

## **PLANNING APPLICATION NUMBER:P07/1853**

Type of approval sought	Full Planning Permission
Ward	Coseley East
Applicant	Mr J. Sund
Location:	<b>12, THE PADDOCK, COSELEY, BILSTON, WV148XZ</b>
Proposal	<b>CREATION OF UPPER STOREY ERECTION OF EXTERNAL CAVITY WALL AND NEW ROOF TO EXISTING BUNGALOW AND SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION (RESUBMISSION OF WITHDRAWN APPLICATION P07/1533)</b>
Recommendation Summary:	<b>REFUSE</b>

### **SITE AND SURROUNDINGS**

1. The site comprises what was formerly a two bedroomed bungalow occupying a triangular plot of approximately 270sqm (0.027ha). The property is currently roofless and uninhabitable. It is adjoined to the south by another bungalow (no.13) and to the north-east by a semi-detached house (no.13) and to the north-east by a semi-detached house (no. 11). All three properties are set at an angle to the road and to each other such that no. 12 is almost fully behind no. 13 with no. 11 being angled towards no. 12 so that its rear elevation obliquely faces the side garden fence to no. 12. No. 11 is set about 1.0m lower than no. 12. At the rear of all three properties is a cricket ground in what is otherwise a wholly residential area.

### **PROPOSAL**

2. It is proposed to erect a full pitched roof with gable ends within which would be a bedroom. It is also proposed to erect a flat-roofed extension at the rear to form a lounge/dining room and to construct replacement cavity walling around the existing structure.

3. Internally, the former lounge would become a bedroom, the former dining room a kitchen and the former kitchen a bathroom. The bedroom in the projecting part of the bungalow at the front would remain a bedroom and the proposed extension would provide a replacement lounge and dining area.
4. The rear extension would project 3.5m and be 5.6m wide. The ridge of the roof would be 5.9m above ground.

## HISTORY

### 5. Planning History

Application No. P03/1511 - First floor extension to convert bungalow to four bedroomed house.

Refused on 25.09.03 for the following reasons:

- Dominant and overbearing effect upon no. 11 The Paddock
- Overlooking and loss of privacy for residents on the other side of the road
- Adverse effect upon outlook from no. 13 due to the stagger between the two properties.

### 6. Application No. P04/1716 – Retention of roof (retrospective)

Refused on 08.11.04 for the following reasons:

- Adverse effect upon adjoining residents because of its size and position.
- Not in keeping with the original dwelling and unduly prominent and incongruous feature in the street scene.

Appeal dismissed. An enforcement notice was subsequently served requiring the removal of the roof which was complied with. This is why the property has no roof.

### 7. Application No. P07/1533 – Creation of upper storey and new roof to existing bungalow.

Withdrawn on 20.09.07.

## **PUBLIC CONSULTATION**

8. A letter of objection has been received from the occupiers of No. 11 The Paddock. The objections raised are:

- Adverse effect upon outlook and afternoon sunlight and overbearing structure because of the height and mass of the roof which is much greater than the original, hipped roof to the bungalow. This would result in an 'enclosed, gloomy feel' to the property especially within the small rear garden. This would be exacerbated.
- The ridge of the roof is higher than it needs to be because, when the previous unauthorised roof was removed, the additional four courses of brickwork that had been added when the roof was built were not removed. The current plans appear to show these courses being retained.

## **OTHER CONSULTATION**

9. None required.

## **RELEVANT PLANNING POLICY**

10. Adopted UDP

DD4 – Development in Residential Areas.

Supplementary Planning Guidance

PGN 17 House Extension Design Guide.

## **ASSESSMENT**

11. The key issues are:

- Impact upon the street scene
- Impact upon neighbours

### Impact upon the street scene

12. The proposed front elevation is generally well proportioned and would be very similar to the adjoining bungalow in appearance. Although there would be two velux windows in the front pitch, this would not necessarily detract from the appearance of the property. The existing building is prominent in the street because it has no roof. The site is also vacant and is suffering some vandalism. Accordingly, it is considered that the proposals would actually benefit the street scene.

