

WYRE FOREST DISTRICT COUNCIL

PLANNING (DEVELOPMENT CONTROL) COMMITTEE

1st NOVEMBER 2005

PART B

WF/1109/04		Proposal:	Full: Demolition of existing garage, storage and ancillary buildings to accommodate new extension to provide additional A1 retail sales area, storage and plantrooms with parking; change of use of ground floor and first floor to provide storage and staff facilities; alterations to shop front; 2.4m high fencing to rear boundary (re-submission of WF.18/04) at 63 ARELEY COMMON, STOURPORT ON SEVERN
Date Received:	19.10.04		
Agent:	Barnett Taylor Associates.		
Ord. Sheet:	380186.2,269957.1		
Policy:	D.1,D.3,D.10,D.11,D.18, TR.9,TR.17,RT.6,RT.7, RT.10 (AWFDLP)		
Case Officer:	Julia Mellor		
Ward:	Areley Kings	Applicant:	Perry's (Trading) Ltd.,

Site Location and Description: The application site fronts Areley Common and currently accommodates the existing building, the forecourt parking area and garden to the rear. On site is a post office and small shop with residential accommodation at ground and first floor. It is proposed to demolish the existing garage, storage and ancillary buildings and replace them with a single storey pitched roof extension to the side and flat roof extension to the rear. The larger extension to the rear would protrude approximately 18 metres towards the residential property at 61A. The proposed scheme also comprises seven car parking spaces to the rear with a further seven parking spaces and a delivery space within the existing forecourt area. The application was reported to the meeting of the Planning (Development Control) Committee on 11th January 2005 when delegated authority was given to Officers to approve the application subject to the receipt of satisfactory details of noise emitting equipment and a further noise assessment with the methodology agreed prior to its undertaking with Environmental Health Officers. The purpose of this report is to update Members with respect to the proposed noise mitigating measures.

Planning History: WF.18/04 – Demolition of existing garage etc., new extension to provide additional sales area : Refused 15th April 2004

Consultations and Representations: Environmental Health – Recommend that the detailed proposals satisfy the required noise attenuation provision

(Note that Neighbours have not been consulted with respect to the proposed noise mitigation measures)

Officer Comments: At the outset a noise assessment formed part of the original submission, however Environmental Health Officers at that time advised that they could not accept that it fully realised the potential noise impact to nearby residential units. Environmental Health Officers still however maintained that appropriate noise mitigation measures could be employed on the site but recommended that a more robust noise impact assessment be submitted in writing for approval by the Local Planning Authority. Subsequently, delegated authority was given to approve the application. A second noise assessment was submitted in May 2005 but again Environmental Health Officers considered its findings to be incorrect. In September 2005 Environmental Health Officers met the proprietor on site and in light of the lack of progress with respect to a satisfactory noise assessment, discussed the necessary requirements to ensure that noise generated by refrigeration plant and machinery would not significantly detract from neighbouring amenity. A detailed specification of the proposed equipment has now been submitted with a single cool acoustic refrigeration plant proposed measuring 2.5 metres x 1.53 metres and a height of 2.4 metres. The submitted specification confirms that the overall sound pressure level would not exceed 31dB(A). The proposed single unit would be positioned to the rear of the flat roof single storey extension.

Conclusions and Recommendations: In the light of the detailed specification which raises no objection from Environmental Health Officers, the recommendation is for **APPROVAL** subject to the following conditions:

1. A6 (Full with no reserved matters);
2. A11 (Approved plans);
3. Materials as agreed;
4. Landscaping as agreed;
5. C8 (Landscape implementation);
6. Parking in accordance with plan;
7. Boundary treatment as agreed;
8. No external storage;
9. Parking for site operatives as agreed;
10. Plant/machinery in accordance with details;
11. Plant/machinery to be painted;
12. No additional plant or machinery

Reason for Approval

The concerns of neighbouring residents have been considered in relation to the proposal which seeks to extend this retail premises located within this local centre. On balance, it is considered that the benefits to the local centre outweigh other concerns which it is felt could not be sustained on Appeal. The detailed specification for the proposed refrigeration plant is also considered acceptable. For these reasons the proposal is considered to be in accordance with the policies listed above.

WF/0913/05
Date Received: 07.09.05
Agent: Michael A Chapman.
Ord. Sheet: 383563.4,274442.1
Policy: E.2,D.1,D.3,D.10,D.11,D.15,
TR.9,TR.17 (AWFDLP)
Case Officer: Paul Wrigglesworth

Proposal: Full : **Erection of an extension to Briten Ltd. (warehouse and office extension with mezzanine area in existing building) new access road & car parking area at BRITEN LTD, EDWIN AVENUE, HOO FARM IND.ESTATE, KIDDERMINSTER.**

Ward: Aggborough & Spennells

Applicant: Briten Ltd.

Site Location and Description: Briten Ltd. is situated on Edwin Avenue on the Hoo Farm Industrial Estate. This firm owns a large area of land to the rear of the premises which after a relatively flat area eventually slopes off steeply towards residential properties located in Kenilworth Drive/Chirk Close/Flint Close. The application is for an extension to the side of the existing warehouse building incorporating a new office at the front and a mezzanine area in part of the existing warehouse building. The application also proposes a new access road on the other side of the property leading to the area at the rear where twenty car parking spaces are proposed with landscaping.

Planning History: WF.605/04 – Erection of a new unit to rear with car parking area, extension to Briten Ltd. with car parking area, new access approach : Approved 10th November 2004

Consultations and Representations: Highway Authority – Views awaited

Environment Agency – Views awaited

Severn Trent Water Ltd. – Views awaited

Environmental Health – No objection

Health and Safety Executive – No objection

Worcestershire County Council Historic Environment and Archaeology Service – Views awaited

Disability action Wyre Forest – Access Statement required

Neighbour : one letter received – This building is situated to the rear of my property. The ground level is a lot higher and the windows of my home, including a bathroom, face this direction, therefore my privacy would be affected and object strongly to being overlooked. There is also the problem of the ground on which the extension will be built – it is very sandy and even with new drainage (as trees were taken down) in bad weather the sand washed into our garden; concerned about land movement.

Officer Comments: Outline planning permission exists for an extension to the side of this building. However, because the proposed extension is slightly larger than previously approved, the applicants have decided to make a new full planning application for this. The current application has been amended and now also includes a car parking area and new access road which was approved under outline planning permission WF.913/05. The extensions are well designed and should not have ramifications for residential property. As stated, the car parking area to the rear has been approved previously. This area is immediately adjacent to the rear of the building on the flat area of land which is some distance away from residential property. The intervening land will be landscaped which should reduce the visual impact of these works.

Conclusions and Recommendations: The proposed development accords with the above mentioned policies and is recommended for **APPROVAL** subject to the following conditions:-
1. A6 (Full with no reserved matters); 2. A11 (Approved plans); 3. B3 (Finishing materials to match); 4. E6 (No drainage to watercourse); 5. Fencing; 6. Details of any lighting; 7.

Highway; 8. Severn Trent Water

Reason for Approval

The proposed development is considered to be acceptable in terms of land use designation, impact on neighbouring property, visual amenity on the respective car parking and highway related issues. To approve the development consistent with the above mentioned policies contained within the Adopted Wyre Forest District Local Plan.

WF/0914/05 and WF/915/05
Date Received: 07.09.05
Agent: David Wall Architects
Ord. Sheet: 382920.3,279409.4
Policy: D1, D3, NR5, LA2, GB1, GB2,
GB6, LB1, LB2, LB3, LB5, CA1,
TR9, TR17 (AWFDLP), CTC1,
CTC8, CTC19, CTC20, D39
(WCSP); QE1, QE3, QE5, QE6,
QE9 (RPG11)
Case Officer: Paul Round

Proposal: Full : **Detached garage, pitched roof to existing sun room, erection of conservatory, replacement windows and refurbishment of roof** Listed Building Consent : **Internal alterations, replacement windows, new pitched roof to existing sun lounge, detached garage, conservatory and refurbishment of roof at KNIGHT HOUSE, WOLVERLEY**

Ward: Wolverley

Applicant: Mr & Mrs P Rees

Site Location and Description: Knight House is an impressive detached dwelling located in the centre of Wolverley Village built in the 1820's. It is a grade II listed building, located within the Conservation Area, Green Belt and Landscape Protection Area. The proposals seek for various internal works, small extensions and a detached garage.

Planning History: Various but most recently
WF.1024/81 & WF1025/05 – Garage : Approved
WF.680/82 – Raise existing Wall : Approved
WF.582/04 – Alterations to windows : Approved
WF.356/05 & WF 357/05 – Internal and external alterations : Withdrawn

Consultations and Representations: Wolverley and Cookley Parish Council – Recommend Approval. Highway Authority – Views awaited

Conservation Officer – I have no objections over these proposals and am of the opinion that the proposed works involve the minimal removal of historic fabric, and overall will have a beneficial impact on the Listed Building.

