

**PLANNING
COMMITTEE**

18th July 2024

Planning Application 24/00502/FUL

**Rear first floor bedroom and side two storey garage and bedroom extensions.
3 Southcrest Road, Redditch, Worcestershire, B98 7JG,**

**Applicant: Mr And Mrs Rashid Khan
Ward: Lodge Park Ward**

(see additional papers for site plan)

The case officer of this application is Tara Ussher, Planning Officer (DM), who can be contacted on Tel: 01527 64252 Ext. 3220 Email: tara.Ussher@Bromsgroveandredditch.gov.uk for more information.

Site Description

The site is located close to the corner of Southcrest Road and Barlich Way to the west of Studley Road and to the north of the Warwick Highway. The application site is a semi-detached dwelling which is elevated in relation to the highway and therefore occupies a prominent position in the street scene.

The dwelling is a semi-detached property which shares design features with surrounding properties. The street scene is characterised by semi-detached dwellings separated by consistent sized spaces, with larger gaps close to junctions. The host dwelling is typical of this layout, and the gap between it and No. 1 along with its siting on higher ground give it a relatively spacious, open setting. A flat roofed garage is positioned to the south of number 3 with an area of land dividing the dwelling and the garage.

Proposal Description

The existing dwelling is a three bedroomed unit with a rear conservatory and a detached single storey garage. The application proposes the demolition of the conservatory and the garage and the erection of a two-storey side extension and a single storey rear extension. A dormer window is proposed to the rear to enable the roof space to be utilised as accommodation. The resultant dwelling will have a total of eight bedrooms.

The proposed two-storey side extension has an 'L' shaped footprint and adds new family room, playroom, garage and kitchen and utility on the ground floor and provides three new bedrooms and ensuite on the first floor. Part of the development sits behind the main dwelling and thus appears as a two-storey rear extension, this area provides an additional bedroom.

The proposed single-storey rear extension provides a dining area, whilst the dormer window on the rear would run the width of the dwelling, provides an internal stair access and two further bedrooms in the extended roof space.

PLANNING COMMITTEE

As viewed from the front elevation, the main two storey extension sits parallel to the host dwelling. Consequently, the front wall and roof are aligned and are not 'set back' or 'down' in relation to the original. In contrast, the element that contains the garage with bedroom over, is set down in relation to the ridge line, but is not set back.

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

National Design Guide NPPF

National Planning Policy Framework (2019)

NPPG National Planning Practice Guidance

Redditch High Quality Design SPD

Relevant Planning History

20/01047/FUL	Proposed two storey side extension, demolition of rear conservatory and erection of single storey rear extension. Appeal Dismissed 16.06.2021	Refused	22.02.2021
21/01720/FUL	Erection of Two Storey side and single storey rear extension	Approved	17.03.2022
24/00047/FUL	Side 2 storey and rear single storey extension and loft conversion	Refused	12.03.2024

Consultations

WRS - Contaminated Land

Worcestershire Regulatory Services (WRS) have reviewed the application for potential contaminated land concerns as part of the weekly planning list check. The records held by WRS indicate the property is located within 250m of a number of areas of former quarrying that have since been infilled with unknown materials. WRS therefore recommend that the applicant is made aware via an advisory note in respect of ground gases. Recommends Landfill near extensions informative for an extension within 250m of landfill.

Public Consultation Response

Three Neighbours consulted on the 29.05.2024 expired 22.06.2024.

PLANNING COMMITTEE

One response received summarised as ;

- Design - We feel that the proposed loft extension, rear first floor bedroom and side two storey garage and bedroom is not of a design which is in keeping with the character and appearance of the rest of the estate. It is a very large extension across the existing house and a new extension at the side and back of the dwelling, where most extensions on the estate are either garage conversions or buildings over the garage. It will change the character of the house dramatically.
- Loss of Privacy - We feel that the proposed loft extension dormer and rear first floor bedroom windows would lead to a significant reduction in privacy in our garden as they would look directly down onto our patio and into our garden.
- Parking - With an eight bedroom house comes the problem with parking in the future. The estate has already become hazardous especially during School dropping off and picking up times, with three schools in close proximity it is difficult to get on and off the estate during these times.
- Future Development - Ultimately, if you allow for this excessive and obtrusive eight bedroom development to take place, you are opening the floodgates for a myriad of similar developments on the estate which will no doubt significantly impact on local urban green space.

Cllr Fry

Requested that the application is considered at planning committee as opposed to being dealt with under Delegated Powers.

Assessment of Proposal

Background

The planning history of this site is material to the consideration of the merits of this application. Members will observe that an application (20/01047/FUL) for a similar proposal to that to be considered here, was refused by the Council and an appeal was subsequently lodged and dismissed by the Planning Inspectorate on 16 June 2021 (Appeal ref APP/Q1825/D/21/3270963).