### Impact upon neighbours

13. The original bungalow had a hipped roof and a ridge height of 5.25 metres. The hips were quite pronounced such that the ridge was only 1.7m long compared with a bungalow width of 8.7 metres. The roof would have been too small to be converted to a bedroom.
14. The current applicant's first application (P07/1533) showed a gable-ended roof 6.8m high at the ridge and accommodating two bedrooms. On being advised that this was considered excessive, he withdrew the application in favour of the current scheme which shows a similar roof but lower (at 5.9m) and providing a single bedroom only. This would be 0.75m higher than the original roof and includes gable ends rather than hips.
15. In terms of the impact upon no. 13, it is not considered that there would be any adverse effect despite the pronounced stagger between the two properties. A conservatory has been built behind the nearest habitable room window at no. 13 the new roof would not appear to breach the 45° code guidelines for this reason. Also, the new roof would be on the north side of no. 13's back garden so the passage of the sun would prevent any overshadowing of the neighbours' garden. No objection has been received from the occupiers.
16. The agent states that, to achieve a 2.0m high headroom and provide sufficient area for a usable bedroom, the height of the proposed roof cannot be lowered any further

and it would not be possible to hip the two ends. In fact, in its amended form and allowing for a ceiling height of 2.3 metres, the loft bedroom would be split by the stairs to form two areas of 1.0m x 3.0m and 1.0m x 3.9m either side. At 2.0m ceiling height, the room would be 1.8m x 8.4m but, again, split by the stairs. Hipping the roof would reduce this area substantially, to the point where it would not be a viable development.

17. These points are accepted and it would appear that, if a usable room is to be provided in the roofspace, the roof itself is as low as it could be.
18. So far as the additional four course of brickwork laid by the previous owner to effectively raise the ceiling height of the bungalow prior to the unauthorised roof being constructed is concerned, the agent has responded by submitting a plan showing the eaves to the new roof 0.25m above the top of the existing ground floor window openings. It is normal building practice to put a lintel over a window and, given the span of the existing rooms in this case, the correct lintel when faced would be three brickwork courses deep. The 0.25m shown by the agent would be equivalent to four brickwork courses. Therefore, the distance to the eaves would be only one course of brickwork more than it would need to be to satisfy Building Regulations. On this basis, it is considered that the overall height of the bungalow is virtually as low as it could be.
19. In dismissing the appeal against the former roof, the Inspector considered that the increased height and width over the original roof would give the rear of No. 11 an 'enclosed and gloomy feel' and concluded that the roof would 'harm the living conditions of the occupiers of No. 11 by reason of the adverse visual impact and effect on available sunlight'. Although the exact height of the former roof was never known, the owner had stated that the roof had been raised 1.65 metres. This would have given a ridge height of 6.9m which is 1.0m higher than the current proposal.
20. The issue is really whether a roof 1.0m lower than the previous one and 0.75m higher than the original roof would adversely affect the amenities of No. 11. In the light of the Inspector's remarks on this issue, it is considered that the impact would be

detrimental and, therefore, that the application should be refused. This would effectively mean that no bedroom could be accommodated in the roof of this property.

21. So far as the proposed ground floor extension is concerned, although this would be visible above the existing boundary fence from the rear rooms and garden at No. 11, it is not considered that its impact would be detrimental. Also, this extension is below the permitted development tolerance for the property and would not actually need planning permission.

## **CONCLUSION**

22. The existing property is vacant, uninhabitable and has no roof. As such, it is detrimental to the street scene. Renovation and a replace roof are urgently required and would be provided by the proposed development. However, notwithstanding the proposed loft bedroom being reduced in height and floor area as far as possible to maintain a viable room, it is considered that the impact of the proposed roof upon No. 11, The Paddock, would be unacceptable and would adversely affect the amenities of the occupiers of that property.

## **RECOMMENDATION**

23. It is recommended that the application be refused for the following reason:-

Conditions and/or reasons:

1. The proposed new roof would adversely affect the amenities of the occupiers of No. 11, The Paddock, by reason of its height, mass and extent. As such, it would be contrary to Policy DD4 of the adopted Dudley UDP.