

PLANNING APPLICATION NUMBER: P11/0215

| | |
|-------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Type of approval sought | Full Planning Permission |
| Ward | PEDMORE & STOURBRIDGE EAST |
| Applicant | Mr Atma Matharu |
| Location: | 78, REDLAKE DRIVE, PEDMORE, STOURBRIDGE, WEST MIDLANDS, DY9 0RX |
| Proposal | TWO STOREY REAR EXTENSION (RESUBMISSION OF WITHDRAWN APPLICATION P10/1710) |
| Recommendation Summary: | APPROVE SUBJECT TO CONDITIONS |

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

1. The application site measures 445m² and the property is a detached dwelling featuring a half-hipped roof. The property benefits from a two storey front projection with half-hipped roof and a mono-pitched front canopy at ground floor level. The two storey front projection features a double garage and the site has a paved area to the front of this. The house also features an existing rear conservatory close to the boundary with no. 76 Redlake Drive. The ground level lowers towards the west.
2. No. 76 Redlake Drive is located to the north of the application site with no. 80 Redlake Drive immediately to the south and featuring a rear conservatory. Abutting the rear boundary of the site are nos. 22, 23 and 24 The Meadows at 27m distance. To the front of the application property are nos. 77, 79 and 81 Redlake Drive at over 30m from the front elevation.
3. The property is located within an established residential area with this dwelling having been built during the 1980s. The surrounding dwellings are predominantly large detached dwellings set within similar sized plots to the application site. None the rear at first floor level. The ground level lowers towards the properties to the west.

PROPOSAL

4. This proposal seeks permission for a two storey rear extension following demolition of the existing rear conservatory. This would provide an extended lounge and kitchen at ground floor level with two extended bedrooms with one en-suite bathroom at first floor level.
5. The two storey rear extension would line through with the existing side elevations and would project 2.5m past the original rear elevation. The addition would feature two sets of pitched roofs with gables facing to the south-west (rear). These roofs would be a maximum of 7m in height.

HISTORY

6. This property has one previous relevant application and also benefits from a single storey rear conservatory extension.

| APPLICATION No. | PROPOSAL | DECISION | DATE |
|-----------------|---------------------------|-----------|----------|
| P10/1710 | Two storey rear extension | Withdrawn | 24.01.11 |

The above application proposed a greater rear projection and was withdrawn after Officers advised that it would not be acceptable.

PUBLIC CONSULTATION

- Direct notification was carried out to thirty-two surrounding properties and thirty-four written representations objecting to the scheme have been received. The latest date for receipt of comment was 15th March 2011.
- The objections were based on the following material planning considerations:
 - Over-development of the site;
 - Overly large in size – depth, width and height, would not fit into the small size of gardens – reduced separation distance and disproportionate to main house and out of scale with other properties;
 - Loss of daylight to windows and garden;

- Restriction of outlook;
- Reduction in privacy due to separation distance;
- Out of character with the immediate neighbourhood and area;
- Overbearing impact due to the projection past the original rear elevation;
- That this proposal would set a precedent for further similar extensions which would encourage further extensions which would transform the neighbourhood;
- The extension would be too close to neighbours properties – i.e. encroachment;
- General impact on neighbour's amenity – highlighted by previous refusals in the area.

Other non material considerations have been mentioned such as covenants, land and property values, affecting the existing view and a reduction in garden area to application property to create a confined appearance.

OTHER CONSULTATION

None relevant

RELEVANT PLANNING POLICY

Saved Unitary Development Plan Policies

- DD1 Urban Design
- DD4 Development in Residential Areas

Supplementary Planning Documents / Guidance

- Parking Standards and Travel Plans Supplementary Planning Document
- PGN12: The 45 degree code guidelines
- PGN 17. House extension design guide

ASSESSMENT

7. 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.

8. The key issues are
 - Design
 - Neighbour Amenity
 - Access and Parking

Design

9. Policy DD4 of the saved 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 scale and mass of the two storey rear extension would be broadly in-keeping with the original size of the large property and would not represent overdevelopment of the site. The proposal would not be excessive in comparison to the existing footprint of the dwelling and the proposed extension would not project any further to the rear than the existing conservatory (which will be removed).
10. As a rear extension the proposal would not be seen from the highway to the front and would predominantly be screened from The Meadows to the side so would therefore not adversely affect the street scene or the character of the area. Although the two pitched roofs would not match precisely the main half-hipped roof of the property they would be an appropriate and symmetrical addition to the rear of the property. The two pitched roofs projections would also relate to the main two storey projection on the front of the dwelling and would enable the rear extension to have a reduced mass rather than an overly large single roof. The lowered ridge height of the additions would ensure that the extension remained a subservient addition to the main house which would therefore not be a dominant or out of character addition.
11. The fenestration of the proposal would also be acceptable and would relate satisfactorily to the original dwelling. Therefore, the overall size and design of the

proposal would be in-keeping with the original size and design of the host property so would be considered an acceptable addition. Therefore, in these respects the proposal would comply with Policy DD4 – Development in Residential Areas of the saved UDP (2005) and PGN 17 – House Extension Design Guide.