English Heritage - No comments – Should be determined in line with local and national policy guidance and your specialist conservation advice.

Georgian Group - The group are broadly in line with proposals. Object to demolition and construction of new garage and conservatory. Will cause visual interruption to the symmetrical and unobtrusive collection of buildings.

Environment Agency – No comments

Neighbour – No representations received

Officer Comments: The proposals have been significantly amended since the withdrawal of the previous application, and have been formulated through discussions with the Conservation Officer. The majority of the works are uncontentious and involve internal alterations, and replacement of external windows and doors. These are not considered to be harmful to the character of the Listed Building. The external works involve the roofing of an existing flat roof extension, demolition of the existing 1980's garage and replacing with a timber conservatory. These works in terms of their design and position are felt to enhance the external appearance of the building, and will achieve an overall benefit to the character of the Listed Building. Due to the demolition of the garage, the applicants wish to erect a detached garage and construct a driveway that will be sited away from the house. The design and position of the garage and driveway will not adversely affect the character and appearance of the Listed Building or the Conservation Area. The comments of the Georgian Group have been noted, however in view of no objections being raised by English Heritage or the Council's Conservation Officer, I take the view that on balance the works are acceptable

Conclusions and Recommendations: The works proposed are not considered to have a harmful effect on the character or appearance of the Listed Building or the Conservation Area, and I therefore recommend **APPROVAL** subject the following conditions:-

[WF914/05] – 1. A6 (Full with no reserved matters); 2. A11 (Approved plans); 3. B1 (Samples/Details of materials); 4. G1 (Details of works to Listed Buildings); 5. J5 (Domestic garages: restriction of residential use)

[WF915/05] – 1. A7 (Listed Building Consent); 2. A11 (Approved plans); 3. B1 (B1 (Samples/Details of materials); 4. G1 (Details of works to Listed Buildings)

Reason for Approval:

The proposed alterations are considered to be of a design that would complement the Conservation Area and the adjacent Listed Building. The effects of the development on neighbouring property has been carefully assessed and it is considered that there will be no undue loss of amenity. The proposal is thus in accordance with the policies listed above.

WF/0916/05		Proposal:	Full : Change of use of Care Home to guest house/bed and breakfast accommodation at DRAKELOW MANOR, SLADD LANE, WOLVERLEY.
Date Received:	07.09.05		
Agent:			
Ord. Sheet:	381716.7,280124.2		
Policy:	D1, D3, NR5, LA2, GB1, GB2, GB6, LB1, LB2, LB3, LB5, CA1, TR9, TR17 (AWFDLP), CTC1, CTC8, CTC19, CTC20, D39 (WCSP); QE1, QE3, QE5, QE6, QE9 (RPG11)		
Case Officer:	Claire Bishop	Applicant:	Mrs E Hawken
Ward:	Wolverley		

Site Location and Description: Drakelow Manor is a remote farm complex which is located half way between Sladd Lane and Drakelow Lane approximately 1 mile west of Wolverley village and is accessed via a private track from Sladd Lane. The Old Granary and Summerhill Barn are also located within this small complex of buildings and have now been converted into independent units of residential accommodation but are within the same ownership as the farmhouse. Up until recently Drakelow Manor was used as a nursing home for the elderly, however, this has now closed. This application seeks to change the use of the premises to provide guest house accommodation with a total of 10 guest bedrooms and integral owners/managers accommodation. The site is within the designated West Midlands Green Belt and Landscape Protection Area.

Planning History: WF.582/74 – Change of use from dwelling to private nursing home: Refused; WF.14/76 – Kitchen and bathroom extension: Approved; WF.291/84 – Change of use to rest home for the elderly: Approved; WF.140/88 – Extension: Approved; WF.343/89 – Extension to residential home for the elderly: Approved; WF.269/92 – Change of use of barn to managers accommodation: Approved; WF.888/96 – Conversion of barn to dwelling: Approved; WF.248/05 – Change of use of care home to guest house/bed & breakfast accommodation: Withdrawn.

Consultations and Representations: Wolverley and Cookley Parish Council – Recommend Approval
Highway Authority – Views awaited

Ramblers Association – Clearly this development will impact directly upon the bridleway which also serves as the access drive. Since both the access from the public carriageway and part of the access drive itself are to be widened it is a reasonable assumption that greater motor vehicle traffic is anticipated. Since the bridleway gives public access to three categories of User we would expect there to be some proposals for ensuring the safety and the enjoyment of this right of way. We see nothing within the proposals before us to allay those concerns. In the circumstances we are left with little alternative but to make formal objection to this application in its current form and until such time as proposals are formulated.

Economic Development and Tourism – Views awaited

Disability Action Wyre Forest – Request ramp to be designed as permanent feature and shower room to disabled bedroom to be a wet room

Neighbour/Site Notice – No representations received

Officer Comments: Policy TM.4 of the Local Plan allows for the change of use of existing buildings within the Green Belt to small scale country house hotels and guest houses provided the proposal meets with the policies for the re-use and adaptation of rural buildings. It is not proposed to physically alter the external appearance of the building. There would be a number of internal alterations, however, the building is not listed and therefore the proposal is considered to comply with Policies RB.1 – RB.4. The guest and accessible car parking would utilise existing hard surfaced areas within the building's curtilage and it is not felt to be harmful to the visual amenity or openness of the Green Belt or Landscape Protection Area. This application is a re-submission of an earlier planning application which was withdrawn following concerns from the Highway Authority due to lack of visibility at the junction of the private access track with Sladd Lane and the track being of insufficient width to allow for 2 vehicles to pass. The scheme has been amended to provide for passing bays and improved visibility which would involve the loss of a small area of foliage and a very slight encroachment into the adjoining agricultural land. In visual terms the amendments are considered to be acceptable however the Highway Authority's observations are awaited on this scheme. In response to the issues raised by the Ramblers Association additional information has been requested from the applicant however this has not yet been submitted. Notwithstanding this, it is considered that this matter could be adequately controlled by a condition/note.

Conclusions and Recommendations: In view of the above the application is recommended for **delegated APPROVAL** subject to no objections being received from the Highways Authority

1. A6 (Full with No Reserved Matters);
 2. A11 (Approved Plans);
 3. C10 (Visibility Splay – Replacement Hedge);
 4. J16 (Restrictions of Use);
 5. Public footpath/bridleway; Note – Public footpath/bridleway not to be obstructed
- Reason for Approval: The proposed development is compliant with the above policies in the Local Plan in terms of usage and compatibility with Green Belt. The proposed change of use is capable of implementation without creating serious adverse effects on the amenity of the immediate locality or highway safety.

WF/0917/05	Proposal:	Full : Erection of two storey and single storey extensions at 16 SUMMERHILL AVENUE, KIDDERMINSTER.
Date Received: 07.09.05		
Agent: -		
Ord. Sheet: 381476.2,276410.5		
Policy: D.1, D.3, D.17, TR.9, TR.17 (AWFDLP)		
Case Officer: Stuart Allum	Applicant:	Mr G S Perks,
Ward: Habberley and Blakebook		

Site Location and Description: Number 16 Summerhill Avenue is a detached dwelling located in a residential area to the east of Kidderminster town centre, accessed from Bewdley Hill. There has been one previous extension to the property (see below). The proposal is for a two storey side extension together with a single storey extension to the rear of the new extension. The extension will provide a garage at ground floor and an en-suite bedroom at first floor level.

Planning History:

WF.262/89 – Rear ground floor extension : Approved

Consultations and Representations:

Highway Authority – No objection

Neighbours – No representations received

Officer Comments: Policy D.17 of the Adopted Wyre Forest District Local Plan relates to extensions to dwellings and requires them to be in scale and keeping with and not overwhelm the original building. The proposed extensions in two storey and single storey form, to the side of the dwelling are considered to be in scale and harmony with the original building, and will also appear as visually subservient additions in the context of the street scene. Although the two storey element is shown to be constructed up to the boundary of the neighbouring bungalow, I do not feel that the development would create an unacceptable visual over dominance of that property, or a serious loss of amenity or privacy.

Conclusions and Recommendations: This proposal complies with the appropriate Development Plan policies. I therefore recommend **APPROVAL** subject to conditions, and in consideration of Articles 1 and 8 of the Human Rights Act 1988.

1. (A6 Standard time); 2. A11 (Approved Plans); 3. B3 (Finishing materials to match);

Reason for Approval

The proposed extensions are considered to be of an appropriate scale and design to the main dwelling and will have an acceptable appearance in the street scene. The impact of the extension upon the neighbouring property has been carefully assessed and it is considered that there will be no undue impact upon their amenity. For these reasons the proposal is considered to be in accordance with the policies listed above.