Following this, application 21/01720/FUL was submitted proposing the erection of a (smaller) two-storey side extension and single storey rear extension. This proposal was considered to overcome the objections raised with respect to appealed application and was therefore granted subject to planning conditions on 17.03.2022. This scheme remains live and capable of implementation.

The applicant then decided to pursue a scheme 24/00047/FUL which was more akin to that dismissed at appeal, but with the addition of a 'box' dormer extension to the rear of

PLANNING COMMITTEE

the dwelling. That application was, because of its similarity to the dismissed appealed application, refused on 12.03.2024.

This current application is a further proposal for a two-storey addition to the dwelling. However, it incorporates additional two storey development to the side of the dwelling and to the rear of the dwelling, beyond that considered under the refused application 24/00047/FUL.

Assessment

Turning to the consideration of the application, the main issue for consideration is the impact of the proposal on the character of the streetscene and whether any harm to the residential amenity of neighbouring properties would arise. The planning history is relevant to the consideration of these points.

Character and Appearance

The application is for a 'L' shaped two-storey side extension, demolition of rear conservatory and garage, erection of a single storey rear extension and dormer extension roof element to an existing dwelling located within an area of established residential development.

The dwelling is a semi-detached property which shares design features with surrounding dwellings, albeit the associated flat-roofed garage is separated from the main dwelling by a small area of land. The property is elevated in relation to the highway, occupying a prominent position in the street scene.

The proposed single-storey rear extension would project 4 metres from the rear of the existing dwelling and it is proposed that it would provide a dining room. Given its size and siting, this element of the scheme does not cause concern in terms of impact on neighbours, or design or materials. Therefore, this element of the scheme is considered to comply with development plan policies.

The main two storey extension would be constructed, with regard to its ridge line and front alignment, in line with the original dwelling. The portion relating to the garage with bedroom above would also share the same front alignment, but this smaller portion would sit at a lower land level and thus have a lower ridge line, appearing 'set down' in relation to the extended form of number 3 Southcrest Road. The extension, whilst constructed using matching brick and tile materials, would in this iteration of the design, be almost the same total width as the original dwelling.

Applications for planning permission should be assessed on their individual merits and against current planning policies and guidance forming the development plan for the area. Policy 39 of The Borough of Redditch Local Plan (39.2) requires that all development should contribute positively to the local character of the area and should respond to, and integrate with, the distinctive features of the surrounding area. Paragraph 135c of the National Planning Policy Framework encourages good design, that is sympathetic to local character and Paragraph 132 underlines the importance of reflecting

PLANNING COMMITTEE

local advice, as contained within the Councils High Quality Design Supplementary Planning Document (SPD).

Redditch Borough Council adopted a High-Quality Design SPD to help inform at a more detailed level what good design can look like and this document is a Material Planning Consideration. Comments contained in the SPD are relevant at para 3.3.1:

"Side extensions will be required to be subordinate in size and prominence. To achieve this, extensions should be clearly set down from the ridge of the dwelling and set back from the principal elevation. Each application will be considered on its own merits to ensure that the design of the side extension is appropriate to that property and its surroundings"

Para 3.3.2 states that:

"Extensions should reflect the proportions of the original building. To achieve this, an extension should be of a smaller and less substantial scale than the main building, as over-large extensions can unbalance the proportion and harmony of the host building and can also have a detrimental effect on the street scene as a whole"

Further, at Para 3.1.11 it states that:

"An alteration or extension must consider the impact on the street scene. An alteration or extension must: i) Enhance and strengthen the local distinctiveness of an area, for example reflect the pattern and spacing of buildings; ii) Not normally project forward of the principal elevation, or that fronting the public domain. One exception would be the addition of a porch; and iii) Respect local styles and features to maintain local distinctiveness."

The existing dwelling has a simple frontage, which is reflective of the character in the local area; it has a linear form, created in part by the roof shape and the arrangement of windows. The proposal would reflect this character by retaining those features. However, the now much enlarged mass and scale of the proposed side extension fails to provide a subordinate addition as required by the SPD. Noting also the prominent and elevated position of the extension, it is concluded that the development fails to respect the otherwise relatively spacious character of the immediate area and thus fails to comply with Policy 39 of the Borough of Redditch Local Plan No 4.

In the appeal decision under reference APP/Q1825/D/21/3270963, the Inspector at paragraph 3 commented that the main issue was the effect of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of the host dwelling. The Inspector commented at para 4 that: *'Although some dwellings in the area have been extended in various ways, those extensions appear subordinate to the host dwelling in terms of their scale and appearance. As a result, the balance of the semi-detached pairs and the generally consistent character and appearance of the street scene has largely been retained'*.

PLANNING COMMITTEE

The Inspector at Para 5 commented that the scheme under consideration '*.. would be built flush with the front elevation of the dwelling and the roof would extend at the same ridge height, which would make it prominently visible in this elevated position. The proposed extension would be greater than half the width of the host dwelling and as such would be a bulky and disproportionate addition which would not reflect the proportions of the existing property*'. It is noteworthy that the width of the current proposal is greater than that considered by the inspector.