Neighbour Amenity

12. Whilst the proposed extension would be visible from No. 76 Redlake Drive the extension (which would project 2.5 metres from the rear elevation) would be positioned 2m from the side wall of the house and 2.75m from the nearest habitable room window ensuring that the 45 degree code would not be breached. The two windows that are located toward the boundary with No.78 both provide light to the same room, reducing the impact that the extension would have. Therefore, despite the orientation of the properties there would be no significant impact on daylight provision or outlook for this dwelling.
13. The two storey flank wall would also not be considered as overbearing when viewed from this house due to the set off the boundary from this property. The previous application proposed a larger extension and was considered unacceptable by Officers, however, it is considered that the 2.5 metres projection now proposed would be acceptable. There would be no proposed side facing windows to impact on privacy for the occupiers of no. 76 and the proposed rear facing windows would not result in a greater degree of overlooking than the existing situation. The extensions would be no closer than the existing property and despite the orientation of the dwellings there would not be a significant impact on daylight / sunlight provision or outlook. Therefore, on balance, the occupiers of this dwelling would not experience any significant impact on residential amenity.
14. No. 80 Redlake Drive would not be adversely affected by the proposal which would be located 2m from the side elevation of this house. There would be no breach of the 45 degree code guidelines with respect to the nearest habitable room windows and due to the 1m set off the boundary the addition would not appear overbearing when viewed from this house or impact significantly on outlook. Due to the orientation of the properties there would be no reduction in daylight or sunlight

provision to this property. There would also be no side facing windows to impact on privacy for the occupiers of this house and therefore the proposal would not result in a detrimental impact on residential amenity for the occupiers of No.80 Redlake Drive.

15. Nos. 77, 79 and 81 Redlake Drive would suffer no adverse impacts as the extension would not be visible from these properties due to screening provided by the original house.
16. Nos. 22, 23 and 24 The Meadow would be located at least 23m from the proposed extension which would also be located over 9.75m from rear boundary that is shared with these properties. This distance would be in accordance with Planning Guidance Note 17 which requires at least 22m between facing habitable room windows. Although the ground level reduces towards the houses to the rear it is not considered that the difference in land level is so significant that a greater separation distance would be required. It is a material consideration that under permitted development rights a two-storey extension with an overall projection of 3 metres, 0.5m greater than the existing proposal, could be erected if the overall width was reduced. Although there is a rear conservatory on no. 24 The Meadows the windows would not be directly facing towards this and there would be at a distance of at least 19m from the proposal. At this oblique angle this distance is considered to be, on balance, acceptable.
17. This separation distance is therefore considered to be appropriate for the two-storey rear extension which would be only 2.5m closer to these properties than the original dwelling. The ground level difference is not considered significant enough to require an increase in this separation distance, particularly taking into account the fall-back position of permitted development rights. Therefore, despite the change in ground level there would be no additional impact on daylight, outlook or privacy for the occupiers. Overall, there would be no significant harm to the occupiers of these properties resulting from the development.

18. Therefore, it is considered that there would not be any demonstrable harm to the amenities of the occupiers of neighbouring properties due to adequate separation distances. The two-storey rear extension would be set off the boundary with both adjoining properties to the side, nos. 76 and 80 Redlake Drive, and as a fairly modest rear projection would not appear overbearing. There would also be no significant loss of daylight provision or outlook to occupiers of both adjoining dwellings as a result of the proposal. The separation distance to properties to the rear would also be in accordance with PGN 17. The proposal therefore complies with Policy DD4 – Development in Residential Areas, PGN 12 – 45 degree Code and PGN 17 – House Extension Design Guide.

Access and parking

19. The proposal would not reduce the level of car-parking available and would also not increase the parking requirement at the property. At least three car parking spaces would be provided on-site and the proposal would therefore comply with the Parking Standards and Travel Plans SPD and Policy DD4 of the saved Unitary Development Plan (2005).

CONCLUSION

20. It is considered that the proposed rear extension would be of an in-keeping design and appropriate size in comparison to the original house and existing rear additions. Due to the location at the rear the proposals would not adversely affect the street scene and would not have an adverse impact on the visual amenity or the character of the area.
21. There would also be no significant impact on residential amenity for the occupiers of surrounding properties due to the modest rear projection and set off the boundary. The proposal would not increase the parking requirement of the property and there would be no reduction in parking spaces so the development would comply with Policy DD4 (Development in Residential Areas) of the saved Dudley UDP and PGN 17 (House Extension Design Guide).

RECOMMENDATION

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

Reason for approval

It is considered that the proposed two storey rear extension 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 decision to grant planning permission has been taken with regard to the policies and proposals in the adopted Black Country Joint Core Strategy (2011), the saved UDP (2005) and to all other relevant material considerations.

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

The development hereby permitted shall be built in accordance with the approved plans labelled Dwg. No. 1078/001 Rev A and the amended 'Block plan' 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. The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the details shown on plan labelled Dwg no. 1078/001 Rev. A and the amended 'Block plan' unless agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.




ECLIPSE
 ARCHITECTURE
 HAYWOOD HOUSE 40 NEW ROAD
 STOURBRIDGE WEST MIDLANDS DY8 1PA
 TEL/FAX +(44) 01384 387740
 DESIGN@ECLIPSEARCHITECTURE.CO.UK

Site:
78 Redlake Drive
Pedmore
Stourbridge

Title:
Block Plan

Scale:
1/500
 Drg No.:

Date:
March 2011
 Sheet Size:
A4

DRAWN BY: A.J. Denham BSc.(Hons) MCIAT AMASl

Write in dimensions to be taken only. Do not scale from drawing.
 Minor inaccuracies may occur due to printing processes.

© Eclipse Architecture (UK) 2010