WF/0922/05	Proposal:	Full : Erection of first floor office extension over garage/car repairs at LAND ADJ. 5 COMBERTON TERRACE, KIDDERMINSTER.
Date Received: 09.09.05		
Agent: Engineering & Building Design		
Ord. Sheet: 383649.7,276340.7		
Policy: D1, D18, LB1, LB5, (AWFDLP) Design SPG		
Case Officer: Stuart Allum	Applicant:	Mr & Mrs Ingles
Ward: Greenhill		

Site Location and Description: This application relates to land adjacent to the row of terraced properties on Comberton Terrace which are locally listed. The site is also adjacent to Comberton Place car park. The proposal is for a first floor extension over an existing single storey garage building which is used for car repairs. The extension will provide an office and storage area, together with a toilet and small kitchen area. The existing garage building is 3.6 metres in height and the maximum height of the extension would be 7.8 metres.

Planning History: of relevance

WF 400/05 – First floor extension over garage/car repairs : Withdrawn

Consultations and Representations: Highway Authority : Comments awaiting

Severn Trent Water – Comments awaiting

Environmental Health – Comments awaiting

Conservation Officer – Objects to the proposal; the amendments do not overcome the previous objections to the scheme. Recommends refusal

Neighbour– No representations received

Officer Comments: This is a revised scheme following the withdrawal of a previous application for a similar type of development. Concern was raised over the previous scheme due to the scale and massing of the extension and the poor quality of its design. The current scheme involves a reduction in the height of the roof by 0.6 metres and also the introduction of two dormer windows on the front elevation facing towards Comberton Terrace. As the extension is at first floor level it will be clearly visible from Comberton Hill and the wider area, and the premises will be viewed in the context of the locally listed terrace of properties. It is considered that the proposed changes to the scheme do not satisfactory overcome the concerns raised with the previous application. The extension will still be an incongruous feature within the street scene and will detract significantly from the setting of the neighbouring row of terraced properties which are locally listed.

Conclusions and Recommendations: In view of the above I recommend **REFUSAL** of the application for the following reasons:

1. The proposed extension by virtue of scale, massing and design will represent an incongruous feature at this site which comprises a single storey garage building. It also fails to respect the local distinctiveness of the area and as such would have an adverse impact on the visual amenity of the area. The proposal would be contrary to Policies D1, D3 and D18 of the Adopted Wyre Forest District Local Plan and also advice within the adopted SPG on Design Quality.
2. The proposed extension by virtue of scale, massing and design would detract from the setting of the row of terraced properties, Comberton Terrace which are locally listed and contribute positively to the character and appearance of the area. The proposal would be contrary to Policies LB1, LB5 and CA6 of the Adopted Wyre Forest District Local Plan.

WF/0924/05

Date Received: 13.09.05
Agent: Simon Fletcher Architects
Ord. Sheet: 380764.8,272002.2
Policy: D.1, D.17 (AWFDLP)
Case Officer: Joanne Howells
Ward: Lickhill

Proposal: Full : **Erection of two storey side extension and rear conservatory at 20 OLIVE GROVE STOURPORT ON SEVERN**

Applicant: Mr & Mrs Wood

Site Location and Description: Number 20 Olive Grove is a semi-detached property located within the central area of Stourport on Severn. The application seeks consent for a two-storey extension to the side and a conservatory extension to the rear.

Consultations and Representations:

Stourport on Severn Town Council – Awaiting comments

Highway Authority – No objections subject to condition

Neighbour : One letter of objection from the adjoining neighbour (No 19) - We do not have a problem with extension, but we are concerned about the overall height of the conservatory, we feel it will greatly reduce the light in our conservatory and in our kitchen, which is already dark due to our own conservatory.

Officer Comments: The property has not been previously extended and the first floor of the side extension is set back approximately 1.5m with a lower ridge height and is therefore considered subservient to the original property. Overall the design is in keeping with the character and style of the original dwelling. Since the application was submitted the agent has been requested to amend the scheme by replacing the first floor side window to the proposed fourth bedroom with a high level window to prevent any potential loss of privacy and overlooking into the neighbouring property. These revised plans have now been received.

With regard to the neighbour's concerns there is a central bay window to the rear of their property which is the single source of light to the kitchen. However the location of this window approximately 3m from the shared boundary is not considered to be affected by the 45 degree code and the single storey rear extension would not significantly affect light into the kitchen more so than the existing situation. The lack of light may unfortunately be exacerbated by the neighbour's own conservatory which has a largely brick wall to this north (shared) side and an obscure glazed roof.

Conclusions and Recommendations: The neighbours comments have been taken into consideration, however the proposed conservatory is not considered to cause a significant adverse impact on neighbour amenity. Therefore subject to no new objections being received during the re-consultation period, I recommend **delegated APPROVAL** subject to the following conditions:

1. A6 (Full with no reserved matters); 2. A11 (Approved plans); 3. B3 (Finishing materials to match); 4. Highway; Note - SN12 (Neighbour's rights)

Reason for Approval

The proposed extension is considered to be of an appropriate scale and design to the main dwelling and will have an acceptable appearance in the street scene. The impact of the extension upon neighbouring properties has been carefully assessed and it is considered that there will be no undue impact upon their amenity

WF/0927/05

Date Received: 13.09.05
Agent: Barnett Taylor Associates.
Ord. Sheet: 380771.1,272180.9
Policy: D.1, D.17
Case Officer: Joanne Howells
Ward: Lickhill

Proposal: Full : **Replacement garage
at 81 BEWDLEY ROAD,
STOURPORT ON SEVERN.**

Applicant: Mr & Mrs Barnett

Site Location and Description: 81 Bewdley Road is a detached property located in the north west area of Stourport on Severn. This application seeks consent for a replacement double garage at the end of the garden to the rear of the property, much of which has already been built.

Planning History: WF.798/85 - Lounge and kitchen extension - Approved

Consultations and Representations:

Stourport on Severn Town Council – awaiting comments

Highway Authority – No objections

Neighbour - One letter of objection has been received from the property immediately behind the application site concerned with the following: I object to the size of the garage particularly the height. I am suspicious about the reasons for the size, which is actually higher than our bungalow and for a double garage about two-thirds the size of our bungalow. It is very imposing and I believe the garage floor has been raised from the height of the original and this will impinge on our privacy.

I am concerned about the proximity to the garden wall as it does not allow a large turning circle for cars to use the garage. I am also concerned that at a later date the garage may be turned into living accommodation and I would like a clause written into any endorsement of the plans.

Officer Comments: The proposed replacement garage is over 5m away from the original property but Policy D17 requires curtilage buildings to harmonise with the existing townscape and not create incongruous features. In this case the proposal is for a substantial garage with two windows and a door at the rear and double garage doors to the front. It is both larger in height and width than the existing double garage at the adjacent property and measures some 6.7m x 8.5m x 5m. The proposal is not considered to be an acceptable size or design in this location and it is not considered to be harmonious with its setting and is visually dominant. With regard to the neighbours' concerns the garage is considered to affect amenity in terms of its overbearing relationship. It is considered that the extension would have an adverse impact upon the existing outlook from the neighbour's garden. The Highways Partnership has been consulted with regard to this application but have no objections with regard to the turning circle. Conditions can be attached to proposals to restrict the use of buildings, however in light of the above comments the proposal is considered contrary to local plan policies.

Conclusions and Recommendations: In view of the above the proposal is considered contrary to local plan policy, therefore I recommend **REFUSAL** for the following reason:

1. The proposed double garage is not considered to be of an appropriate size and as a result design and would have an adverse visual impact upon the surrounding townscape. Furthermore by virtue of its size it is considered that the garage would have an overbearing impact upon the adjacent gardens and therefore detract from the amenity currently enjoyed by neighbours. As such the proposal is considered contrary to policies D.1 and D.17 of the Adopted Wyre Forest District Local Plan.

WF/0928/05

Date Received: 13.09.05
Agent: T.J.Preece And Associates
Ord. Sheet: 374613.8,273135.5
Policy: H.9, D.1, D.5, D.17, LA.1, LA.2,
TR.9 AWFDP; CTC.1, CTC.4,
D.10 AWCSP; QE.1 and QE.6
RPG11)

Case Officer: Claire Bishop
Ward: Rock

Proposal: Full : **Erection of three bay detached garage at CHERRY CROFT, BLISS GATE ROAD, ROCK.**

Applicant: Mr N Montandon

Site Location and Description: Cherry Croft is a substantial property located on western side of Bliss Gate Road at the junction with Dark Lane. The application seeks permission for a 3 bay detached garage with storage space on the first floor to be located between the dwelling and Bliss Gate Road. The application site is within an Area of Great landscape Value and a Landscape Protection Area.

Planning History: WF.1310/03 – Replacement dwelling with temporary caravan as residence during construction: Approved; WF.623/03 – Two storey extension, demolition of part of house: Approved; WF.339/03 – Erection of two storey and single storey extensions, demolition of part of existing house: Approved.

