

**PLANNING
COMMITTEE**

25th May 2010

Appeal Outcome Report for information

Appeal made against refusal of planning permission

Planning Application details: 2009/251/FUL

Proposal	Single and two storey extensions to dwelling
Location	25 Milton Close, Headless Cross, Redditch
Ward	Headless Cross and Oakenshaw Ward
Decision	Refusal 16th December 2009

Decision made by officers under delegated authority

The author of this report is Steven Edden, Planning Officer (DC), who can be contacted on extension 3206 (e-mail: steve.edden@redditchbc.gov.uk) for more information.

Discussion

The proposal was to erect a two storey extension to the side and rear of the property, with a further single storey extension to the rear.

The reason for refusal related to the perceived dominating and adverse effect the two storey extensions would have had upon the character and appearance of the existing dwelling with the consequential detrimental impact the proposals would have had upon the street-scene. The development was considered to be harmful to the visual amenities of the area.

The Inspector noted that the extensions would be prominent in the street-scene due to the angle of approach along Milton Close and the rise in ground levels and considered that the extensions would not appear subordinate to the existing dwelling. Viewed from an angle, the Inspector considered that the extensions would appear as bulky and disproportionate additions to the dwelling, greatly increasing the property's visual impact and conflicting with the advice contained within the Council's SPG on Encouraging Good Design which states that over-large extensions can unbalance the proportion and harmony of the building. He considered that the extension would have a detrimental and discordant appearance, accentuated by the rise in ground levels resulting in conflict with Policy B(BE).13 and B(BE).14 of the Borough of Redditch Local Plan No.3.

The Inspector took into account concerns expressed by neighbours that the proposed development would lead to a loss of light, but considered (like officers during consideration of the planning application) that the proposals would not cause a material loss of sunlight to the nearest neighbouring

**PLANNING
COMMITTEE**

25th May 2010

property. This however was not considered to outweigh the harm to the character and appearance of the dwelling and the street-scene.

Costs application

No application for costs was made.

Appeal outcome

The appeal was DISMISSED.

Recommendation

**The Committee is asked to RESOLVE that
the item of information be noted.**