

## **PLANNING APPLICATION NUMBER:P07/0341**

Type of approval sought	Full Planning Permission
Ward	Castle & Priory
Applicant	Mr & Mrs Choudary
Location:	<b>71, PRIORY ROAD, DUDLEY, DY1 4EY</b>
Proposal	<b>ERECTION OF SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION (RETROSPECTIVE)</b>
Recommendation Summary:	<b>REFUSE</b>

### **SITE AND SURROUNDINGS**

1. The application site is a semi-detached property. Priory Road is a residential street comprising post-war semi-detached properties. The application site is located opposite Priory Park. The application site has residential properties on either side as well as to the rear in Maple Road.
2. The dwelling has been extended with the addition of a two storey side extension, which has recently been built following the approval of planning permission in 2006 (P06/1237). The design of the extension complements the appearance of a similar extension that has been added to the other half of the semi-detached property (no. 73). The two storey side extension to no. 73 also extends beyond the rear of the property. 69 Priory Road comprises a flat roofed two storey side extension being flush with the front of the original house and extending beyond the rear elevation of the property.

### **PROPOSAL**

3. The proposal seeks retrospective planning permission for the erection of a single storey rear extension. The extension comprises the same footprint as the single storey rear element that was approved by planning permission P06/1237. The

extension is stepped being 3.7 metres deep closest to no. 69 and 2.6 metres deep closest to no. 73. The approved single storey rear extension (P06/1237) would have stood 3.7 metres in height to its ridge and 2.5 metres in height to its eaves with a gable roof. This element of the scheme was approved however paragraph 11 of the officer's report did state that:

'...The pitch of the roof and its design (gable not hip) does not match the original house. Amendments were sought to try and seek changes to the design of this element of the extension to a monopitch roof being more in keeping with the original dwelling. No amendments have been received. Whilst the design of the single storey element is not ideal it is not on balance a sufficient reason in which to warrant the refusal of planning permission.'

4. The single storey rear extension forming part of planning permission P06/1237 was not built in accordance with the approved plans. The height of the extension has been increased from 3.7 metres to its ridge to 4.2 metres with the eaves height increasing from 2.5 metres to 3 metres. The change has meant that the window serving the bathroom has been reduced in size in order to accommodate the increased ridge height.

## HISTORY

<b>APPLICATION No.</b>	<b>PROPOSAL</b>	<b>DECISION</b>	<b>DATE</b>
P05/0467	Two storey side and single storey rear extension to provide kitchen, shower room, dining room and garage with bedrooms above.	Approved subject to conditions.	25 April 2005
P06/1237	Two storey side and single storey rear extension to provide kitchen, shower room, dining room, garage and enlarged living room with bedrooms above.	Approved subject to conditions.	11 August 2006

## PUBLIC CONSULTATION

5. The application was advertised by way of neighbour notification letters being sent to the occupiers of six properties within close proximity to the application site. The latest date for comments was the 19<sup>th</sup> March 2007. Two letters have been received from the occupiers of no. 69 Priory Road and 77 Maple Road who raise the following material planning considerations:

- The increased height has resulted in a loss of light to the patio area of no. 69.
- Loss of sunlight to rear garden of 77 Maple Drive that immediately backs onto the property.

## OTHER CONSULTATION

6. Not applicable.

## RELEVANT PLANNING POLICY

Adopted Dudley Unitary Development Plan (2005)

Policy DD4 Development in Residential Areas

Supplementary Planning Guidance

PGN No. 17 House Extensions

## ASSESSMENT

The Key Issues are:

- Design and Appearance
- Scale and Massing

### Design and Appearance

7. The rear extension extends across the whole width of the property albeit stepped in closest to the boundary with no. 73 Priory Road. The gable design on a hipped roof semi-detached property does not complement the design or appearance of the original dwelling. This issue was raised in consideration of the previous planning application relating to the application site but on balance at the time was not considered a sufficient reason on its own to warrant the refusal of planning permission.

### Scale and Massing

8. The extension extends across the full width of the house with the height extending 3 metres to the eaves and 4.2 metres to the top of the ridge. The width, height and gabled design of the extension results in an over dominant building that forms an incongruous addition to the original house. The scheme erodes the character of the original house. This is in particular demonstrated through the insertion of a smaller window within the bathroom in order to accommodate the excessive height of the extension which no longer results in the windows within the rear elevation lining through with each other or being of appropriate proportions.

9. The application site is located to the north of no. 69 Priory Road. Due to this and the path of the sun the proposed extension would not have an undue impact in terms of resulting in a loss of light to the patio area of this property. The excessive height of the extension could result in the overshadowing of the patio area in the afternoon thereby harming the enjoyment of the garden area to this property.
10. The rear extension is located some 26 metres from the rear elevation of 77 Maple Road. The separation distance between the site and this property would ensure that the proposals do not result in an adverse impact to the occupiers of this property.

#### Plans

11. Whilst this is a retrospective planning application the elevations do not show what has been built whereby the French doors serving the extended living room have been replaced with a window. The drawings as submitted are inaccurate. Revised plans showing what has actually been built on site have been requested but these have not been received.

### CONCLUSION

12. The scale and massing of the extension through its excessive height forms an incongruous addition to the original house detracting from its character and appearance and will result in the overshadowing of the adjoining neighbours garden/patio area during the afternoons thereby having a detrimental impact upon residential amenity. The plans submitted are inaccurate and do not reflect exactly what has been built on site.

### RECOMMENDATION

13. It is recommended that 1) planning permission is refused for those reasons set out below and 2) that authorisation is given to take enforcement action against the unauthorised extension.

Conditions and/or reasons:

1. The scale and massing of the extension through its excessive height forms an incongruous addition to the original house detracting from its character and appearance and will result in the overshadowing of the adjoining neighbours garden/patio area during the afternoons to the detriment of their residential amenity. The plans submitted are inaccurate and do not reflect exactly what has been built on site. The proposals are contrary to Policy DD4 (Development in Residential Areas) of the Adopted Dudley Unitary Development Plan.