Consultations and Representations:

Rock Parish Council – Recommended Approval

Highways Authority – Views awaited

Environment Agency – No comment

Neighbour/Site Notice – No representations received

Officer Comments: Cherry Croft is a new dwelling which replaced a more modest property. Permitted development rights for extensions and curtilage buildings were taken away when the development was approved and the background justification of Policy H.9 of the Local Plan says where dwellings are replaced, the scale and size of any future extensions will be considered against the previous original dwelling. It would appear that the replacement dwelling has a larger floor area than the cottage (including approved extensions) it replaced. The proposed garage building would have a footprint of 69.36m² and would be 5.2m in height to the ridge thus allowing for useable space within the roof. No objections are raised to the overall style of the building which would be in character with the existing house, however, by virtue of its' siting, size, scale and height the proposal would not only increase the scale and massing of the buildings that were originally present on the site but would also have a detrimental impact on the character and quality of this part of the landscape which is within an Area of Great Landscape Value and a Landscape Protection Area. The proposed development would therefore be contrary to policies LA.1 and LA.2 of the Local Plan.

Conclusions and Recommendations: The provisions of Articles 1 & 8 of the Human Rights Act 1998 have been taken into consideration, however, the application is recommended for **REFUSAL** for the following reasons:

1. The application site is within an area designated as a Landscape Protection Area and an Area of Great Landscape Value. The proposed 3 bay detached garage and store, when considered together with the replacement dwelling and the previous extensions to the original dwelling, would increase the mass and scale of the buildings that were originally on the site and would go beyond what would be in scale and character with the original buildings thus having a detrimental impact on the character and quality of this part of the landscape. The development would therefore be contrary to Policies D.1, D.5, D.17, LA.1, LA.2 and the aims of Policy H.9 of the Adopted Wyre Forest District Local Plan; Policies CTC.1, CTC.4 and D.10 of the Worcestershire County Structure Plan and Policies QE1 and QE6 of the Regional Planning Guidance for the West Midlands.

WF/0932/05

Date Received: 14.09.05
Agent: Clist And Chandler
Ord. Sheet: 382299.8,275689.6
Policy: H2, D1, D3, D4, TR9, TR17AD
D11 – WCCSP QE3, -RPG11
Case Officer: Paul Round
Ward: Sutton Park

Proposal:

Full : **Erection of detached dwelling at
LAND ADJ 63 POPLAR ROAD,
KIDDERMINSTER.**

Applicant:

P Manning Esq

Site Location and Description: 63 Poplar Road is a detached property situated on the top of a ridge that backs onto the properties in Woodward Road, Kidderminster. The property has a substantial side garden on which it is proposed to construct a detached three bedroom property. The site is allocated for residential purposes within the local plan and it is felt that the nature of the land constitutes previously developed land.

Planning History: KB.242/71 – Detached House – Refused : Appeal – Dismissed

KB.659/71 – Pair of Semi-detached dwellings – Refused

KB.276/74 – Bungalow - Refused

Consultations and Representations: Highway Authority - No objection subject to conditions

Severn Trent - No Objection subject to condition

Neighbour – 5 letters of objection received, raising the following issues: -

- loss of light to habitable rooms - Loss of privacy - Concern over stability of land - Direct overlooking
- Concern over drainage and surface water run off - Dominance and loss of light to garden area - Devaluation of property

Officer Comments:

Members will note from the history of this site that there have been a number of refused applications and a dismissed appeal in the 1970's. The concerns at that time related to lack of amenity space and loss of amenity to adjacent properties by virtue of an overbearing appearance. The appeal was dismissed purely on the lack of space between the properties, being 23ft (7m), and as such it was considered to create an overbearing impact. The current proposal has been designed to overcome the previous concerns and the constraints of the site. The properties to the rear (59 and 60 Woodward Road) are at a lower level, approximately 3m below the application site, and are within 6m of the boundary of the site. These properties only have habitable windows at first floor level. The position of the dwelling from the boundary is 5m, giving a total distance between the dwellings of 11m. The proposed dwelling has been designed to have only non-habitable rooms facing the rear of the property. This site currently provides an unattractive streetscene to Poplar Road and this application provides an opportunity to utilise land and provide positive contribution to the area. The sites constraints are unusual, however it is felt that the dwelling proposed would meet the policy criteria, provide efficient use of land without prejudicing the amenities of residents or the area. Revised plans are anticipated to lower the eaves height at the rear of the dwelling to lessen the height of the dwelling, and to remove the garage to allow adequate amenity space around the dwelling. Such amendments will result in an overall acceptable relationship between the dwellings, and due to the nature of the windows to the rear, which can be obscure glazed, it is felt that no undue loss of privacy or increased overlooking will occur. In terms of the neighbours gardens, it is not considered that an increase in overlooking will occur over and above that which occurs at present through the current use of the land as garden to 63 Poplar Road. The design of the property is considered to be characteristic to the surrounding area and will not appear incongruous in its setting in the streetscene. The Highway Authority is satisfied with the scheme in terms of highway safety, which also provides a benefit in an increase in the footway along Poplar Road. On balance, having considered all the objections do consider that the application would result in such a degree of harm that could be support a refusal in this case. Matters raised by the neighbours in respect of ground stability and drainage can be dealt with via appropriate conditions.

Conclusions and Recommendations: I therefore recommend **delegated APPROVAL** subject to the receipt of satisfactory amended plans, and no new objections being raised as a result on the subsequent consultation process and the following conditions:-

1. A6 (Full with No Reserved Matters), 2. A11 (Approved Plans), 3. J1 (Removal of Permitted Development – Residential); 4. J7 (Windows: Obscure Glazing); 5. B1 (Samples/Details of Materials); 6. B11 (Details of Enclosure); 7. B13 (Levels Details); 8. D3 (Slope Stability); 9. E2 (Foul and Surface Water); 10. F5 (Construction Site Noise/Vibration); 11. F13 (Control of Dust); 12. Highways

Notes – A. SN1 (Removal of Permitted Development Rights); B. SN12 (Neighbours rights); C. Highway

Reason for Approval

The proposed dwelling is well designed and will have an acceptable appearance in the street scene. The scheme is also acceptable in terms of highway safety. The impact of the dwelling upon neighbouring properties has been carefully assessed and it is considered that there will be no undue impact upon their amenity. For

these reasons the proposal is considered to be in accordance with the policies listed above.

WF/0935/05	Proposal:	Full: Demolition of bridge abutments & regrading of embankments. at TBY/10 RUDDS BRIDGE WYRE FOREST
Date Received: 14.09.05		
Agent: May Gurney Ltd.		
Ord. Sheet: 372863.0,275992.1		
Policy: LA2, NC1, NC3, NC4, NC5, NC7, LR8 (AWFDLP)		
Case Officer: Joanne Howells	Applicant:	Rail Property Ltd
Ward: Rock		

Site Location and Description: This application relates to TBY at 10 Rudds Bridge which is part of a disused railway line, of which only the bridge abutments remain. The site is on the western edge of the district, within a Landscape Protection Area and Area of Great Landscape Value. It is also adjacent to the Wyre Forest SSSI and National Nature Reserve which the eastern railway bank lies within. A bridleway and track to the nearest property also runs between the abutments.

Planning History: None

Consultations and Representations: Rock Parish Council – Recommend refusal as the stonework from this former bridge should be retained and conserved

Highway Authority – No objection subject to conditions

Severn Trent Water – No comments received

County (Footpaths) - No comments received

County (Archaeology) - No comments received

Central Networks – No objection

English Nature - Objection received concerned with the lack of consideration for protected species and impact on vegetation, and no restoration/ enhancement to mitigate for the works

Wildlife Trust – No comments received

Ramblers Association – Objection received concerned with an absence of material information with regard to the bridle way and potential impact of the works. Further information has been received from the Agent and the Ramblers Association has been reconsulted (consultation period ends 28th October).

Neighbour - One letter of objection concerned with damage done to the track and property due to the works. *Officer Comment - The neighbour has been informed this is a private matter between them and the applicant, and their comments have been forwarded accordingly.*

Officer Comments: The disused railway runs through the nature reserve and the re-grading of the embankment is considered an appropriate proposal in this area. The proposal is not considered to have a significant adverse effect on the quality or character of the Landscape Protection Area. The site is in a remote location and is not considered to affect neighbour amenity. With regards to the objection from English Nature the Agent has not provided sufficient information to fully consider the impact on protected species or vegetation. The Agent has since been requested to submit a more comprehensive survey of the habitat with suitable mitigation measures as necessary. Without this information it is not possible for English Nature to make a detailed assessment of the impact of the development and as such the application is considered contrary to Policy NC1 and NC4 of the Adopted Wyre Forest District Local Plan. These policies state that development that may have an adverse effect (directly or indirectly) on a SSSI or National Nature Reserve, and on a species protected under European or British Law, will not be permitted.

