

PLANNING APPLICATION NUMBER: P05/0630

Type of approval sought	FULL PLANNING PERMISSION
Ward	HALESOWEN NORTH
Applicant	MR RAY DADD
Location:	17, HURST GREEN ROAD, HALESOWEN, B62 9PS
Proposal:	ERECTION OF 1 NO TWO BEDROOM DWELLING WITH GARAGE AND ASSOCIATED ACCESS
Recommendation summary:	REFUSE

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

1. The application site is almost triangular with a wide frontage, tapering to the rear boundary. It currently comprises the side garden to no. 17. That property is a corner plot semi-detached dwelling. The application site is used for informal parking for no. 17: there is a shared dropped kerb/highway frontage with 16. There is currently a staggered screen fence across the site which encloses the rear garden from the side. The shared boundary with no. 16 is 1 metre high. No. 16 has a lean to garage onto that boundary.
2. The character of the area is residential/suburban, with dwarf walls at the back of pavement line. Most of the properties are rendered/half rendered.

PROPOSAL

3. This a full application for the erection of a 2 bedroom starter home. It is shown with a bay window at ground floor, and stepped rear building line to seek to enable the plot to fit in the site boundaries. An attached garage is shown on the right hand side of the proposed dwelling, with a 7 metre drive in front.
4. The applicants have annotated the layout plan to show that the proposed dwelling would not have a forward building line which would contravene the 45 degree code when measured from the bay on the front elevation of no. 16.
5. The layout plan also shows space for replacement parking for no. 16.
6. Amended plans have been submitted. These show the insertion of landing and hallway windows on the side elevation facing north east along Hurst Green Road, and a part rendered finish.

HISTORY

7. A summary of the planning history is set out below.

APPLICATION No.	PROPOSAL	DECISION	DATE
P04/1340	Conversion of semi-detached house into 2 flats and single storey extension to create an attached bungalow	Approved	02/09/04
P04/1963	2 storey extension to create 4 flats.	Refused	11/11/04

8 The reasons for refusal, relating to P04/1963, were centred on a lack of parking, the proposal being out of character with the streetscene, and insufficient amenity space. (P04/1963).

PUBLIC CONSULTATION

9 I have received letters of objection from the occupiers of number 16 Hurst Green Road and number 6 Moat Drive. The letter from the occupier at no. 16, also contains the signatures of the occupiers of numbers 59, 61 and 65 Hurst Green Road, along with no. 13 Moat Drive.

10 The issues raised in summary are:-

- It will block the light from no. 16;
- It will give rise to more traffic on a busy road (with buses, and children and old people using the footway) close to a junction;
- The proposed garage would be half way up the side of no. 16.

OTHER CONSULTATION

11 Head of Environmental Protection – no adverse comments, subjected to a condition on contaminated land (soil gases).

12 Head of Transportation and Road Safety (HTRS) – no comments received.

RELEVANT PLANNING POLICY

13 Policies 53 (new residential development to meet minimum space and other amenity levels), 85 (no adverse effect on character, and adequate parking to be provided), and 99 (adequate provision for access and parking to be made), of the UDP are relevant.

14 Policy DD1 of the Revised Deposit UDP (principles of good urban design to be followed) and DD4 (development in residential areas) are relevant.

15 Planning Guidance Notes 3 (design and layout of new residential schemes) is relevant.

ASSESSMENT

- 16 There is general planning policy encouragement for making the efficient use of land in the urban area for housing development where this is on previously developed land (PPG3). This proposal accords with this. I therefore consider there to be support for the proposal in principle.
- 17 In terms of impact on the amenity of the occupier of no. 16, there is a landing window facing, and I concur with the applicants that the forward building line of the proposed plot would project to the extent that it would not cause overshadowing to no. 16. I therefore consider that there would be no undue impact on the amenity of the occupier of no. 16.
- 18 There is a secondary kitchen window and landing window on the facing elevation of no. 17. Whilst the rear amenity area of that property would be reduced to below that set out in the guidelines, I consider that the residual area is similar to that of other properties nearby. I therefore do not consider this to be significant.
- 19 In terms of access and parking, I consider there is space to provide for 2 parking spaces within the site, which is in accordance with guidelines. Notwithstanding a lack of response from HTRS, I do not consider that the additional traffic generated by the proposal will unduly impact on highway safety.
- 20 In terms of the amenity for future occupiers, I note that an 11 metre long garden is shown. In addition, whilst the rear garden area is below that contained within the guidelines, this is not by a significant amount as was the case with the refused flatted development (P04/1963). I therefore consider this to be adequate.
- 21 With regard to design considerations, the proposed dwelling has been sited so as to address the stagger between the reasonably commensurate forward building line of number 16 to 11 (consecutive numbers) Hurst Green Road, and the corner plot (no. 17). The consequence of this is that it will have a projecting gable considerably in front of the established building line onto Hurst Green Road.
- 22 Although the applicants have sought, through the submission of amended plans, to add interest to that projecting gable when viewed along the length of that street, in my view the proposal dwelling would still present itself as a visual intrusion into what is a relatively open suburban street.
- 23 To embellish on this, the proposed dwelling would differ from the siting of no. 17 as, although this dwelling is sited forward of the main building line, it is located on a corner and so the unit is set at an angle to address the junction.

- 24 The proposal therefore represents the introduction of a new dwelling which markedly falls in between the two building lines and as such would not integrate successfully into the streetscape. The proposal would therefore appear incongruous within the streetscene, and is unacceptable for this reason.
- 25 This is different from the approved single storey extension and conversion (P04/1340), which was considered to successfully “turn the corner”.

CONCLUSION

26. The proposal is unacceptable on design terms.

RECOMMENDATION

27. It is recommended that the proposal be refused for the following reason:-

Conditions and/or reasons:

1. The siting of the proposed dwelling seeks to address the stagger between the reasonably commensurate forward building line of number 11 to 16 (consecutive numbers) Hurst Green Road, and the corner plot (no. 17). The consequence of this is that the proposed dwelling is shown sited markedly in front of the established building line onto Hurst Green Road. It is considered that it would form a visual intrusion into what is a relatively open suburban street, with the proposal failing to integrate successfully into the streetscape. The proposal would therefore appear incongruous within the streetscene, and is consequently contrary to policy 85 of the Unitary Development Plan and policy DD4 of the Revised Deposit UDP.