

# **PLANNING COMMITTEE**

**11th November 2020**

---

**Planning Application 20/00921/FUL**

**Erection of a two storey side and rear extension**

**36 Granby Close, Winyates East, Redditch, B98 0PJ**

**Applicant: Mr Jordon Cooke**  
**Ward: Winyates Ward**

**(see additional papers for site plan)**

The case officer of this application is Steven Edden, Planning Officer (DM), who can be contacted on Tel: 01527 548474 Ext. 3206 Email: [steve.edden@bromsgroveandredditch.gov.uk](mailto:steve.edden@bromsgroveandredditch.gov.uk) for more information.

## **Site Description**

The host property is a semi-detached two bedroomed dwelling situated to the western side of Granby Close. The property is constructed from brick (walls) under a pitched tiled roof.

The immediate area is comprised of a mixture of semi-detached and detached two storey houses.

The dwellings nearest neighbours are No.37 (to the north) and No.35 (to the south).

## **Proposal Description**

This application seeks planning permission to erect a two-storey extension to the side of the property (facing north) and to erect a first floor flat roofed extension to the rear of the property above an existing brick built flat roofed utility room and W/C. The extension would provide an enlarged kitchen and living / dining room area at ground floor, whilst providing two new bedrooms and bathroom area at first floor level. Materials proposed for use would match those of the existing dwelling.

## **Relevant Policies:**

### **Borough of Redditch Local Plan No. 4**

Policy 1: Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development

Policy 20: Transport Requirements for New Development

Policy 39: Built Environment

Policy 40: High Quality Design and Safer Communities

## **Others**

Redditch High Quality Design SPD

NPPF National Planning Policy Framework (2019)

# **PLANNING COMMITTEE**

**11th November 2020**

---

## **Relevant Planning History**

None

## **Consultations**

### **WCC Highways**

Comments received are summarised below:

#### **Originally received comments**

Worcestershire County Council (WCC) acting in its role as the Highway Authority recommends that this application is refused.

It is noted that the existing dwelling is located in a residential and sustainable location off an unclassified road, the site benefits from an existing vehicular access. Granby Close benefits from footpaths and street lighting on both sides of the road and no parking restrictions are in force in the vicinity. The site is located within walking distance of a bus route and bus stop.

Notwithstanding the above, the application is considered to be contrary to the WCC Streetscape Design Guide. At present the existing dwelling is a 2-bed dwelling with 2 car parking spaces which includes a garage. The garage is to be removed and converted into a dining room which would leave 1 car parking space.

Since the existing dwelling is to be converted into a 4-bed dwelling, in accordance with WCC parking standards a 4-bed dwelling is recommended to provide 3 car parking spaces in total. Under provision could lead to displacement of vehicles onto the highway.

#### **Comments based on a revised submitted plan**

A plan has been submitted showing three cars parked 'side by side' within the curtilage of the property. In order to provide 3 car parking spaces in the manner proposed, WCC would require a minimum width of 8.4m (3m for the end spaces and 2.4m for the middle space). As it stands only 2 spaces can be provided 'side by side' and as such this represents an under provision.

#### **Comments based on revised submitted plan 2**

Plan 036(P)010 Rev 1 now confirms that 3 car parking spaces (as recommended) can be accommodated on the site. However, it is highways policy through the Streetscape Design Guide that vehicles enter and leave the site at 90 degrees to the carriageway. The 'side on' car parking space provided is considered to be unacceptable because that vehicle could not enter and leave the site at 90 degrees to the carriageway.

### **Public Consultation Response**

8 letters have been received in objection to the application.  
Comments received are summarised below:

## **PLANNING COMMITTEE**

**11th November 2020**

---

- Approval would set a precedent for other two bedroomed houses to get similar permissions giving the street a 'terraced' appearance rather than its present 'semi-detached' appearance harming the character of the street
- By extending forward and removing the garage area will result in a smaller car parking area for No.36
- The provision of two new bedrooms will mean greater demand for car parking spaces at No 36 which will lead to on-street parking to the detriment of highway safety
- Where will construction vehicles park during the build when parking is already at a premium?
- Concerns that the extension will not blend with the design / materials used to construct No.36 originally
- Proposals would result in overlooking to the detriment of privacy
- Proposals would result in a loss of light to neighbouring dwellings

Other matters 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**

Planning applications for extensions and alterations to dwellings are expected to be of high-quality design that reflect or complement the character and appearance of the local area. Guidance contained within the Councils Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) 'High Quality Design' is expected to be incorporated within development proposals.

The SPD at section 3.3 comments that side extensions should be subordinate and proportionate in scale such that the main dwelling 'dominates' the proposed extension, rather than competes with the scale and form of the main dwelling. The proposed front wall at both ground and first floor has been 'set in' by 700mm beyond the principal elevation serving the existing dwelling and the ridge line serving the side extension has been lowered in accordance with the diagrammatic advice contained at (Figure 2): 3.3.4, page 13 of the SPD. The scale of the side extensions proposed are thus considered to be acceptable.

