

PLANNING APPLICATION NUMBER:P07/1660

Type of approval sought	Full Planning Permission
Ward	Kingswinford South
Applicant	Mr M Hammond
Location:	COPPINS, 105, STREAM ROAD, KINGSWINFORD, WEST MIDLANDS, DY6 9NP
Proposal	SINGLE STOREY FRONT EXTENSION TO CREATE AN ENLARGE GARAGE AND FIRST FLOOR SIDE EXTENSION TO CREATE EN-SUITE BEDROOM. (RESUBMISSION OF PREVIOUSLY REFUSED APPLICATION P06/1351)
Recommendation Summary:	REFUSE

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

1. The site comprises a substantial, four bedroomed detached house occupying a rectangular plot 64m deep and 16.5m wide (0.1 hectare). The house itself is two storey and there are single storey elements either side such that the property extends the full width of the plot. It is set back some 24m from the boundary with the highway which comprises a 4.0m wide cul-de-sac with no footways 125m long off Compton Drive. The end of the access road and the turning head are situated immediately in front of the property. The access road runs parallel with the A491 Stream Road from which it is separated by a grassed verge between 5m and 9m wide containing a number of mature trees. Stream Road is also at a lower level.
2. The immediate vicinity is characterised by sizable dwellings in plots of varying size. It is adjoined by a house of similar size and design to the south (no. 103) and by a large bungalow to the north (no. 107). There are a number of mature trees along the access road and in front gardens, the majority of which are preserved. Two trees in the front garden of no. 105 are preserved and three in the front garden of no. 103. The substantial grounds of New Bradley Hall, a Council run residential facility in Compton Drive, adjoin all the properties along the access road.

PROPOSAL

3. It is proposed to erect a single storey extension in front of the garage (which is situated adjacent to the boundary with no. 103) to form a new garage with the existing garage becoming a store. The new garage would incorporate part of the existing, would be 1.5m wider (at 4.9m) and would project a further 2.0m from the main front wall of the house giving an overall projection of just under 5.0 metres. It would have a full pitched roof hipped at the front, the ridge of which would be slightly lower than the existing garage.
4. It is also proposed to erect a first floor extension over the rear part of the existing garage, the adjoining bathroom, passageway and kitchen/dining room to provide an additional bedroom with en-suite bathroom. The extension would align with the back wall of the house and be recessed approximately 1.0m from the main front wall of the property. It has been designed to match the distinctive, half-hipped roof of the property with matching front dormer to the existing at the front.

HISTORY

5. Application No. P04/0834 – Single and two storey extensions at front, rear and along both sides of house to create double garage, sunroom, covered swimming pool and store with first floor study and bedroom.
Refused on six grounds on 11.06.04.
6. Application No. P04/2253 – Single and two storey extension on southern side of house adjacent to no. 103, to create double garage with two bedrooms and en-suite bathroom above.
Refused on 23.12.04 on the ground that the extensions were out-of- scale and character with the property and would unbalance the relationship with nos. 103 and 107 thereby affecting the neighbours' amenities and the street scene.
7. Application No. P05/0691 – Single storey extension to create double garage and store, and first floor extension to provide bedroom and en-suite bathroom.

Refused on 14.06.05 on the grounds that the development would adversely affect the outlook from the two facing bedroom windows serving the main bedroom at no. 103, and because the drawings were inaccurate and unclear to the extent that a proper detailed consideration could not be made.

8. Application No. P06/1351 – Single storey extension at front to create a double garage, and first floor extension to provide bedroom and en-suite bathroom. (This application was essentially the same as P05/0691 except that the roof of the first floor extension had been altered and the ridge of the garage roof was slightly higher).

Refused on 25.08.06 on the grounds that the development was out-of-scale with the property and would adversely affect the street scene, and because the side extension would have an 'overbearing appearance from the windows serving a bedroom at no. 103 Stream Road causing a detrimental visual impact and harming outlook from those windows'. It was also pointed out that the drawings 'contained a number of inaccuracies and inconsistencies' but this did not constitute a reason for refusal.

9. The current application differs in the following respects from P06/1351:
 1. The projection of the garage has been reduced from 7.7m to 4.9m and access would be from a single up-and-over door at the front rather than two, side-hinged double doors in the side (facing no. 107).
 2. The ridge of the roof would be 0.45m lower at 4.15m and the front would be hipped rather than gabled.
 3. The proposed first floor bedroom would now be fully within roofspace with dormer windows at front and rear thereby reducing the mass of the extension.
10. It is important to note that in the current application the survey elevations of the existing property have been re-drawn in response to previous references to inaccuracies which had been brought to officers' attention by the two adjoining neighbours. In all the previous applications, the ridge height of the house scaled at 6.2 metres. On the re-drawn plan, the ridge is 7.5m above ground.

