PLANNING APPLICATION NUMBER:P09/1414

Type of approval sought		Full Planning Permission	
Ward		ST JAMESS	
Applicant		Mr Richard Price	
Location:	91, GRENVILLE ROAD, DUDLEY, DY1 2NF		
Proposal	TWO STOREY SIDE EXTENSION AND REAR CONSERVATORY (RESUBMISSION OF REFUSED APPLICATION P09/1005)		
Recommendation Summary:	APPROVE SU	JBJECT TO CONDITIONS	

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

- 1. The application site measures 224m² and the property is an asymmetrical semidetached dwelling featuring a pitched roof with gable end. Both the front and rear elevations feature a window that splits the eaves and there is a ground floor front canopy. The property also benefits from an existing single storey garage on the western side and a rear conservatory. The house is set back by over 5m from the highway and has a driveway and garden to the front with garden to the rear.
- 2. No. 89 Grenville Road forms the other half of the semi-detached pair and is located to the east with no. 93 Grenville Road to the west. Nos. 84 and 86 Grenville Road are situated across the highway to the north at 25m distance and at 1m higher within the road. Nos. 232 and 234 Russells Hall Road are to the rear at 24m separation distance.
- 3. The property is located within a predominately residential estate built during the 1960s. This property is set within a row of ten similar asymmetrical semi-detached dwellings with the other surrounding properties being semi-detached dwellings or blacks of flats, with most being of a similar age. The ten semi-detached properties, of which the application property is one, are separated in a rhythmic row with gaps

between and on a staggered building line. The ground level lowers slightly from the highway towards the application property.

PROPOSAL

- 4. This proposal seeks permission for a two storey side and single storey rear extension with front canopy to provide a kitchen extension, utility, W.C., conservatory and bedroom at ground floor level with a study and store at first floor level.
- 5. On the western elevation the ground floor would line through with the front and rear elevations and would measure 2.5m in width and 7.2m in length. It would feature a pitched roof above measuring 5.5m in total height and would comprise a rear facing dormer window.
- 6. The rear extension would project by 5.7m to the rear and would be 2.7m in width with a hipped roof above measuring 3.3m in height.
- The rear conservatory addition would infill between the proposed rear extension and existing rear conservatory and would measure 1.7m in length, 2.5m in width with a hipped roof above measuring 3.3m in height.
- 8. The front canopy would extend across the 2.5m width of the extension and would measure 3m in maximum height.
- 9. Certificate A of the ownership certificate has been signed and the application will therefore be determined on the understanding that all of the development (including guttering and fascia) falls inside land within the ownership of the applicant. It has since been confirmed that no part of the development would overhang the boundary.

HISTORY

APPLICATION	PROPOSAL	DECISION	DATE
No.			
P09/1005	Two storey side and single	Refused	18.09.2009
	storey rear extensions. Rear		
	conservatory.		

10. This property has one previous relevant application.

This application was refused on the following grounds:

 The proposed development would disturb the existing rhythm and gaps within the street in this section of Grenville Road, whereby a clear visual separation is maintained at first floor level between ten adjoining semi-detached dwellings of which the application property is one, and would therefore be an obtrusive and visually discordant addition in the street scene, to the detriment of the visual amenity and character of the area.

The property also benefits from a loft conversion carried out in 2003 under permitted development rights.

PUBLIC CONSULTATION

- 11.
- Direct notification was carried out to six surrounding properties by way of neighbour notification letters and one written representation objecting to the scheme has been received. The latest date for comments was 12th November 2009.
- The objection is based on the following material planning considerations:
 - o That the guttering would overhang the boundary
 - o The impact on the natural daylight received at this property
 - That the extension would be out of character with the other buildings in the street and would have a terracing effect
 - The impact on privacy
 - The face that it would be a two storey extension and the height would be up to the height of the existing second floor
 - There would be a lack of parking on-site which may impact on highway safety

OTHER CONSULTATION

12. No further consultation necessary.

RELEVANT PLANNING POLICY

13.

- Adopted Unitary Development Plan (2005)
- DD4 Development in Residential Areas
 - Supplementary Planning Guidance

PGN 12 – The 45 Degree Code

PGN 17 – House Extension Design Guide

Parking Standards and Travel Plans SPD

ASSESSMENT

14. The proposed development must be assessed with regard to its design and whether it would be compatible with the existing dwelling and the character of the area. The potential impact on the amenity of nearby neighbours must also be assessed along with the relevant parking standard requirements.