With regard to the Parish Council comments the conservation and retention of the stonework is not felt that a refusal on this reason could be substantiated at appeal.

Conclusions and Recommendations: I recommend **REFUSAL** for the following reason:

1. Insufficient information has been provided to assess the impact of the development on protected species and vegetation with a site adjacent to the Wyre Forest SSSI and National Nature Reserve. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies NC1 and NC4 of the Adopted Wyre Forest District Local Plan which seek to ensure that proposals will not to have an

adverse impact of these species.

WF/0938/05

Date Received: 14.09.05
Agent: T.J.Preece And Associates
Ord. Sheet: 380846.2,272145.4
Policy: H.2, D.1, D.3, D.4, D.10, D.13,
TR.9, TR.17 (AWDFLP); D.11
(WCSP); QE.2 & QE.3 (RPG11)
Case Officer: Claire Bishop
Ward: Lickhill

Proposal: Outline: **Erection of detached house & formation of new access for existing dwelling at LAND ADJ. 82 BEWDLEY ROAD, STOURPORT ON SEVERN.**
Applicant: Mr & Mrs Powell

Site Location and Description: The application site is located on the eastern side of Bewdley Road directly opposite the Brinton Arms Public House. The site currently provides off-road car parking, garaging and domestic garden which serve No. 82 Bewdley Road. The south east boundary of the application site adjoins semi-detached dwellings located in Dorsett Road. This is an outline planning application with only siting and means of access to be considered at this stage. External appearance, design and landscaping are reserved matters.

Planning History: None

Consultations and Representations: Stourport on Severn Town Council – Views awaited
Highway Authority – Views awaited

Arboricultural Officer – Object to the proposals on arboricultural grounds. The Cedar and both Beech trees might be detrimentally affected by the alterations to the existing access and introduction of a new access.

Severn Trent Water – No objection subject to condition

Disability Action Wyre Forest – New dwelling to comply with Part M.

Neighbour/Site Notice – One letter received “concerns over the siting of the proposed detached house with the issue of being overlooked especially when out on our decking area in the top right hand corner of the garden. The issue of position of windows on the property and whether clear or obscured glazing is use over looking is another matter.”

Officer Comments: The application site falls within an area allocated for residential purposes and also constitutes previously developed land. The principle of residential development is therefore in accordance with Policy H.2 of the Local Plan. No. 82 Bewdley Road is an attractive detached house that is enclosed by mature gardens, which includes two Copper Beech Trees and an Atlantic Cedar which although not protected do provide significant amenity to the locality, and make a positive contribution to this street scene. When considered together with the dwellings to the west of the application site this part of Bewdley Road is characterised by attractive detached and semi-detached properties with equal spaces of approximately 15m between the buildings. If permission were approved a new dwelling would disrupt the existing street pattern and would not positively relate to the surrounding development. In addition to this it is felt that the proposal represents an over development of the site in that the new dwelling would look hemmed in between no. 82 Bewdley Road and the properties on Dorsett Road. Notwithstanding the above, although external appearance and design details are matters reserved for future consideration I am satisfied that a two storey dwelling could be achieved without having a detrimental impact on the amenities of the properties on Dorsett Road.

Conclusions and Recommendations: The provisions of Articles 1 & 8 of the Human Rights Act 1998 have been taken into consideration, however, the application is recommended for

REFUSAL for the following reasons:

1. A detached dwelling on a plot of this nature and size would represent over development of this site, resulting in a poor relationship with neighbouring properties and would create a cramped visual appearance of the development within the street scene. Due to the restrictions of the plot, siting of the proposed dwelling and the pattern of existing development within this part of Bewdley Road, the proposed development would not adhere to or contribute to the character or local distinctiveness of the area and would result in harm being caused to the visual amenities of the street scene and surrounding area. To approve the development in these circumstances would be contrary to Policies D.1 and D.3 of the Adopted Wyre Forest District Local Plan and advice contained within the adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance – Design Quality.
2. Insufficient information has been submitted with the application to enable the Local Planning Authority to adequately assess the impact of the proposed development on the existing mature trees on the site which provide significant amenity to the locality and are important features within the street scene. The applicant has therefore failed to demonstrate that the proposal will meet the requirements of Policy D.3 and D.4 of the

WF/0942/05	Proposal:	Full: Proposed kitchen extension to rear & dormer window to side at 39 CONISTON CRESCENT, STOURPORT ON SEVERN.
Date Received: 15.09.05		
Agent: A Griffiths		
Ord. Sheet: 380763.0,272540.0		
Policy: D.1, D.17		
Case Officer: Joanne Howells	Applicant:	Mr D Flory
Ward: Lickhill		

Site Location and Description: 39 Coniston Crescent is a semi-detached property with a hipped or catslide roof slope that slopes, on the side elevation, down to single storey level. The property is located north of Stourport on Severn town centre. This application seeks consent for a rear kitchen extension with flat roof design and a hipped roof dormer window protruding from the side to provide larger bedrooms and a bathroom

Planning History: SU / 134/71 – Extension to living room : approved

Consultations and Representations:

Stourport on Severn Town Council – awaiting comments

Highway Authority – No objection

Neighbour - No objections received

Officer Comments: The single storey extension to the rear will fill in a corner of space adjacent to an existing flat roof and will be in line with the neighbouring property. It complies with the 45 degree code and is not considered to affect neighbour amenity. The side dormer window is similar to several within the area including the adjacent property at No. 37 which received planning permission in 1993. The neighbouring dormer window has a slide facing bedroom window, however the bedroom has another window to provide light and the proposed extension therefore meets the 45° guidance. As the window on the proposed dormer window is to a bathroom, this is not considered to affect neighbour amenity. The Agent has been requested to set the proposed dormer window back from the front elevation to ensure that it appears subservient to and does not dominate the appearance of the original building.

Conclusions and Recommendations: On the basis of the plans submitted, it is recommended that **delegated** authority be given to **REFUSE** the application for the following reason:

1. By virtue of the siting and scale of the proposed side facing dormer window, which would be flush with the existing front elevation of the property, the proposal would not appear subservient to the original dwelling. It is therefore considered that the development would be contrary to Policies D.1 and D.17 and the advice contained in the Design Quality SPG (2004)

05/0943/FULL

Date Received: 15.09.05
 Agent: -
 Ord. Sheet: 386293.0,271901.0
 Policy: GB.1, GB.2, GB.6, D.1, D.3, D.5,
 D.17, TR.17 (AWFDLP); D.38,
 D.39 (AWCSP); QE.1, AE.3
 (RPG 11)

Proposal: **Erection of conservatory at
 FARBANK COTTAGE
 DROITWICH ROAD
 HARTLEBURY
 KIDDERMINSTER
 DY104ED**

Case Officer: Stuart Allum

Ward: Blakedown and
 Chaddesley

Applicant: Mr & Mrs J Clarke

Site Location and Description: Far Bank Cottage is located on the very edge of the District, bordering Wychavon District Council area. The district boundary actually runs through the middle of the site, but historically Wyre Forest District Council has been the Planning Authority, and all the previous planning applications have been submitted to and determined by Wyre Forest District Council. This site is in the open Green Belt and the original cottage has been substantially extended at both ground and first floors (see below). The proposal now is to erect a further extension in the form of a conservatory.

Planning History:

WF.114/76 Extensions and Alterations – Approved
 WF.123/90 Detached double garage and garden shed – Approved
 WF.941/92 Extension – Approved
 WF.322/99 Erection of single storey extension – Approved
 WF.564/99 Retention of former agricultural land as part of domestic residential curtilage – Approved

Consultations and Representations:

Stone Parish Council – Views awaited
Elmley Lovett Parish Council – Views awaited
Wychavon District Council – No objections
Highway Authority – Views awaited
Neighbours – No objections

Officer Comments: Adopted Local Plan Green Belt and extensions policies clearly state that extensions to existing dwellings will be regarded as inappropriate development unless the proposal is proportionate to the size of the original dwelling. In this case, although the conservatory itself is comparatively minor in size and volume (floor area 7.28 square metres), the cumulative effect of this and the various previous extensions would have the effect of overwhelming the size of the original rural cottage, which was, by comparison, of very diminutive proportions indeed.

Conclusions and Recommendations: The proposal fails to comply with the relevant and Local Plan Green Belt and extensions policies, together with County green belt policy and national guidance of PPG.2. I therefore recommend **REFUSAL** for the following reasons:-
 1. The application site lies within an area designated as part of the West Midlands Green Belt; the development proposed is considered inappropriate in this location as it would harm the openness of the Green Belt by being a disproportionate extension, coupled with the previous extensions, relative to the size of the original dwelling. This is contrary to policies QE1 and QE3 of RPG11, policies D.38 and D.39 of the Adopted Worcester County Structure Plan and policies GB.1, GB.2, GB.6, D.1, D.3, D.5 and D.17 of the Adopted Wyre Forest District Local Plan.

