

APPLICATION REFERENCE: PL/2016/00121/MINFHO**Site Address:** 47 Kingscote Road, Dorridge, Solihull, B93 8RB

Proposal:	Erection of part two storey/ part single storey front, side and rear extensions and alteration/extension of the existing roof, including the provision of a rear dormer window and roof lights to the front and rear.
Web link to Plans:	Full details of the proposal and statutory consultee responses can be found by using the above planning application reference number at: http://publicaccess.solihull.gov.uk

Reason for Referral to Planning Committee:	Called in by a Member .
---	--------------------------------

Recommendation:	APPROVE SUBJECT TO CONDITIONS
------------------------	--------------------------------------

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

A number of extensions are proposed to the property on the front, side and rear elevations at ground and first floor and in the roof. The extensions proposed represent a modern interpretation of the existing property, however it is considered that they are appropriately designed and proportioned to harmonise with the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and the streetscene. The proposal accords with Policy P15 of the Local Plan and guidance in the House Extension Guidelines.

The proposed extensions would be visible from neighbouring properties, however it is not considered that they would not cause any unreasonable loss of light or privacy, nor have any overbearing impact on neighbouring occupiers. The proposal therefore accords with Policy P14 of the Local Plan.

KEY PLANNING ISSUES

The following key planning issues are material to the determination of this application:

- Impact upon residential amenity; and

- Impact upon the character of the area.

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

Non Statutory Consultees: The following Non-Statutory Consultee responses have been received:

SMBC Drainage - No objection subject to conditions

PUBLICITY

The application was advertised in accordance with the provisions set down in the Town and Country Planning (General Development Procedure) Order 2015.

3 responses were received, 1 response in relation to the original plans and 2 in respect of amended plans that have been submitted. 2 of the responses are from the same household. All correspondence has been reviewed and the main issues raised are summarised below (Planning Committee Members have access to all third party correspondence received):

Objections to Original Plans

Design and Character

- The extensions are more akin to a total rebuild of the property;
- The extensions would give the dwelling the appearance of being squeezed into the plot;
- The new roof and raised eaves would appear overly large and dominant and out of keeping with the rest of the house and the streetscene;
- The box dormers are poorly integrated with out not in keeping with the character of the existing property;

Residential Amenity

- The windows to the rear of the property would cause a loss of privacy to neighbouring gardens;
- The rear dormers will cause loss of privacy to neighbouring dwellings;
- Extensions overbearing on neighbours.

Objection to Amended Plans (additional comments)

Design and Character

- Roof design and overhanging eaves will produce a terracing effect;
- Extensions do not appear subservient;
- The rear “dormer” roof extension is unsightly and overbearing.

Other Issues

- Limited gap proposed between roofs would raise maintenance issues with guttering on neighbouring properties;
- The existing plans are incorrect and show the roof as it stands to be higher than neighbouring properties whereas it is actually lower.

PLANNING ASSESSMENT

This report considers the proposal against the relevant policies of the National Planning Policy Framework (“NPPF”) 2012, the National Planning Practice Guidance and the adopted planning policies of Solihull Council. The policies of the Solihull Local Plan “SLP” 2013 that have been used to assess this application are considered to be in accordance with the NPPF and as such are material planning considerations.

Impact upon residential amenity

In terms of residential amenity impact, key considerations to be taken into account in the assessment of an application relate to the extent of overlooking from the extension, dominance of the extension over neighbours and impact on light to habitable room windows (daylighting and the 45 degree code). The neighbours that would be most significantly impacted on by the proposals are those at Nos. 45 and No.49 Kingscote Road.

- Overlooking

Turning first to impact on No.49, I note that the only windows proposed at first floor would serve an en-suite. At second floor, 2 no. roof lights are proposed, one serving a dressing room and the other acting as a secondary bedroom window. Given the position and high level nature of the roof lights they would not cause any undue levels of overlooking to neighbours at No.49.

In terms of No. 45 there are 3.no first floor windows, 2.no serving en-suite bathrooms and another acting as a secondary bedroom window. It is recommended that a condition be imposed on any forthcoming planning consent requiring that the bedroom window be obscure glazed. There are also 2no. roof lights serving the first floor en-suites, therefore they would not result in any overlooking. Subject to the imposition of the above mentioned there would not be any undue levels of overlooking from new side windows, facing No.45.

- Impact on light and overbearing impact

In order to assess impact on light/ overbearing impact to habitable room window of neighbouring properties the 45 degree guide has been applied. In applying the guide, the proposed extensions would not cause any undue loss of light to habitable room windows on the front or rear of No.49 Kingscote Road.

In the case of No.45 it is noted that the 45 degree line drawn from a ground floor rear habitable room window would be marginally impinged upon by the extensions. However it is recognised that the 45 degree line is already breached by an existing

single storey extension on the rear of No.47, furthermore boundary treatments exist that would already reduce the level of light received by this window. On this basis it is not considered that the proposed extensions would unduly reduce the level of light received by habitable room windows on the rear of No.45, nor would it have an overbearing impact.