The Inspector states at Para 6 that: '*Consequently, due to its size, height and bulk, combined with the lack of set back from the front elevation or set down from the ridge, the proposed extension would dominate the existing dwelling and would not appear subordinate to it. Therefore, it would not reflect the locally distinctive character of the existing dwelling or its relatively spacious setting. Consequently, the proposed side extension would harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling*'.

The current proposal fails to mitigate and address the concerns Officer's have previously expressed regarding the impact of development on character and appearance of the area and that of the Inspectors conclusions under reference APP/Q1825/D/21/3270963. It is concluded therefore that the scheme is unacceptable in regard to its impact upon character and appearance.

Residential Amenity

Paragraph 135(f) of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states that planning decisions should seek a good standard of amenity for existing and future users of land and buildings. Furthermore, the Borough of Redditch High Quality Design SPD provides further guidance in relation to residential amenity, seeking to protect against adverse loss of light, outlook, privacy, and overbearing impact.

In terms of the impact of the two-storey side extension on the residential amenity of the occupiers of 1 Barlich Way, the siting, scale and position of the additions are such as not to attract concerns with respect to privacy, overlooking, overbearing, or overshadowing impacts. A similar conclusion can be reached regarding the impacts upon 5 Southcrest Road, which is adjacent to the single storey (dining room) element of the development.

Consideration is also required as to the impact of the extensions and the dormer window on the amenity of the occupiers to the rear of the site, number 6 Barlich Way. It is noted that objections have been received regarding the impact on privacy from the occupants of this property.

The Councils SPD recognises that overlooking can be a problem if it allows views into private spaces including outdoor spaces. It identifies a number of factors to be considered including distance, the presence of openings, the relative position of buildings, levels and types of rooms affected (para 4.2.48) The SPD also sets out that rear gardens are expected to be 10.5m in length when serving a two storey dwellings (4.2.29).

PLANNING COMMITTEE

The rear elevation of the existing dwelling, measured at first floor, at its closest, is 11.3m from the boundary with the garden of 6 Barlich Way, with an existing bathroom and two bedroom windows orientated in that direction. As a result of the development one of those bedrooms will be extended, meaning the distance to the boundary is reduced to 9.3m. Whilst the SPD does not state a window to garden boundary distance, the reduction to 9.3m is noted as being below the 10.5m of a standard garden length. It is evident that the garden to 6 Barlich Way is of some length and whilst reducing in width, extends across numbers 3-9 Southcrest Road. However, the orientation of the dwellings means it is the area immediately to the rear of number 6 that is impacted by the new window to the bedroom extension. This fact, combined with the elevated position of number 6 relative to the application site and the lack of intervening screening, means there would be a reduction in the privacy currently enjoyed by occupants there, as a result of this development.

Additional overlooking could occur from the proposed dormer extension and the two bedroom windows it provides (the bathroom window would be controlled to be obscure glazed by condition). Whilst permitted development may allow a roof addition of some form, there are limitations relating to volume and conditions regarding construction, that mean the dormer as proposed is unlikely to be achieved using permitted development. This reduces the weight that could be attached to this potential fall-back position and overall, it is concluded that the proposed extensions, would be harmful to the residential amenity of 6 Barlich Way by virtue of overlooking and loss of privacy.

Other matters

Matters raised through public consultation have been addressed in this report where they relate to design and amenity, whilst matters of the potential for future developments would not be material to the consideration of this application, as each application is considered on its own merits.

Regarding provision of parking for a dwelling of more than 6 bedrooms, the Streetscape Design Guide (2022) requires 4 carparking spaces and 5 cycle spaces in such circumstances. Notwithstanding the conclusions above, these could, if considered necessary, be secured by planning condition.

Conclusions

In conclusion, this two-storey extension is considered harmful to both the character and appearance of the area and to the amenity of residents. The proposal would therefore be contrary to the Borough of Redditch Local Plan No 4, the Borough of Redditch High Quality Design Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) and the aims and objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

RECOMMENDATION: That having regard to the development plan and to all other material considerations, planning permission be REFUSED for the following reason:

PLANNING COMMITTEE

1. The proposed extensions, by reason of their siting, size and design would have a dominating, disproportionate and adverse effect on the design, character and appearance of the existing dwelling. As such, the development would be contrary to Policies 39 and 40 of the Borough of Redditch Local Plan No 4, the Borough of Redditch High Quality Design Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) and the aims and objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)
2. The proposed extension, by reason of its rearward projection, and regarding the dormer addition, its elevated position, would be harmful to the residential amenity of the residents at 6 Barlich Way by virtue of overlooking and reducing the privacy enjoyed in their private garden space. The development would be contrary to Policies 39 and 40 of the Borough of Redditch Local Plan No 4, the Borough of Redditch High Quality Design Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) and the aims and objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

Procedural matters

This application is being reported to the Planning Committee at the request of the local ward councillor.