detrimental to visual amenity, the character of the Dudley Town Centre Conservation Area and the setting of the Grade II Listed Building at 59/60 Tower Street. As such the development is contrary to policies DD1, DD4, HE4 and HE6 of the adopted UDP (2005).