05/0944/FULL
Date Received: 15.09.05
Agent:
Ord. Sheet: 381697.0,278176.0
Policy: D1, D17, LB5 (AWFDLP)
Case Officer: Stuart Allum

Proposal: **Erection of replacement garage following demolition of existing at 84 HONEYBROOK TERRACE KIDDERMINSTER DY115QX**
Applicant: Mr P Thetford

Site Location and Description: This application relates to Daisy Meadow Cottage which is a grade II listed building located at 84 Honeybrook Terrace in Kidderminster, The proposal is for a replacement garage following the demolition of the existing garage. The new garage would be 4.5 x 9.0 metres in size with a catslide roof. The maximum height of the garage would be 4.0 metres.

Planning History:

WF 217/88 FULL – studio/kitchen extension resite garage – approved
WF 218/88 LBC – studio/kitchen extension resite garage – approved
WF 40/93 – FULL – Rebuild bathroom, kitchen, dining area – approved
WF 42/93 LBC - – Rebuild bathroom, kitchen, dining area – approved

Consultations and Representations:

Highway Authority – no objections

Conservation Officer – The proposals will make a positive contribution to the setting of the listed building. I fully support this scheme subject to conditions.

Neighbour– 1 letter of objection received – “Whilst I do have some reservation about the height of the proposed structure (so close to my boundary), my prime concern is that the *original* garage was (allegedly) erected without planning permission and was built over an inspection cover for services to our property. I am unable to verify the veracity of this authoritatively as we have only occupied this property since later 2001”.

Officer Comments:

The proposed garage will replace an existing garage located immediately adjacent to Honeybrook Terrace. The building will occupy a large footprint than the existing garage and will be taller in height. The garage will be constructed in timber boarding with a clay tiled roof. Oak timber framing is also proposed for both gable ends. It is considered to be well designed and more in keeping with the style of the listed dwelling. As stated by the Conservation Officer it will make a positive contribution to the setting of the listed building.

With respect to the neighbours concerns the additional height is not considered to harm the amenity of the neighbour and the issue of building over an inspection cover is not a material planning consideration.

Conclusions and Recommendations: The proposed garage accords with the local plan policies and in consideration of Articles 1 and 8 of the Human Rights Act 1998, I recommend **APPROVAL** subject to the following conditions:

1. A6 (Full with No Reserved Matters);
2. A11 (Approved Plans);
3. B1 (Samples/Details of Materials);
4. B8 (Mortar, 5. B10 6. J5

Reason for Approval - The proposed garage is well designed and will make a positive contribution to the setting of the listed building. The impact on the neighbouring property has been carefully considered and there will be no undue harm caused. The proposal therefore complies with the policies listed above.

05/0949/FULL
Date Received: 19.09.05
Agent: Needham Haddrell Ltd
Ord. Sheet: 381582.3,271387.3
Policy: TR.20, E.1, NR.5 (AWFDLP);
D.44, PPG.8 (CSP)
Case Officer: Julia Mellor

Proposal: **Replacement of existing 15m telecommunications mast with a 20m cypress tree style telecommunications mast with associated antennas and cabinet at EXISTING ORANGE TELECOMMUNICATIONS SITE WORCESTER ROAD**

Ward: Mitton

Applicant: Orange Pcs Ltd

Site Location and Description: The site lies within the Severn Trent Water Pumping Station, west of the roundabout junction on Worcester Road and Hartlebury Road. The Site contains an existing monopole operated by Orange reaching an overall height of approximately 15m. The current proposal seeks consent for Vodafone to share the existing Orange installation resulting in the replacement of the existing monopole and increasing its height to approximately 20.5m. However, it is proposed to disguise the mast as a Cypress Tree. The proposals would also provide an additional two cabinets although the size of the existing compound area would remain as existing. The proposal forms part of the Vodafone 3G roll out programme. The nearest residential property at No. 2 Worcester Road lies approximately 45m from the compound. The site lies approximately 80m east of the Gilgal Conservation Area.

Planning History: WF(T)78 – 15m mast, 6 antennae, up to 4 dishes and equipment cabinets – Approved 16.4.02

Consultations and Representations: Stourport on Severn Town Council – Awaiting comment
Highway Authority – Awaiting comment. Severn Trent Water – Awaiting comment
Environment Agency – Awaiting comment. Conservation Officer – Awaiting comment
Wildlife Trust - Awaiting comment

Civic Society – Totally opposed, the existing mast is a visible eyesore sited close to one of the main gateways to the town. The proposal to increase its height and adopt a Cypress Tree configuration is totally unacceptable. At a time when considerable sums of money are being spent on the regeneration of historic Stourport we are totally opposed to having this eyesore close to one of the main entrances to the town.

Environmental Health – No adverse comments

Neighbour – No comments received

Officer Comments: As stated above the proposal comprises a Cypress Tree mast with a life span of 15 to 20 years which would replace the existing 15m grey coloured monopole. It is accepted that the site lies adjacent to one of the main routes into the town centre, however, the agent on behalf of the applicant considers that the proposal “*may actually enhance the visual amenity of the surrounding area, since a conventional mast will be replaced with a structure more in keeping with its immediate environment*”. Information together with photographs have also been submitted showing examples of where a Cypress Tree mast has been used previously. The Agents have also indicated five other sites within the vicinity which have been dismissed for various reasons. According to PPG.8 the sharing of masts and sites is strongly encouraged where it represents the optimum environmental solution in a particular case. Moreover the use of sympathetic designs and camouflage to minimise the impact of a development and to assist the equipment to blend into the landscape is promoted.

Conclusions and Recommendations: It has been a longstanding Government Policy objective to encourage telecommunications operators where practicable to share masts as a means of reducing the overall mast numbers. Whilst concerns have been raised previously, particularly with regard to the height of the tree mast and the design of tree mast chosen the evidence supplied by the applicant has persuaded me to find the visual intrusion within the existing treed setting acceptable. I am further persuaded by the replacement of the existing 15m mast, the location of the site outside the Conservation Area and by virtue of sharing a mast the proposal would assist in reducing the potential number of masts within Stourport on Severn overall. I therefore recommend **APPROVAL** subject to the following conditions:-

1. A6 (Full with No Reserved Matters); 2. A11 (Approved Plans); 3. The masts shall be removed when no longer required.

Reason for Approval

The proposed installation of a replacement mast in a design of a Cypress Tree which would provide a mast shared between two operators is considered it would have an acceptable appearance in the street-scene and complies with Policy TR.20 of the Adopted Wyre Forest District Local Plan.

05/0950/FULL	Proposal:	Erection of two dwellings following demolition of existing building at LAND BETWEEN 52 & 53 CLAUGHTON STREET KIDDERMINSTER DY116PR
Date Received: 19.09.05		
Agent: Engineering and Building Design		
Ord. Sheet: 382155.0,276102.0		
Policy: H.2,D.1,D.3,D.10,TR.9,TR.17 (AWFDLP)		
Case Officer: Paul Wrigglesworth	Applicant:	Mr R Whitehouse
Ward: Sutton Park		

Site Location and Description: It is proposed to demolish an existing commercial storage building situated between Nos. 52 and 53 Claughton Street, Kidderminster. In its place it is proposed to erect a pair of semi detached properties each with two bedrooms. A total of four car parking spaces are to be provided in the front forecourt area. To the rear of the site are further properties situated in a new development known as Claughton Court.

Planning History: WF.361/88 – Use of garage for mechanical repairs : Refused
 WF.274/99 – Pair of semi detached houses : Approved
 WF.1013/00 – Erection of ten additional houses and revisions to approved layout : Approved
 WF.678/05 – Erection of a pair of semi detached dwellings : Withdrawn

Consultations and Representations: Highway Authority – Views awaited
Environment Agency – Views awaited

Environmental Health – No objection subject to condition

Severn Trent Water Ltd. – No objection subject to condition

Neighbour/Site Notice – No representations received (objections raised to previous application)

Officer Comments: An earlier application (WF.687/05) was withdrawn following criticism that it failed to comply with the 45-degree code with respect to a side facing kitchen window on the neighbouring property. However, since the date of withdrawal it has been brought to our attention that there is an extant planning permission (WF.1013/00) to develop a housing scheme between Claughton Street and Sutton Road, which has been partly implemented, and that approved includes these two plots. The earlier scheme (WF.1013/00) was submitted prior to the 45-degree code being adopted and fails to comply. Nevertheless the current scheme should be judged against the background that there is an extant permission for two dwellings on this land and it could be argued that it would be unreasonable to withhold consent if the new situation is no worse in terms of the 45 degree code. In this regard the applicant has reduced the height of the roof and it now occupies the same siting as before. The proposed dwellings do however now also include a single storey structure to the rear but this is compliant with the 45-degree code after taking account of the presence of the existing building on site. In terms of design, relationship with the street scene and impact on the other neighbouring property the application is judged to be acceptable and compliant with adopted planning policies.