Concerns have been raised that the second floor bedroom window serving the dormer extension on the rear of the property would have an overbearing impact on neighbours and would result in loss of privacy to neighbouring gardens. These concerns are acknowledged, however it is noted that the dormer extension would not breach the 45 degree line drawn from adjacent habitable room windows. Furthermore it is not considered that views from second floor window would be materially more harmful to privacy of neighbours than the views from existing first floor windows within the property.

Having regard to the above comments it is considered that the proposed extensions would not cause any unreasonable loss of light or privacy to neighbouring properties, nor would they have an overbearing impact. The proposal would therefore accord with the requirements of Policy P14 of the Solihull Local Plan and the House Extension Guidelines SPD and positive weight should be attached in the planning balance to the matter.

Impact upon the character of the area

No. 47 Kingscote Road is a traditional detached two-storey dwelling dating back to the late interwar years/ early 1950s. Its design is typical of dwellings built during this time period with a hipped roof, projecting front gable feature, porch and chimney. Houses along Kingscote Road are all set back from the road behind an established and narrowly undulating building line. Properties are built up relatively close to the boundaries with neighbouring properties, however terracing is prevented by the presence of side access passageways and single storey side extensions/ garages.

It is not disputed that the proposed extensions would increase the bulk, scale and mass of the existing dwelling. However, having regard to the built form of neighbouring properties within the wider streetscene it is not considered that the proposals would appear unduly incongruous or overly prominent in the streetscene. The front extension would be flush with the front elevation of No.45 and would maintain the generous set back from the street at the front of the property. The fenestration and eaves level of the proposed extensions generally follows that of adjacent properties and a gap of 1m has been left between the proposed side wall of No. 47 Kingscote Road and No.49 Kingscote Road, which is considered to be sufficient to avoid any terracing effect. The front extension would be built up tight to the boundary with No.45, however this is in line with the existing side wall of No.47 and therefore would not unduly impact on the existing levels of spaciousness between these properties.

It is noted that the eaves of the proposed extension would project out from the new side wall of No. 47 by approximately 0.4m on the right hand side, adjacent to No.49. This has been raised as a concern by neighbours who fear that the overhang would undermine the symmetry of the dwelling and detract from the character of the area

and visual amenities of the streetscene. These concerns are noted, however given the overall scale of the dwelling it is not considered that a 0.4m overhang at eaves level would unduly impact upon the overall symmetry of the building. Furthermore it is not considered that the 0.4m gap between the guttering serving Nos. 47 and 49 would result in a terracing effect, given the presence of the more extensive gap beneath.

It is considered that the part two storey/ part single rear extensions would integrate with the style and character of the existing dwelling in terms of fenestration and roof pitch and design, albeit they would offer a modern interpretation. The proposed dormer extension would project from the rear aspect of the roof and would be set below the main ridge height of the roof meaning that there would only be limited side views of it from Kingscote Road. Having regard to the above it is not considered that the rear extensions, including the dormer, would have a detrimental impact on the wider character and appearance of the area and visual amenities of the streetscene.

Representations have been received, raising concerns that the gap between the guttering would lead to maintenance issues in the future. Whilst this concern is acknowledged, it should be noted that property maintenance is not a material planning consideration. Nonetheless it is noted that access to the side gutters would currently be restricted by the presence of the single storey side extension forming a WC and utility room on the side of No.47.

Overall it is considered that the extensions proposed are appropriately designed to harmonise with the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and streetscene. The extensions proposed are not subservient to the existing dwelling, however it is considered that the design of the extensions achieve a continuity of design that is in context with the streetscene. Furthermore the gaps proposed are considered to be sufficient to ensure that the extended dwelling would not appear unreasonably squeezed into the plot.

The extensions proposed, whilst increasing the scale, mass and bulk of the existing dwelling, are considered to be appropriately designed in line with the requirements of Policy P15 of the Solihull Local Plan and the House Extension Guidelines SPD and positive weight should be attached to the matter in the planning balance.

CONCLUSION

The extensions proposed represent a modern interpretation of the existing property. Nonetheless, on balance, it is considered that they are appropriately designed and proportioned to harmonise with the character and appearance of the existing dwelling. Sufficient gap has been provided to the boundary of the site to ensure that the extended property would not appear squeezed into the plot. The extended property would therefore be in keeping with the character of the area and the visual amenities of the streetscene.

Representations received concerning the impact of the proposal on the amenities of neighbouring occupiers are duly noted. However, taking into account guidance within Policy P14 of the SLP and the House Extension Guidelines, it is not

considered that the proposed extensions would cause any unreasonable loss of light or privacy, nor have any overbearing impact on the amenities of neighbours.

RECOMMENDATION

Approval is recommended subject to the following précis of conditions:

1. CS00 – Compliance with all plans
2. CS05 – Commencement within 3 years (full)
3. CS07 – Matching materials
4. CD12- No further windows
5. CD15 – Obscure glazed window at 'A'
6. RE02 - Reason