

PLANNING APPLICATION NUMBER: P05/2288

| | |
|-------------------------|--|
| Type of approval sought | FULL PLANNING PERMISSION |
| Ward | AMBLECOTE |
| Applicant | MR R LANGLEY |
| Location: | 72, HIGH STREET, AMBLECOTE, STOURBRIDGE, DY8 4DJ |
| Proposal: | FRONT AND SIDE EXTENSIONS TO CREATE COVERED YARD AND GARAGE. ERECTION OF BOUNDARY WALL. |
| Recommendation summary: | REFUSE |

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

1. The site is a locally listed detached property located at the foot of Holy Trinity Church (listed on the Council's Historic Environment Record), located in a mixed use area. It is situated on High Street, Amblecote, which is a classified road.

PROPOSAL

2. This is for front and side extensions to create a covered yard and garage and erection of a boundary wall (Part retrospective). Building work to the boundary wall and side extension has commenced.

HISTORY

- 3.

| APPLICATION No. | PROPOSAL | DECISION | DATE |
|-----------------|---------------------------|----------|---------|
| CB/78/1972 | Vehicular access crossing | Refused | 21/9/78 |
| | | | |

PUBLIC CONSULTATION

4. Local councillors, the chairman of Holy Trinity Church, the Secretary of Amblecote History Society and local residents objected to the proposal. A petition containing 120 names to the proposal was received. The main grounds for objection were:

- The changes would be visually obtrusive, out of keeping with the property, inappropriate in scale and type of construction materials.
- Previous permission for a dropped kerb was refused in the past by the Highways Dept on the grounds that it would be detrimental to highways safety.
- Inappropriate and dangerous siting of vehicular access.
- Suitability and safety of the retaining wall at the rear and disturbance to graves.
- Inaccurate existing plan drawings – neither the before or existing situation are accurately shown in the drawings. The original ‘clinker wall’ has been removed and replaced with modern red brick wall on two sections of the boundary.
- No party wall agreement served.
- Concern regarding the historic Victorian railings forming the boundary of the church yard.

OTHER CONSULTATION

5. Traffic & Road Safety – Objected to the proposal on the grounds that the proposal would provide inadequate access, contrary to DD6 and AM3:

- Length of drop crossing required for the development to permit a car to turn into and out of the access, is excessive and therefore would result in a danger to pedestrians.
- The width of the drive is inadequate to permit a car to stand while a driver/passenger gets into or out of the car.
- A car parked on a wider section of the drive to permit access to both sides of the car would then prevent main pedestrian access to and from the house.
- The angle by which the drive of a car emerges on the footway will have restricted visibility therefore increasing the dangers for all users of the highway.

Historic Environment Team – Objected to the proposal on the grounds that the existing clinker wall would be replaced with an inappropriately designed brick wall and timber infill panels. Both the garage (in terms of its location, scale and massing) and the proposed boundary walls would be an inappropriate alteration and extension to the locally listed building. In addition, they would have a detrimental impact on the setting of the locally listed building. Also, insufficient information has been supplied, in order to determine the impact on the graveyard – sections need to be supplied about the landscaping/earth removal that is being proposed. The principle of vehicular access has not been approved either. Therefore, the proposal is contrary to policy HE5 of the adopted UDP.

Head of Traffic and Road Safety – Section of retaining wall was subject to a retrospective application still not approved from 1999. The current application shows the existing non-approved retaining wall being extended. Full details including calculations for this wall to be approved. The same will apply to the walls incorporated buildings.

RELEVANT PLANNING POLICY

6. AM3 (Strategic Highway Network)
DD1 (Urban Design)
DD4 (Development in Residential Areas)
DD6 (Access and Transport Infrastructure)
HE5 (Buildings of Historic Importance)

PGN17 (House Extension Design Guide)

ASSESSMENT

7. The determining issues are whether the design of the proposal would be compatible with the existing locally listed dwelling, the setting of the listed building and the character of the area, policy guidelines and highways safety.
8. The height, scale, massing and position of the proposed garage relative to the public highway and materials/design of the existing side extension, boundary wall and proposed garage would appear dominant and incongruous within the streetscene and

would have a detrimental impact on the visual amenity of the area, locally listed building and setting of the listed building.

The existing walls on both sides of the vehicular access (portion adjacent to No.70 not shown on plans) would reduce visibility to the detriment of highways safety.

CONCLUSION

9. The proposal is thus considered to be an unduly prominent and incongruous feature within the streetscene, which has an adverse impact upon the character of the locally listed, listed building, surrounding area and highways safety. This is contrary to Policies AM3 (Strategic Highway Network), DD1 (Urban Design), DD4 (Development in Residential Areas), DD6 (Access and Transport Infrastructure), HE5 (Buildings of Historic Importance) and Planning Guidance Note 17 (House Extension Design Guide).

RECOMMENDATION

10. That the application be refused for the reason set out below and
11. Enforcement action be authorized to ensure the removal of the wall and side extension.

Conditions and/or reasons:

1. The development, by virtue of its height, scale, massing, materials, design and position relative to the public highway would appear dominant and incongruous within the streetscene and would have a detrimental impact on the visual amenity of the area, the locally listed building, setting of the listed building and highways safety. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies AM3 (Strategic Highway Network), DD1 (Urban Design), DD4 (Development in Residential Areas), DD6 (Access and Transport Infrastructure), HE5 (Buildings of Local Historic Importance) and Planning Guidance Note 17 (House Extension Design Guide).