Conclusions and Recommendations: In view of the above, I recommend that the application be **APPROVED** subject to the following conditions:

1. A6 (Full with no reserved matters);
 2. B1 (Samples/details of materials);
 3. B10 (Window details [amended]);
 4. B13 (Levels details);
 5. Delete permitted development rights for extension/side windows to Plot adjacent No 52;
 6. Fencing;
 7. Obscure glazed side facing windows;
 8. D1 (Contaminated land);
 9. Severn Trent Water;
 10. Highway;
 11. F5 (Construction site noise/vibration);
- Notes A. Highway B. SN12 (Neighbours' rights)

Reason for Approval

The proposed dwellings are well designed and will have an acceptable appearance in the street scene. The scheme is also acceptable in terms of highway safety. The impact of the dwellings upon neighbouring properties has been carefully assessed and it is considered that there will be no undue impact upon their amenity over and above the extant permission WF.1013/00 and after taking into account the profile of the existing building For these reasons the proposal is considered to be in accordance with the policies listed above.

05/0953/FULL		Proposal:	Replacement dwelling (Amendment to WF 755/02 - Revised ridge height) at RIVER MEAD 0 BIRDS BARN LANE WOLVERLEY KIDDERMINSTER DY115SG
Date Received:	14.09.05		
Agent:	WALL JAMES & DAVIES		
Ord. Sheet:	382215.0,282132.0		
Policy:	H.9,D.1,D.3,D.9,LA.2, GB.1,GB.2,GB.6,CH.4 (AWFDLP); CTC.4,D.39 (WCSP)		
Case Officer:	Paul Round	Applicant:	Mr S Chamberlain
Ward:	Wolverley		

Site Location and Description: 'Rivermead' is a detached property located in the settlement of Kingsford. The site is within the Green Belt, Landscape Protection Area and Area of Great Landscape Value. The former chalet building was demolished following an approval for its replacement in 2002. The replacement bungalow is now complete, however due to significant differences between the 'as built' property and that approved under WF.755/02. An application to regularise the development was refused in April and an Appeal hearing is pending. The current application seeks consent for the retention of the bungalow, albeit with a revised ridge height. The applicant is willing to remove a large outbuilding as part of these works.

Planning History: WF.244/87 – Replacement bungalow (outline) : Approved, not implemented
 WF.380/89 – Replacement bungalow (reserved matters) : Approved, not implemented
 WF.755/02 – Replacement bungalow : Approved
 WF.1283/04 – Detached bungalow (retrospective) : Withdrawn
 WF.288/05 – Detached bungalow (retrospective) : Refused : Appeal Hearing - Pending

Consultations and Representations: Wolverley and Cookley Parish Council – Views awaited
Highway Authority – No objection. Neighbour : Two letters of support received: The constructed property is a vast improvement to the area and is well designed. If amendment is not passed then additional building work will be required, making a retrograde step for the environment due to building traffic, etc. Fully in support of this application.

Officer Comments: The previous application was refused due to the *“The replacement bungalow as built would constitute inappropriate development due to the increase in height above the original chalet and the previously approved replacement bungalow. The applicant has failed to demonstrate any very special circumstances why this inappropriate development should be permitted in the Green Belt”*. This application addresses this reason for refusal in that it involves the removal of the existing roof and replacement with a shallower roof pitch in order to achieve the same height as the approved scheme. This application is considered to be acceptable and will result in the dwelling being compliant with Green Belt policies. The remainder of the differences between as built and the approved scheme were not considered to be contentious when considering the previous application and are still felt to be acceptable. Overall the revised scheme is now acceptable and complies with local plan policy. The issue of the existence of bats within the roof space is still likely to be a concern although the applicants are aware that the necessary licences must be in place prior to disturbance of the bat roost. Although this is of significance, it is not something that should withhold the grant of planning permission in this case. A condition is proposed to give 12 months for the alterations to the roof to be carried out. This will leave sufficient time for the works to be carried out whilst enabling a licence to be obtained with respect to the bats.

Conclusions and Recommendations: In view of the above and in consideration of Articles 1 and 8 of the Human Rights Act , I recommend **APPROVAL** subject to the following conditions:-

1. A11 (Approved plans), 2. Full details of roof alterations to be submitted to and carried within 12 months of the date of permission, Detached building to be removed within 12 months of the date of permission, 3. J1 (Removal of Permitted Development – Residential), 4. J5 (Domestic Garages: Restriction of Residential Use); Notes SN1 (Removal of Permitted Development Rights), SN3 (Protection of Species).

Reason for Approval

The principle for residential development on this site has been established by WF.755/02. The design of the revised scheme is acceptable in terms of the impact on the Green Belt and Landscape Protection Area and also its impact and relationship with the neighbouring dwellings. It is thus considered that the proposal conforms to the policies listed above.

05/0955/FULL		Proposal:	Change of use of ground floor to use Class A2 (Financial & Professional Services) at 47 LOAD STREET BEWDLEY DY122AS
Date Received:	20.09.05		
Agent:	-		
Ord. Sheet:	378525.3,275315.6		
Policy:	RT.2		
Case Officer:	Claire Bishop		
Ward:	Bewdley & Arley	Applicant:	Toner Estate Agents

Site Location and Description: 47 Load Street is a Grade II Listed Building and forms part of a double fronted retail unit which is currently occupied by 'Editions'. This application proposes to sub-divide the existing unit and change the use of the ground floor from retail to A2 use (professional and financial services).

Planning History(relevant): WF.302/88 – Change of use to shop & offices: Approved.

Consultations and Representations:

Bewdley Town Council – Views awaited

Forward Planning – Views awaited

Highways Authority – No objection

Severn Trent Water – Views awaited

Neighbour/Site Notice – one letter received “Bewdley needs its retail outlets to function as a centre for both local residents and tourists; Bewdley is a market town that relies on attracting tourists and needs a variety of a reasonable number of shops; over the last two years Bewdley has lost a number of retail outlets to office use; 47/48 Load St has a very attractive shop frontage and is in a prominent position in the town; to lose this property to office use would break up and fragment a row of interesting and varied shops; concern that Bewdley has had a difficult few years with almost constant disruption for flood defence work which has made trading difficult for many businesses.”

Officer Comments: In the context of an assessment of the balance of retail and non-retail uses in primary shopping areas of Bewdley, this proposal meets the criteria set out in the reasoned justification to Policy RT.2. This Policy requires that no more than 3 units in a run of 7 (i.e. the application site and 3 units each side) should be non-retail (A1 Use Class). The on site assessment and calculation reveals that only the unit which is the subject of this application out of the 7 in this particular grouping would be non-retail as a consequence of this application being approved. The application does not propose to alter the appearance of the shop front however should any alterations be proposed at a later date these would require listed building consent.

Conclusions and Recommendations:

The proposal conforms with the appropriate development plan policies and I therefore recommend **APPROVAL** subject to the following conditions and in consideration of Articles 1 & 8 of the Human Rights Act 1998.

1. A6 (Full with No Reserved Matters); 2. A11 (Approved Plans). Notes SN4; SN5; SN10.

Reason for Approval: The proposed change of use is considered to comply with the Council’s requirement to prevent the unacceptable clustering of non-retail uses in the primary shopping areas of Bewdley Town Centre. The proposal is therefore considered to be in compliance with the above mentioned policies of the Adopted Wyre Forest District Local Plan.

05/0962/FULL

Date Received: 01.09.05
Agent: Ian Poole Design
Ord. Sheet: 377506.0,274919.0
Policy: D.1, D.3, D.17
Case Officer: Claire Bishop

Proposal: **Two storey extension to side comprising garage,WC & bedrooms over with utility,kitchen & dining room extensions to rear & front porch at
5 PINETREE ROAD
BEWDLEY
DY122JD**

Ward: Bewdley & Arley Applicant: Mr C Pointon

Site Location and Description: The application site relates to a semi-detached dwelling in a predominantly residential area to the west of Bewdley town centre. The application seeks permission to extend the property to the side at two storey level, to the rear with a single storey lean-to and a porch to the front.

Planning History: None

Consultations and Representations:

Bewdley Town Council – Views awaited

Highway Authority – No objection

Disability Action Wyre Forest – New entrance to be step free

Neighbour – No representations made

Officer Comments: Policy D.17 says that residential extensions must be subservient to and not overwhelm the original building, which should retain its visual dominance. Paragraph 3.47 of the Adopted Design Quality SPG states that extensions to existing residential developments need to be subservient to the original building. This can be achieved by stepping extensions back from the original building line and by ensuring that ridge heights are lower than the original building. In this context whilst the principle of a two storey side extension may be acceptable the proposed extension is not set back from the principle elevation nor set down from the main ridge. As a result the proposal would create a terracing affect to the Pinetree Road frontage and the extension is not considered to be visually subservient to the original dwelling.

