

**PLANNING
COMMITTEE**

2nd November 2011

APPEAL OUTCOME REPORT FOR INFORMATION

APPEAL MADE AGAINST REFUSAL OF PLANNING PERMISSION

PLANNING APPLICATION DETAILS: 2011/107/FUL

PROPOSAL	TWO STOREY EXTENSION TO SIDE AND SINGLE STOREY EXTENSION TO REAR
LOCATION	32 PETERBROOK CLOSE, REDDITCH
WARD	HEADLESS CROSS AND OAKENSHAW
DECISION	DECISION MADE BY OFFICERS UNDER DELEGATED POWERS 9TH JUNE 2011

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

Discussion

The case related to a two storey and single storey extension to a detached dwelling house in Peterbook Close. The planning application was refused for the following reasons:

1. The proposed two storey side extension, by virtue of its siting, size and design would have a disproportionate, dominating and adverse effect on the design, character and appearance of the existing dwelling and would have a consequential detrimental impact upon the street-scene. As such, the development would be harmful to the visual amenities of the area contrary to Policies B(BE).13 and B(BE).14 of the Borough of Redditch Local Plan No.3 and the Borough of Redditch SPG on Encouraging Good Design.
2. It would be possible in the future to occupy the proposed two storey extension as a separate dwelling. However, if this were to be the case, additional matters would then need to be taken into consideration which would be outside the remit of the current application. It is therefore not possible to assess the current proposal against the policy criteria relating to the creation of a new dwelling, nor is it reasonable to restrict its occupation in the absence of this information. Therefore the harm of this proposal cannot be fully assessed against the relevant policy criteria within relevant policies for example PPS 1, PPS 3 and Local Plan No.3 Policies B(HSG).6, B(BE).13, B(BE).14 and C(T).12 and the Encouraging Good Design SPG.

PLANNING COMMITTEE

2nd November 2011

Officers sought to defend these reasons through written representations to the Planning Inspector.

The Inspector, like Officers, considered that due to its width, the two storey side extension would fail to respect or reflect the proportions of the existing dwelling or other dwellings in the locality, being out of keeping with the prevailing pattern of development on the estate. The Inspector considered that the situation would be exacerbated by the introduction of a second front door which would give the extension the appearance of a small attached dwelling. Turning to the second reason for refusal, she noted that internal floor plans showed that an internal door would be positioned between the two storey extension and the existing dwelling and that front and rear gardens would not be divided. She considered that the occupation of the development by a dependant relative could be achieved via the imposition of conditions to reinforce the fact that the property comprises a single dwelling. The Inspector concluded that the proposal did not need to be assessed against the additional policies as listed in the second refusal reason. However, she considered that finding in favour of the appellant on the second refusal reason did not outweigh the harm identified by the Council in refusal reason one, the Inspector considering that the two storey extension would harm the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and the street-scene.

A small single storey rear extension was shown on the plans accompanying the planning application and appeal. Despite Officers confirming that this aspect would fall within the provisions of permitted development rights, the Inspector considered that these minor works should form part of the appeal.

Appeal outcome

SPLIT DECISION

Finding the single storey rear extension wholly acceptable, as did Officers, the Inspector **ALLOWED** the appeal in so far that it related to this element, and **DISMISSED** the appeal in so far as it related to the two storey extension. Costs were neither sought nor awarded.

Further issues

None.

Recommendation

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