

PLANNING COMMITTEE

8th August 2018

Planning Application 18/00645/FUL

First floor side extension

8 Kempsford Close, Oakenshaw, Redditch, B98 7YS

Applicant: Mr G Frost
Ward: Headless Cross and Oakenshaw Ward

(see additional papers for site plan)

The author of this report is Steven Edden Planning Officer (DM), who can be contacted on Tel: 01527 548474 Email: steve.edden@bromsgroveandredditch.gov.uk for more information.

Site Description

The application relates to a link detached four bedroomed dwellinghouse situated to the southern side of Kempsford Close. Numbers 7 and 8 Kempsford Close are attached / linked to each other by means of their respective single storey pitch roofed garages. Number 8 is fully detached from the neighbouring dwelling to the south-west (Number 9).

Proposal Description

Planning permission is sought for a first floor side extension over the existing garage to the part of the dwelling which faces north-east towards number 7 Kempsford Close. The extension would accommodate an additional bedroom and bathroom at first floor level. The extensions front wall would be set back from the existing principal elevation by a distance of 450mm.

Relevant Policies

Borough of Redditch Local Plan No. 4

Policy 1 Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development
Policy 39 Built Environment
Policy 40 High Quality Design and Safer Communities

Others

SPG Encouraging Good Design
NPPF National Planning Policy Framework (2018)

Relevant Planning History

None

PLANNING COMMITTEE

8th August 2018

Public Consultation Response

Two letters received objecting to the application for the following summarised reasons:

- The proposed development would not be in keeping with the close
- The extension would have an overbearing effect on our property
- Noise and banging resulting from the build could cause structural damage to our property
- An overshadowing effect would occur with the extension blocking out sunlight which currently reaches our house
- The extension would overlook our property more considerably than at present resulting in a loss of privacy

Assessment of Proposal

The application site is situated within a residential area of Redditch where there is a general presumption in favour of domestic extensions subject to satisfying the relevant policies of the development plan.

The proposed extension is considered to be a proportionate addition and would be constructed of matching materials (brick walls under a tiled roof) and would complement the host dwelling.

The extension would be visible in the street-scene. However, the dwelling is set back from Kempsford Close by a distance of approximately 6 metres, reducing its prominence. The proposed extension would be set back from the existing dwelling at the front creating a visual break between the original dwelling and extension and resulting in the subservience required and as set out in the Councils SPG 'Encouraging Good Design'.

No windows are shown to the proposed flank (side) wall facing No.7 Kempsford Close, nor would there be a future requirement to place windows in this elevation since single windows matching the design and proportions of windows serving the existing dwelling would be formed in the front and rear elevation of the extension, thus safeguarding privacy.

All development projects will inevitably generate a degree of disturbance and noise during the construction phase. It is not usually necessary however to impose a condition restricting hours of working in respect of a relatively minor domestic construction project, mindful of the other statutory controls to address nuisance.

The property benefits from an existing dropped kerb allowing access to the frontage of the dwelling for the parking of at least 4 cars, meeting the Councils parking standards.

In accordance with relevant policies of the development plan including the Councils SPG referred to above, it is considered that the proposed extension would not cause any

PLANNING COMMITTEE

8th August 2018

detrimental harm to the occupiers of neighbouring properties in terms of loss of privacy, light or outlook.

The proposal is considered to be in general accordance with the relevant policies of the development plan and the presumption in favour of sustainable development as set out in the NPPF and Policy 1 of LP4 and can therefore be recommended for approval.

RECOMMENDATION:

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

Conditions:

- 1) 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.

- 2) The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the following plans and drawings:

Drawing PL001 – (Amended) Rev C – Proposed floor plans
Drawing PL003 – (Amended) Rev B – Proposed elevations

Reason: To provide certainty to the extent of the development hereby approved in the interests of proper planning.

- 3) 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 Policies in the Local Plan.

**PLANNING
COMMITTEE**

8th August 2018

Informatives

- 1) The local planning authority have worked with the applicant in a positive and proactive manner to seek solutions to problems arising in relation to dealing with this planning application through negotiation and amendment.

Procedural matters

This application is being reported to the Planning Committee because two (or more) objections have been received. As such the application falls outside the scheme of delegation to Officers