

**PLANNING
COMMITTEE**

20th November 2013

Planning Application 2013/215/FUL

Removal of existing ground floor structure (conservatory) and replacing with proposed two storey extension

137 Enfield Road, Redditch, Worcestershire, B97 5NF

**Applicant: Mr Jamie Millham
Expiry Date: 10th September 2013
Ward: ASTWOOD BANK AND FECKENHAM**

(see additional papers for Site Plan)

The author of this report is Stacey Green, Planning Officer (DM), who can be contacted on Tel: 01527 881 342 Email: s.green@bromsgroveandredditch.gov.uk for more information.

Site Description

This application relates to a semi-detached property located on the south east side of Enfield Road within a designated residential area. It has been extended at the rear with a conservatory.

This application seeks to demolish the conservatory and erect a two storey rear extension. This report considers the amended plans that were submitted following discussions with the case officer.

Relevant Policies:

Borough of Redditch Local Plan No.3:

B(BE)13 Qualities of Good Design
B(BE)14 Alterations and Extensions

Others:

SPG Encouraging Good Design
NPPF National Planning Policy Framework

Consultations

North Worcestershire Water Management

EA flood risk maps show there to be no evidence of fluvial flood risk to the site however there is some evidence of past surface water flooding along Enfield Road as well as the nearby surrounding area. The streets and roads located to the west of the proposed site are also highlighted as being prioritised locations with regards to past drainage issues. It will therefore be important to bear this in mind and to ensure that an adequate way of

PLANNING COMMITTEE

20th November 2013

dealing with any additional surface water runoff created from the proposed development is implemented in order to ensure that it will not create or exacerbate any flood risk on site or within the surrounding local area. According to Severn Trent Water maps there are both public foul and surface water sewers within the vicinity as well as combined sewers.

Based on the documents provided the applicant has made no statement of where they propose to discharge any additional foul and surface water to that is created by the proposed development. In order for me to provide an adequate response these will need to be provided. In the meantime I would like to provide the following as advice and recommendations to be considered by the applicant wherever possible.

With regards to foul water disposal, assuming the applicant proposes to connect to the existing mains system, please bear in mind that it will be necessary to obtain written permission to connect from the relevant Water and Sewage Company, in this case Severn Trent Water Ltd.

With regards to the discharging of any additional surface water, I would like to recommend that the applicant consider the use of SuDS or a soakaway wherever possible on site as it is encouraged to retain as much as is possible of the surface water created by a development on site. SuDS techniques such as above-ground attenuation ponds, rainwater harvesting and porous surface materials are some examples of such SuDS techniques. If a soakaway is considered by the applicant it will be important to ensure that it is of adequate capacity by carrying out the necessary porosity tests. If for some reason none of these methods are viable then details of the applicants proposed method of surface water discharge will need to be provided along with any necessary permissions.

Special measures may also need to be taken to protect any existing apparatus below land where the proposed development will be situated.

I would like to attach the following conditions: No building work shall commence until a full drainage scheme of both foul and surface water, including SuDS has been submitted and approved in writing by the LPA. Regarding surface water, I would like to see that my recommendations of SuDS techniques have been considered and I will need to see proof of porosity testing with accompanying calculations for the use of a soakaway, if this method is chosen, in order to ensure that it is of adequate capacity. It will also be necessary to provide written proof of permission to connect to any existing public sewer systems, if this is the chosen method of foul and / or surface water disposal.

Reason: In order to ensure satisfactory drainage conditions that will not create or exacerbate flood risk on site or within the surrounding local area.

Public Consultation Responses

Two adjoining neighbours have raised the following concerns about the proposal:

- * The extension would be very close to the kitchen and bedroom windows of no. 135
- * The extension would block daylight to the kitchen at no. 135

PLANNING COMMITTEE

20th November 2013

- * There would be a view of a brick wall from the kitchen which would be overpowering
- * The extension would not be in keeping as there are no other two storey extensions in the row of houses
- * The first floor side window would overlook no. 139.

Other issues which are not material planning considerations have been raised, but are not reported here as they cannot be considered in the determination of this application.

Assessment of Proposal

The proposed extension would be set in from the neighbouring property (no. 135) by 1.35metres and substantially set down from the main roof of the house. The ground floor extension would project 4.3m from the rear wall and the first floor extension would have a maximum projection of 3.3m. By virtue of its scale and siting it is considered that the proposal would be subservient to the existing dwelling and would not have a detrimental effect on the appearance of the street scene.

Concerns have been raised by adjoining occupiers in respect of the first floor side window overlooking their property. Amended plans have been received which omit this window to prevent issues of overlooking. Concerns have also been raised that the two storey extension would cause a loss of light to the kitchen and that the proximity of the side wall of the extension would be overwhelming to the other adjoining occupiers.

The Council's SPD, 'Encouraging Good Design' deals with matters of overshadowing and loss of outlook. It considers that two storey extensions will normally be acceptable where the extension complies with a line drawn at 45 degrees horizontally from the nearest part of any main windows of a habitable room in any adjoining property. In regard to single storey extensions, it is normally expected that these meet a 60 degree line. The first floor part of the extension has been staggered so that it meets the 45 degree code from the neighbours. Whilst the extension would be moderately close to the neighbours at 135, having regard to the extent of the closest first floor rear wall projecting 2.2metres, it is not considered that the proposal would significantly harm the neighbours outlook or light. It is noted that the ground floor extension would breach the 60 degree line from the neighbours nearest window by 0.35m. However, having regard to the extent of this breach, the existing 2m high boundary fence along the common boundary and the hipped design of the roof which would slope away from these neighbours; it is not considered that the kitchen extension would cause a significant loss of light to the adjoining property over and above that which already exists. It is also noted that the existing conservatory projects from the rear elevation to the same extent as the proposed ground floor extension.

Having considered the policies above it is the Council's view that the proposal complies with the provision of the development plan and is of an acceptable design which would maintain the amenities of the neighbours.

PLANNING COMMITTEE

20th November 2013

Since Building Regulations will require that 'adequate provision shall be made for rainwater to be carried from the roof of the building', it is not considered necessary for this application to attach a drainage condition.

In this case the applicant submitted a scheme which raised issues of overlooking. The proposal was amended to omit a first floor side window. It is now considered that the proposal delivers a policy compliant sustainable form of development.

RECOMMENDATION:

That having regard to the development plan and to all other material considerations, planning permission be GRANTED subject to the following conditions:

- 1) All new external walls and roofs shall be finished in materials to match in colour, form and texture those on the existing building, or if a near match cannot be found, the written approval of the Local Planning Authority should be obtained for materials prior to development commencing. The development shall then be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason:- To ensure that the development is satisfactory in appearance, to safeguard the visual amenities of the area and in accordance with Policy B(BE).13 of the Borough of Redditch Local Plan No.3.

- 2) The development to which this permission relates must be begun not later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date of the grant of this permission.

Reason: In accordance with the requirements of Section 91(1) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

- 3) The development hereby approved shall be implemented in accordance with the following plans:

Drawing numbers 103 Rev E and 104 Rev B received 22.10.13.

Reason: To accurately define the permission for the avoidance of doubt and to ensure that the development is satisfactory in appearance in order to safeguard the visual amenities of the area in accordance with Policy B(BE).13 of the Borough of Redditch Local Plan No 3.

Procedural matters

This application is being reported to the Planning Committee because two (or more) objections have been received.