Committee Date: 02/05/2013  Application Number: 2013/01962/PA
Accepted: 20/03/2013  Application Type: Householder
Target Date: 15/05/2013
Ward: Moseley and Kings Heath

29 Elizabeth Road, Moseley, Birmingham, B13 8QH

Erection of a single storey and two storey rear extension

Applicant: Mr M Fiaz
29 Elizabeth Road, Moseley, Birmingham, B13 8QH
Agent: Arcon Architects
72 Cliveden Avenue, Great Barr, Birmingham, B42 1SL

Recommendation
Approve Subject To Conditions

1. Proposal

1.1. Consent is sought for a single and two storey rear extension.

1.2. The proposed ground floor of the extension would form an ‘L’ shape. The main part of the ground floor would be 5m in depth, with an additional section replacing the existing ‘store’ to a total of 8m from the rear elevation. Internally at ground floor, a large family lounge and extended kitchen would be created.

1.3. At first floor, the proposal would extend 4m from the rear elevation of the property. The proposal would be the full width of the existing dwelling with a gable roof over. The internal layout of the first floor would be reconfigured to allow an additional bedroom with two en suite bathrooms.

1.4. This application has been made in conjunction with application 2013/01958/PA, for a similar rear extension, with the intention to implement both simultaneously.

2. Site & Surroundings

2.1. The application property is a traditional dwelling house located within a quiet residential cul de sac comprising of similar scale properties. The area surrounding the application property is residential in character.

2.2. The application dwelling has brick elevations with a gable roof over. To the rear there is an existing extension and conservatory which projects from the rear elevation of the house by 8m along the rear boundary with No.31. The application site benefits from a large rear garden which contains mature landscaping. The rear boundaries are defined by a 1.8m high close board fence.

3. Planning History

3.1. 16/01/2013- 2013/00275/PA- Erection of a two and single storey rear extension- Withdrawn.
3.2. This application has been submitted alongside a similar proposal for a single storey and two storey extension to the rear of No.27 Elizabeth Road (Ref 2013/01958/PA).

4. Consultation/PP Responses

4.1. Neighbours and local Ward Councillors have been consulted. Responses were received from Councillor Ernie Hendricks, the Moseley Society, No’s 15, 18, 25, 26, 30, 31 and 32 Elizabeth Road. Objections can be summarised as:
- Loss of light/ loss of outlook.
- The scale of the proposal and the impact on the character of the area.
- The clarity of the plans
- Disruption during building works and the impact on recently laid paving stones in the frontages of Elizabeth Road.
- Party Wall Issues.

4.2. Councillor Straker-Welds has requested that the application be heard at Planning Committee to enable Committee to assess the scale of the proposal.

5. Policy Context

5.1. The following local policies are applicable:
- Birmingham Unitary Development Plan (Adopted 2005)
- Draft Birmingham Development Plan.
- Places For Living (Adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance 2001)
- The 45 Degree Code (Adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance 1996)
- Extending your Home (2007)

5.2. The following national policies are applicable:
- NPPF- National Planning Policy Framework.

6. Planning Considerations

6.1. I consider that the design of the proposal and impact on the residential amenities and character of the area are the principal matters for consideration.

6.2. This application has been submitted following a recently withdrawn application. The earlier application was withdrawn by the agent to allow for further negotiations related to the design and impact of the proposal. The main changes are to the depth of the first floor rear element of the proposal. This has been reduced by 1m to a depth of 4m. The agent has amended the plans to omit an additional staircase in the first floor. It is noted that a loft conversion of the property could be carried out under permitted development.

6.3. The proposal would comply with the objectives of your Committees 45 Degree Code. The proposal would comply with the Code to the rear of No.31 when taking into account the existing extension to the rear of the application property. I note that the proposed development breaches the 45 Degree Code to No.27, although the code issue on this side would be overcome as the extension would be constructed simultaneously with the extension at No. 27. As a result, the proposed development would not cause further detriment by virtue of significant loss of light or outlook amenity to this property.
6.4. The numerical guidelines contained within ‘Places for Living’ and ‘Extending your Home’ would be met. Permitted development rights should be removed by way of a condition in order to protect the future privacy of the neighbouring occupiers.

6.5. I consider that the design of the proposal is acceptable and sufficient amenity space would be retained. The proposal would not be visible from the street scene of Elizabeth Road and the overall proposal complies with the design guide ‘Extending your Home’.

6.6. Notwithstanding the objections raised from the public participation carried out, I do not consider that the proposal would unduly affect residential or local amenity. The proposal would not cause sufficient detriment in order to sustain a refusal of the application.

7. Conclusion

7.1. This application is recommended for approval as the proposal complies with the objectives of the policies as set out above.

8. Recommendation

8.1. Recommend- Approval subject to the following conditions:

1. Requires that the materials used match the main building
2. Requires the scheme to be in accordance with the listed approved plans
3. Limits the approval to 3 years (Full)
4. Requires the erection of extensions simultaneously
5. Removes PD rights for new windows

Reason for Approval

1. Birmingham City Council grants Planning Permission subject to the condition(s) listed below (if appropriate). The reason for granting permission is because the development is in accordance with:

Case Officer: Kerry Challoner