PUBLIC CONSULTATION

11. A letter of objection has been received from the occupiers of no. 103 Stream Road. The objections raised are:

- Detrimental to the outlook from the main bedroom at the property which is lit by two small windows which directly face the side of no. 105, the existing garage to which is 4.25m from the windows and the existing main side wall of the house 9.0 metres away. This is already below the Council's minimum distance standard of 14m between a habitable room window and a gable wall.
- Out of character and balance with the house itself and with nos. 103 and 107, which constituted a reason for refusal of previous applications.
- The forward extension of the garage and its increased width would present a 'dominating and intrusive sight' from the driveway of no. 103 and the access road.
- The proposed garage could seriously damage an attractive 30-40 year old conifer growing along the boundary between the two properties.
- Possible damage to the private sewer serving both properties because the proposed garage would be directly over it.
- The plans still show errors and anomalies which would militate against making a sound, reliable decision on the proposals. For example, the house is shown as being 1.3m higher on the current (re-drawn) plans.
- The applicant runs a heating and plumbing business and some of the floor space to be provided may be used in connection with the business.

12. It should be noted that this neighbour has objected to all the previous applications.

OTHER CONSULTATION

13. None required.

RELEVANT PLANNING POLICY

14. Adopted UDP

DD4 Development in Residential Areas

Supplementary Planning Guidance

PGN 17 House Extension Design Guide

ASSESSMENT

15. The key issues are:

- impact upon the character of the area/street scene
- impact upon no. 103 Stream Road

Impact upon the character of the area/street scene

16. As the plans appended to this report show, the current proposals are substantially the same as three of the four previous applications in that they include a new garage projecting forward of the existing and a first floor extension on the southern side of the house. All of those applications were refused because of adverse effect upon the street scene in that the infilling of the gap at first floor level upto the boundary with no. 103 would upset the visual relationship between the three properties, nos. 103, 105 and 107, to an unacceptable degree and would be contrary to the character of the locality which mostly exhibits single storey buildings at the sides and visual gaps between properties.

17. In the light of this, it would be inconsistent and illogical to reach a different conclusion, notwithstanding the complementary matching design of the extensions. Accordingly, the previous reason for refusal relating to impact upon the street scene has not been overcome.

Impact upon No. 103 Stream Road

18. The previous two applications have been refused because of the adverse effect the development would have upon the outlook from the main bedroom at no. 103, the two windows to which would directly face the proposed first floor extension.
19. The applicant has attempted to lessen the impact upon the neighbours' bedroom by effectively putting all the proposed first floor accommodation within the roofspace with dormer windows at front and rear rather than just in the front as in the previous application. Also, the length of the garage has been reduced and the pitched roof is lower and has slightly less mass because of the hip at the front.
20. However, to maintain a half-hip to keep the whole house in balance, the end wall of the extension would be higher than in the previous scheme. The actual impact upon the neighbours' outlook would, therefore, be about the same across the current and previous schemes.
21. The extension site has been viewed from the neighbours' bedroom. The outlook from this room onto the side of the applicants' house is poor but this is how the properties were built many years ago and doubtless reflected the design concept at the time to maintain gaps at the sides of the properties. The proposed extension would impact upon the outlook from the room and, as it would effectively be closing down the space in front of the bedroom windows and reducing the gap between the windows and the side wall of no. 105, it is considered that the impact would be adverse. The distance between the two would certainly be well below that normally required by the Council in similar situations, i.e. 14 metres. Accordingly, it is considered that this particular reason for refusal has not been overcome.

Other issues

22. So far as the impact upon the conifer tree is concerned, this tree is not included in the blanket Tree Preservation Order covering many of the trees in this area and would not warrant preservation itself. The front gardens of nos. 103 and 105 contain other trees which are preserved and which would not be affected by the proposals. It is also noted that the roots to the conifer are already causing cracks in the tarmac in front of the applicants' garage.
23. The issue of the drain is a private matter between the two parties and is not material to the consideration of the proposals.
24. There are still some inaccuracies in the drawings i.e. chimneys shown flush with the gables rather than projecting, but the re-drawn elevations do appear accurate in terms of the general proportions of the property. Any such inaccuracies are not material in assessing the impact upon no. 103 or the street scene, which can be adequately gauged from the site inspections that have been undertaken.
25. The application is for bona fide residential extensions to a residential property. Should they be used in connection with a business which became the subject of a complaint, this would be investigated in the normal manner and would be reported on separately.

CONCLUSION

26. It is considered that the extensions have been well designed to complement this attractively designed property. However, the previous reasons for refusal relating to the impact upon the street scene and the outlook from the main bedroom at no. 103 have not been overcome.

RECOMMENDATION

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

Conditions and/or reasons:

1. The development proposed would be out-of-scale with the property and would adversely affect the relationship with the adjoining properties to the detriment of the character of the area and street scene contrary to policy DD4 of the adopted Dudley UDP.
2. The development proposed would have an overbearing appearance from the facing windows serving a bedroom at no. 103 Stream Road causing a detrimental visual impact upon the outlook from that room contrary to policy DD4 of the adopted Dudley UDP.