

PLANNING APPLICATION NUMBER:P05/2741

Type of approval sought	Full Planning Permission
Ward	Pedmore & Stourbridge East
Applicant	Mr D Salter
Location:	330, HAGLEY ROAD, STOURBRIDGE, DY9 0RD
Proposal	TWO STOREY AND 1ST FLOOR SIDE EXTENSIONS TO CREATE GARAGE WITH ENLARGED BEDROOM AND EN-SUITE ABOVE (RESUBMISSION OF REFUSED APPLICATION P05/2347)
Recommendation Summary:	APPROVE SUBJECT TO CONDITIONS

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

1. The site is a residential plot comprising of a detached dwelling located within a row of similar dwellings within an established residential area. The applicant's property and the adjacent property (No 332 Hagley Road) have integral single storey flat roofed single garages projecting forward of the main dwelling
2. The dwelling is located in an established residential area with detached residences the most dominant house type.

PROPOSAL

3. Permission is sought for a two storey and first floor side extension to create garage with enlarged bedroom and en-suite above. (Resubmission of refused application P05/2347)

HISTORY

4. There have been four previous applications at this property. This application is a resubmission of refused application P05/2347. It was refused for the following reason,

‘The proposed garage extension, by virtue of its siting and design would have an adverse impact upon the residential amenity of occupiers of No. 328 Hagley Road, contrary to policy DD4 and planning guidance notes 12 & 17.’

APPLICATION No.	PROPOSAL	DECISION	DATE
SB/62/393	Conservatory, verandah and tool shed.	Withdrawn	16/12/62
SB/63/235	Covered way, conservatory and tool shed.	Approved	02/08/63
89/51597	Bedroom, study and lounge extension.	Approved with Conditions	31/07/89
P05/2347	Two storey and 1st floor side extensions to create garage and enlarged family room with enlarged bedroom and en-suite above.	Refused	05/12/05

PUBLIC CONSULTATION

5. Six letters of neighbour notification were sent out with one written response received.
6. The neighbours at No. 328 Hagley Road provided the following objections;

- The overall scale of the proposed extension seems disproportionate and would take the building line up to the shared boundary, closing down the space between the properties significantly and increasing the proximity to each other. This in itself may restrict the feeling of light and space on the side and rear of our property.
- In allowing an extension of this nature it would totally inhibit our ability to extend our property towards the joint boundary should we wish to do so as this would cause a 'terrace effect' particularly to the frontage. We cannot extend our property to the other side as it borders a public footpath and right of way.
- We note that this application has made changes to the garage line in order to try to comply with the forty five degree rule. Having looked at the plans we would seriously question that to be the case. Furthermore the garage extension would result in the destruction of part of our front garden and trees, and the potential loss of light therefore remains inevitable.

OTHER CONSULTATION

7. Not applicable.

RELEVANT PLANNING POLICY

8. PGN's 12, 14 & 17 (The 45 Degree Code, Car Parking Standards & House Extension Design Guide) and Policy DD4 of the adopted UDP (Development in Residential Areas).

ASSESSMENT

9. The determining issue is whether the design of the extension has addressed the reasons for refusal in the original application and whether the new proposal is compatible with the existing dwelling and the character of the area. The impact upon the amenities of nearby residents will also be considered.
10. The proposed first floor side extension will be developed above the existing family room along the northern elevation of the dwelling in line with the existing front and rear elevations of the property. The design of the extension relates to the character

of the original house in terms of scale and design with the eaves detail, window design and roof style and pitch assimilating well with the features present in the existing dwelling. The extension would extend up to the boundary with No. 328, however the positioning of the houses would ensure that there would be no adverse terracing effect. As there are no side facing windows in the southern elevation of No. 328 there will be no adverse affect on the daylighting on any habitable room. This part of the proposal will therefore not have an adverse effect on the character of the area or upon the residential amenity of the adjacent property (No. 328). This adheres with PGN 17 (House Extension Design Guide) and the principles of policy DD4 of the adopted UDP.

11. The original application was refused due to the proposed garage extension at the front of the dwelling breaching the 45 degree code in relation to the living room of the adjacent dwelling. This new application has amended the scheme, reducing the garage extension by 0.95 metres as well as reducing the existing garage to the same length to provide a more appropriate design scheme. The proposal now adheres with PGN 12 (The 45 Degree Code) and will not adversely affect the residential amenity of the adjacent dwelling. As the design of the garage extension retains the characteristics of the existing garage, the extension will not appear as an incongruous addition within the street scene. The proposal therefore adheres with the principles of policy DD4 of the adopted UDP as well as PGN's 12 & 17.
12. Although the proposed garages with a length of 4.35m are not deemed as appropriate for a standard family car, there will not be any adverse affect on parking provision with the property also providing two spaces within the curtilage of the site. The garages will then be able to be utilised as storage space for the dwelling or as a parking area for a small hatchback motor vehicle. The proposal will not affect the provision of adequate on-site parking which adheres with policy DD4 of the adopted UDP and PGN 14 (Car Parking Standards).

CONCLUSION

14. The proposed development will have no adverse affect on the character of the area due to its design relating to the character of the original house in terms of scale and design. The residential amenity of the adjacent property will also not be adversely affected due to the proposed garage extension complying with the 45 degree code. The provision of adequate car parking space at the dwelling will not be affected by the proposals.
15. The reasons for refusing the original application have now been addressed to create a satisfactory development.
16. The proposal is in conformity with PGN's 12, 14 & 17 and policy DD4 of the adopted UDP and is therefore acceptable.

RECOMMENDATION

17. It is recommended that permission is granted subject to the following conditions.

REASON FOR APPROVAL

18. The decision to grant planning permission has been taken with regard to the policies and proposals in the adopted Dudley UDP (2005) and to all other relevant material considerations.

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 development shall closely match the type, texture and colour of the existing brickwork and roof tiles.

-
-
3. For the avoidance of doubt, this permission relates to drawing number C.C.S. 265 Rev. A and shall be implemented in strict accordance with these plans unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.

