

PLANNING APPLICATION NUMBER: P05/1972

Type of approval sought	FULL PLANNING PERMISSION
Ward	KINGSWINFORD SOUTH
Applicant	MR J MAGUIRE
Location:	36, STREAM PARK, KINGSWINFORD, DY6 8HU
Proposal:	ERECTION OF TWO-STOREY SIDE AND REAR EXTENSION TO P04/0107)
Recommendation summary:	APPROVE SUBJECT TO CONDITIONS

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

1. The application property is the western most of a semi-detached pair located at the head of a narrow residential cul-de-sac. The site is an irregular shaped plot which widens to the rear, and the ground level rises gently from the front to the rear of the site.
2. The application property was originally constructed with a hipped roof over with front and rear facing gables. The surrounding properties located within Stream Park have all been built to a similar design.
3. Due to the location of the application site at the end of a cu-de-sac the adjacent property to the southwest No. 37 Stream Park is set at an almost 90 degree angle to the application dwelling with the application dwelling facing southwest and the adjoining dwelling facing southeast. The rear amenity space of the application site adjoins the rear amenity space of Nos. 24 and 26 Oakfield Avenue, and Nos. 37 and 35 Stream Park.
4. The application property has been extended to the side and rear with a large two storey development. The development extends some 3.6m to the rear and some 3m to the side of the original dwelling with a hipped roof over which extends to the ridge of the original dwelling roof with a much shallower pitch than that of the dwelling roof.

5. Planning permission was granted for the extension on 17 March 2004 (P04/0107), however, the extension was not constructed in accordance with the approved plans and the alterations to the design of the roof were not considered to be acceptable amendments to the approved plans. This application relates to amendments to the previously approved scheme and to the roof of the existing side/rear two storey extension.

6. The revised design proposes that the two storey development would extend the dwelling 3m to the side and 3.6m to the rear, with the front elevation of the extension set back some 2.9m from the front elevation of the original dwelling. Due to the rise in ground level from the front of the application site to the rear, the height of the proposed extension would measure some 7.4m at the front of the extension and 6.7m at the rear. The roof over the existing extension would be lowered so that the highest part would lie flush with the ridge of the original rear facing gable, and the southwest corner would be hipped to match the existing northwest facing corner. The height from the eaves to the highest part of the roof would measure 1.6m with a flat roof area of 4.3m wide x 3.6m deep above. The layout of the windows and doorways is primarily the same as in the approved scheme, although one first floor bedroom window and a ground floor doorway in the northwest facing elevation, and a southeast facing ground floor kitchen have been omitted from the revised scheme. Other minor alterations from the approved plan include a reduction in the width of the front elevation from 2.5m to 2m, and an increase in the depth of the extension from 3.4m to 3.6m.

HISTORY

7.

APPLICATION No.	PROPOSAL	DECISION	DATE
P03/2112	Two storey side and rear extension to create hall, study utility and kitchen with bedrooms en-suite above	Refused	22/12/03
P04/0107	Two storey side and rear extension to create hall, study utility and kitchen with two en-suite bedrooms above (resubmission)	Approved with Conditions	17/03/2004

8. The approved scheme of P04/0107 proposed to extend the dwelling 3m to the side and 3.4m to the rear, with a hipped roof over the rear section of the development and a side facing gable to the front. The primary alteration from this approved scheme is the design of the roof as described above.

PUBLIC CONSULTATION

9. Five letters of notification were issued. Six written objections have been received.

10. Letter received from No. 29 Cranham Drive who objects to the development on the following grounds:

- The development is disproportionately large in relation to the surrounding properties.
- The development has resulted in loss of light and a gross invasion of privacy.
- The large number of rooms and inhabitants may lead to unacceptable levels of noise pollution.

11. Letter received from No. 31 Cranham Drive who objects to the development on the following grounds:

- The extension creates an imposing outlook and possible tendency to be overlooked.
- The extension has not been built to the original plans and therefore is illegal.
- There are rumours the building would be rented out to students, which is unacceptable.

12. Letter received from No. 28 Oakham Avenue who objects to the development on the following grounds:

- The extension does not conform to the plans and planning permission.
- The roof angle and materials used are not in compliance with the original planning permission granted and the subsequent recent application.
- The roof structure dominates the landscape and is not in keeping with the adjacent property No. 35 Stream Park.
- The roof angle, design and materials are not sympathetic to the surrounding properties.

13. Letter received from the tenants of No. 37 Stream Park who object to the development on the following grounds:

- The size of the extension is imposing as the side elevation is now 10ft closer to the boundary line, and the first floor window overlooks a large area of the rear garden.
- The narrow cul-de-sac is already very congested and the extension would bring more parking problems.
- Concerns regarding multiple single occupancy.

14. Letter received from the owners of No. 37 Stream Park who object to the development on the following grounds:

- The extension is far too big and imposing in its dominant location at the head of the residential cul-de-sac.
- The site is located on higher ground than No. 37 and appears like a block of flats.
- The extension blocks light from the area, and the side facing window overlooks No. 37 which is an invasion of privacy.