15. Key Issues

- Impact on the character of the area
- Impact on residential amenity
- Parking Standards

Impact on the character of the area

16. Policy DD4 of the Adopted UDP states that extensions to residential dwellings will be allowed provided they do not adversely affect the character of the area or residential amenity. The front mono-pitched canopy at ground floor level would match the existing front canopy and would be in-keeping with the dwelling. The pitched roof side extension would also relate well to the existing property and despite the roof slope not exactly matching the original roof it would be appropriate and in-keeping. The lowered roof height of the two storey extension from the previous submission would also mean that the extension would be subservient to the original property. The proposed extension would not unbalance the pair of semi-detached houses to which the application property belongs. Although the proposal includes a two storey extension a visual break between the adjacent properties

would be maintained at first floor level. The row of 10 semi-detached properties would therefore appear as a defined development with a clear rhythm and the break would not be removed or rhythm of the street scene disturbed. It is therefore considered that these additions would not create an incongruous feature which would adversely impact upon the street scene or be prominent on the host property. The rear extensions would not be visible from the street scene and there would be no impact on the character of the area. The development would therefore comply with Policy DD4 of the adopted UDP and Planning Guidance Note 17: House Extension Design Guide.

Impact on residential amenity

- 17. There would be no impact on residential amenity for no. 93 Grenville Road as there are no habitable room windows on the side facing towards the proposal except an ancillary kitchen door. Although the rear extension would breach the 45 degree code guidelines with regards to this property there is an existing single storey rear garage which would screen the development and already restricts light to these rear facing windows. The projection of the rear extension would be no worse than the existing garage serving this no. 91 Grenville Road. Therefore, there would be no negative impacts on residential amenity for this dwelling.
- 18.No. 89 Grenville Road would suffer no adverse impacts as the majority of the proposal would not be visible from the property. The rear extensions would not breach the 45 degree code with respect to this dwelling and the development would be screened by the existing conservatory.
- 19. Nos. 84 and 86 Grenville Road would be over 24m from the facing habitable room windows and at slightly higher ground level. This would be no worse than the existing situation and there would be no negative impacts on amenity for these dwellings.
- 20. The properties to the rear on Russells Hall Road would be over 24m from the two storey facing habitable room windows and 18m from the single storey aspect. There would be no impact on residential amenity for these dwellings.
- 21. It is considered that there would be no demonstrable harm to neighbouring properties in terms of loss of light, outlook or privacy as a result of the proposal. The

proposal therefore complies with Policy DD4 – Development in Residential Areas, PGN 12 – The 45 Degree Code - and PGN 17 – House Extension Design Guide.

Parking Standards

22. With the addition of a fourth bedroom there would be a requirement for up to three spaces to be provided on-site and safely off the highway. There would be a loss of some hard-standing to the side of the property and two slightly sub-standard spaces would be provided to the front of the property. Although the spaces would be slightly under the standard size a ground floor side extension could be completed under permitted development rights and these are maximum limits for car parking spaces. The residential area also provides some opportunity for on-street parking and therefore, this proposal complies with the Parking Standards and Travel Plans SPD.

CONCLUSION

23. It is considered that the proposed two storey side and single storey rear extension with front canopy would not have an adverse impact upon the visual amenity and character of the area. The proposed development would relate to the original dwelling through replication of the roof design and a lowered ridge height would ensure that the addition was subservient to the host dwelling. There would still remain a gap between the row of similar properties and there would be no adverse impact on the rhythm and gap of the street scene. The front canopy would relate to the dwelling and line through with the existing canopy whilst the rear extensions would not be visible from the street scene. The additions would not impact on residential amenity for neighbouring properties and there would remain adequate parking on the frontage. The proposal would therefore comply with Policy DD4 of the adopted UDP and Planning Guidance Note 17: House Extension Design Guide.

RECOMMENDATION

24. It is recommended that the application is approved subject to the following conditions:

Reason for the Grant of Planning Permission

It is considered that the proposed two storey side with single storey rear extensions and front canopy would relate satisfactorily to the existing dwelling, protecting visual and residential amenity. There would be no demonstrable harm to neighbouring properties and no adverse effect on the street scene or character of the area. The proposal, therefore, complies with the following Council policies and guidance; Policy DD4 – Development in Residential Areas – Adopted Dudley UDP, PGN 12 – the 45 Degree Code and PGN 17 – House Extension Design Guide.

The decision to grant planning permission has been taken with regard to the policies and proposals in the Dudley Unitary Development Plan and to all relevant material considerations including Supplementary Planning Guidance.

The above is intended as a summary of reasons for the grant of planning permission for further detail please see the application report.

Note for Applicant

The development hereby approved will remain in accordance with the approved drawings received on the 12th October 2009 and labelled 'RP.3062/09 Revision A' unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Conditions and/or reasons:

- 1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.
- 2. The materials to be used in the approved development shall match in appearance, colour and texture those of the existing building unless otherwise agreed in writing with the local planning authority.
- 3. A hard-standing sufficient for two cars to park clear of the highway shall be maintained at the front of the property for the life of the development, unless otherwise agreed in writing with the local planning authority.

219