Although first floor side extensions to dwellings within Granby Close are not commonplace, there are numerous residential areas within the Borough comprised of primarily semi-detached dwellings where properties have been extended above garages to the side and where such alterations have not been considered to give rise to harm to the character and appearance of that street. Considering this application on its individual

## **PLANNING COMMITTEE**

**11th November 2020**

---

merits, your officers are satisfied that harm to the character and appearance of the dwelling and the visual amenities of the area would not occur in this case.

The orientation of the proposed extensions, primarily to the northern side of the existing dwelling, taking into consideration the applications' compliance with the 45 degree line guidance set out within the Council's SPD at 3.1.7, satisfy your officers that an overshadowing impact leading to a loss of light to adjoining neighbours would not occur.

Overlooking from existing first floor windows exists at present and will continue to exist. It is for the decision maker to determine whether any additional impacts caused by overlooking would be material. Your officers' advice to members in this case is that privacy would not be materially compromised.

Highway safety concerns have been raised within the representations received.

Paragraph 109 of the National Planning Policy Framework comments that '*development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety.*'

Granting planning permission would allow the dwelling to change from a 2 bedroomed to a 4 bedroomed property. Prior to the adoption of the Borough of Redditch Local Plan No.4 in January 2017, the parking requirement for a 4 bedroomed dwelling (Under the Borough of Redditch Local Plan No.3) was 2 'in-curtilage' car parking spaces. WCC streetscape design guide standards currently require that 4 bedroomed dwellings provide 3 car parking spaces within the curtilage of the property.

The existing dwelling can accommodate two cars within the hardsurfaced driveway and the applicant has explained that it is their intention to remove the existing grassed area to the side of the existing driveway to provide a larger car parking area which would accommodate 3 vehicles. A plan has been submitted by the applicant demonstrating that three cars can be accommodated within the frontage to the property (Plan 036-P-010 Rev 1), although members will note that this arrangement does not satisfy WCC Highways due to the fact that the WCC Streetscape Design guide that vehicles enter and leave the site at 90 degrees to the carriageway.

Notwithstanding the above, if an applicant for planning permission were unable to provide vehicle parking as per the WCC streetscape design guide standards, it is necessary to examine the policy requirement which comments that *development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety.*

Granby Close is a quiet residential cul-de-sac where vehicles are not generally travelling through the Close at speed. Dwellings are well set back from the edge of the highway and all have in-curtilage parking provision. Most dwellings within Granby Close can accommodate 2 vehicles within their curtilage and some dwellings are able to accommodate 3 or more vehicles.

## **PLANNING COMMITTEE**

**11th November 2020**

---

As per the majority of residential cul-de-sacs within the Borough, Granby Close has no on-street parking restrictions in place and is accessed via Whitehouse Lane where again, no parking restrictions are in force.

Your officers visits to the site which have included inspections after 6pm on a weekday do not suggest that on-street parking is commonplace. As such, even if on-street parking were to occur, which your officers are suggesting is an unlikely long-term consequence of granting planning permission for this development, your officers do not believe that highway safety would not be compromised.

As set out above, Paragraph 109 of the NPPF comments that development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety. Representations have referred to additional parking demand creating problems in the Close. It is important however to draw a distinction between perceived parking problems and genuine highway safety concerns, especially when the presence of parked cars on a street can reduce vehicle speeds.

On-street parking demand during the construction period would inevitably be high and is an inevitable consequence of granting permission for new development as is increased noise and general disturbance to neighbours. However, such demands would arise from other domestic home improvement projects which cannot be controlled under planning law and such inconvenience is temporary and not in itself a reason to refuse permission.

In conclusion, your officers are satisfied that highway safety and the visual and residential amenities of the area would not be prejudiced by granting planning permission for this development.

The proposed application is considered to comply with the provisions of the development plan and would constitute a sustainable form of development in accordance with the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework.

### **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.

## **PLANNING COMMITTEE**

**11th November 2020**

---

- 2) All new external walls and roofs shall be finished in materials to match in colour, form and texture those on the existing building.

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.

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

Site location plan dated 21st September 2020

Drawing 036(P)07 proposed floor plans dated 24th September 2020

Drawing 036(P)08 Rev 1 proposed front and side elevation dated 24th September 2020

Drawing 036(P)09 Rev 1 proposed rear and side elevation dated 24th September 2020

Drawing 036(P)10 Rev 1 site layout plan and proposed ground floor plan dated 8th October 2020

Drawing 036(P)11 proposed first floor plan dated 24th September 2020

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

### **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.