- The roof angles are out of keeping with the original house and the surrounding properties. The design of the original roof has not been taken into account when designing the extension.
- The roof tiles do not match the adjoining property No. 35, and look out of keeping with the property itself and the surrounding properties.
- The existing extension has not been built in accordance with the original plans.
- The flat roof section raises security and privacy issues.
- The property should not be let as multiple occupancy as this would create parking and access issues.
- Property values would suffer as a result of the building work.

15. Letter received from No. 35 Stream Park who objects to the development on the following grounds:

- The development has restricted the amount of light to the garden and conservatory from late afternoon onwards leaving the garden dark and cold.
- Concern regarding the future use of the development as multiple occupancy dwelling.
- The development is grossly out of character with the surrounding properties and appears oversized for the amount of land it stands on.
- The roof of the development has very little in common with the original plans and building work has continued regardless.

OTHER CONSULTATION

16. None Required

RELEVANT PLANNING POLICY

17. Policy DD4 – ‘Development in Residential Areas’ Adopted UDP 2005
18. Supplementary Planning Guidance Note 17 ‘House Extension Design Guide’
19. Supplementary Planning Guidance Note 12 ‘The 45 Degree Code’

ASSESSMENT

20. As the applicant has been previously granted planning permission for an extension of this nature and scale, the key issue in determining this application is the impact of the proposed amendments to the design.

Design and Scale

21. The primary change to the design relates to the proposed roof over the extension. It is considered that although the revised design of the roof does not relate sympathetically to the design of the original dwelling roof there would be a significant visual improvement over the existing roof structure. The lower height of the roof would give the extension a more subservient appearance in relation to the existing dwelling in accordance with guidance set out in Supplementary Planning Guidance Note 17 'House Extension Design Guide'.
22. Although the scale of the extension is large, the dimensions have not been significantly altered from the previously approved design. The depth of the extension has been increased by 0.2m and the width of the front elevation has been reduced by 0.6m. It is therefore considered that the revised scale of the development, when assessed against the previously approved scheme, is acceptable.
23. Providing matching materials are used throughout, it is considered that the design and scale of the extension would be acceptable.

Impact on residential amenity

24. It is considered that the revised design of the development, when assessed against the approved scheme, would not have a detrimental impact to the residential amenity of the neighbouring properties. The number of habitable room windows installed at first floor level in the northwest facing side elevation of the development has been reduced from two to one, and the originally proposed ground floor southeast facing kitchen window has been omitted from the design. Therefore there would be no detrimental impact to the privacy of neighbouring occupants.

25. The increase in depth of the development by 0.2m would not contravene the 45 degree line from the quarter point of the nearest ground floor habitable room window or the centre point of the nearest first floor habitable room window to the rear of the adjoining property No. 35 Stream Park. Therefore it is considered that the revised design would not have a detrimental impact upon the outlook from and light to the rear of No. 35 as the development complies with the Council's 45 degree code, as set out in Supplementary Planning Guidance Note 12.

Car Parking Standards

26. The proposed development would not affect the current off-street parking provision at the property and therefore there are no concerns regarding an increase in on-street parking.
27. With regard to the concerns of the neighbouring residents concerning the possible use of the property as a multiple occupancy dwelling, a change of use application would need to be submitted and approved by the Local Authority before any such scheme could be lawfully implemented. Any increase in on street parking as a result of multiple occupancy is therefore not an issue in the determination of this planning application.

CONCLUSION

28. It is considered that the revised design and scale of the proposed two storey extension is acceptable. The redesigned roof, although not sympathetically related to the original roof of the dwelling, would be a significant improvement over the existing roof structure. The lower height of the proposed roof would create a more subservient appearance to the development in accordance with the guidelines set out in Supplementary Planning Guidance Note 17 'House Extension Design Guide'.
29. It is also considered that the revised design of the development would not have an adverse on the residential amenity of the neighbouring properties when assessed against the design of the approved scheme (P04/0107). The extension would contain fewer windows and the increase in depth would not contravene the 45 degree code from the windows to the rear of the adjoining property No. 35 Stream Park.

30. It is considered that the revised design of the development, when assessed against the approved scheme, complies with Policy DD4 'Development in Residential Areas' of the Adopted Unitary Development Plan 2005, and the guidelines set out in Supplementary Planning Guidance Note 17 'House Extension Design Guide'. Therefore it is recommended that the application should be approved.

RECOMMENDATION

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

Conditions and/or reasons:

1. A05A Commencement within 3 years - Full
2. The external materials used in the development hereby permitted shall match in colour, form and texture those of the existing building.
3. Roofing tiles removed from the existing roof are to be reused on the new section of roof to the front elevation.
4. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that order) no windows other than those shown on the plans hereby approved shall be inserted into the development hereby approved.
5. The development hereby permitted shall be built in accordance with the approved plan 003 05 004 J Rev O, unless agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.