Conclusions and Recommendations: The design and form of the proposed extension would not be visually subservient to the original dwelling and therefore the proposal is contrary to policy D.17 and the guidance of the Supplementary Planning Guidance. The provisions of Articles 1 and 8 of the Human Rights Act 1998 have been taken into consideration, however, I recommend the application for **REFUSAL** for the following reason:

1. The proposed extension. The extension which is not set back from the principal elevation nor set down from the main ridge is not considered to be subservient to the original dwelling and if approved would create a terracing effect and would not allow the original building to retain its visual dominance. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy D.17 Of the Adopted Wyre Forest District Local Plan; the adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance on Design Quality and guidance provided in PPS1.

05/0964/FULL		Proposal:	Change of External Paint Colour of all elevations from White to Buttermilk at 2 WYRE HILL BEWDLEY DY12 2UE
Date Received:	22.09.05		
Agent:	-		
Ord. Sheet:	378185.7,275100.9		
Policy:	D1, D3, D17, CA1 (AWFLP)		
Case Officer:	Joanne Howells	Applicant:	Mr C Oliver
Ward:	Bewdley & Arley		

Site Location and Description: This application site relates to 2 Wyre Hill, which is located within the south west part of Bewdley and within the Bewdley Conservation Area. The dwelling occupies a prominent position on the hill and is the end property adjoining three others which are Listed Buildings with a traditional black and white frontage. The application seeks consent to change the external colour from white to buttermilk.

Planning History: **Planning History:** WF/0869/83 LBC – Erection of external wall and other internal works to create bathroom : Approved

Consultations and Representations:

Bewdley Town Council – Awaiting comments

Conservation Officer – I recommend refusal, as the colour change will have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of No 2 and No4 Wyre Hill. Having investigated the matter further, these properties are seen as the same building or 'group' and the alteration to the façade of one of these properties will remove some of this visual grouping.

Neighbour - Two letters of objection received. First Objector (No 56) – this is a listed building within a conservation area... situated on the original thoroughfare through Bewdley. What would be the outcome if other owners decided to 'add a little colour? Black and White has always been traditional, lets keep it. Second Objector (No 55a) – being in such a prominent position and joined to 'white cottages' it would stand out like a 'sore thumb'. Buttermilk is not an offensive colour, but it would set a precedent. The residents have always adhered to black and white, which is in keeping with the area.

Officer Comments: The dwelling is curtilage listed as it adjoins Nos. 4, 5 and 6 which are Grade II listed Policy LB2 of the Adopted Local Plan advises that alteration should be compatible with the historic fabric of the property and utilise materials and finishes similar to the original. Buttermilk is not considered a traditional colour and therefore its application is considered would detract from the character and appearance of the Listed property.

Conclusions and Recommendations: In light of the above I therefore recommend **REFUSAL** for the following reason:

1. The proposed application of external paint to a non traditional colour would detract from the historic character and appearance of the property contrary to Policy LB2 of the Adopted Wyre Forest District Local Plan and Policy CTC19 of the Worcestershire County Structure Plan.

05/0966/FULL	Proposal:	Two storey side extension at
Date Received: 21.09.05		19 BRIDGE ROAD
Agent: Alison J Southerton		COOKLEY
Ord. Sheet: 384223.0,280411.0		KIDDERMINSTER
Policy: D.1, D.17, CA.1 (AWFDLP)		DY10 3SA
Case Officer: Joanne Howells	Applicant:	Mr M Harvey & Miss M
Ward: Cookley		George

Site Location and Description: No 19 Bridge Road, Cookley is a semi-detached property located in the northern part of Cookley, adjacent the canal. This application seeks consent for a two-storey side extension with dormer windows front and rear.

Planning History: KR/56/70/R Proposed brick, cedar and glass extension

Consultations and Representations: Wolverley and Cookley Parish Council – Awaiting comments

Highway Authority – No objection

British Waterways – No comments received Wildlife Trust - No comments received

Conservation Officer - No comments received

Neighbour - One letter of concern received from owner No 28 concerned with the following; the building works would make the ground unstable as the canal runs underneath the property and my property is also built over the canal. If the plan goes through I would like it in writing that this will not affect the stability of my property.

2nd letter of objection received from The Barns, Nash Lane concerned with plans for the area were turned down previously due to the canal bridge alongside No 19.

Officer Comments: The two-storey side extension would be set back 750mm from the front of the existing garage and would have a lower ridge height. It is therefore considered subservient to the original building and not intrusive in the street scene. The extension does not project beyond the rear elevation and is not considered to affect neighbour amenity in terms of loss of light or privacy.

A revised plan has been requested from the Agent however, to raise the position of the dormer windows on the roof plane so that align with the original dormers to be more visually acceptable. Although the proposed dormers are of flat roof design, in this case they are in keeping with the form and detailing of the original property and are considered acceptable in terms of the original character of the property and street scene in accordance with Policy D17 of the Local Plan.

With regard to the neighbours comments a note will be added to any planning permission to point out that building regulations approval will be required. The issue of compensation due to any damage caused by the works is deemed a private matter between the applicant and the neighbour. The proposed extension is not located directly over the canal tunnel.

Conclusions and Recommendations: In light of the above comments, the proposal is not considered to cause an adverse impact on neighbour amenity or the character of the area and I recommend delegated **APPROVAL** subject to the receipt of satisfactory revised plans and the following conditions:

1.A6 (Full with No Reserved Matters); 2. A11 (Approved Plans); 3.B3 (Finishing Materials to Match); 4. SN12 (Neighbours' rights); Note: A. SN9 (Building Control Manager)

Reason for Approval The proposed extension is considered to be of an appropriate scale and design to the main dwelling and will have an acceptable appearance in the street scene. The impact of the extension upon neighbouring properties has been carefully assessed and it is considered that there will be no undue impact upon their amenity. For these reasons the proposal is considered to be in accordance with the policies listed above.

05/0967/FULL		Proposal:	Erection of detached dormer bungalow with new driveway & garage for existing dwelling at 36 MANOR AVENUE KIDDERMINSTER DY116EA
Date Received:	21.09.05		
Agent:	Michael Baynton		
Ord. Sheet:	381298.0,277188.0		
Policy:	H2, D1, D3, D4, TR9, TR17 (AWFDLP); D11 (WCCSP); QE3, CF1 (RPG11)		
Case Officer:	Paul Round	Applicant:	Mr & Mrs Davenport
Ward:	Habberley and Blakebook		

Site Location and Description: No. 36 Manor Avenue is a detached bungalow located close to the junction with Habberley Road, opposite the Briars Public House, and has its frontage and access onto Manor Avenue. The proposal is submitted in outline, with only siting and access to be determined at this stage. The submitted layout plan shows a detached bungalow on the garden area, and the creation of a new driveway and garage for the existing property. The site is allocated for residential purposes and is considered to constitute previously developed land. This proposal forms a resubmission of a previous refusal.

Planning History: WF.526/05 – Detached Bungalow – Refused

Consultations and Representations:

Highway Authority – Awaiting Comments
Severn Trent Water Ltd. - Awaiting Comments
Arboricultural Officer – No Objection
Neighbour – No comments received

Officer Comments: This resubmission increases the size of the site by taking more of the garden area of the parent property, and very slightly decreases the size of the front facing gable of the bungalow. In addition the applicants have reviewed the access arrangements, now wishing to utilise the existing access for both dwellings. This revision will remove the need for an additional access, which previously would cause harm to the trees protected by a TPO on the site. In light of this the Arboricultural Officer has returned a no objection response to this current scheme. Although no objections were received from the Highways Authority for the previous application the suitability of the current scheme from a highway safety point of view has, at the point of writing, yet to be assessed. The applicants have increased the width of the site by 2m in an attempt to increase the space around the dwelling and provide additional amenity space. This small increase in the amount of land associated with the proposed dwelling does not diminish the overdevelopment of the site or alter the harmful affect of the proposal on the character of the surrounding area. As such it is not considered that the revised scheme fully overcomes the previous refusal reason.

Conclusions and Recommendations: In light of the above I therefore recommend **REFUSAL** for the following reasons :-

1. The proposed dwelling, by virtue of its position, provision of amenity space, parking facilities, and driveway or the existing dwelling would result in an over-development of the site leading to a cramped appearance and resulting in significant harm to the character of the surrounding area. As such the proposal would be contrary to Policies D1 and D3 of the Adopted Wyre Forest District Local Plan, and the adopted Design Quality SPG.

05/0971/FULL		Proposal:	New pitched roof & dormer to front, first floor extension, dormer & extension to balcony to rear at 525A CHESTER ROAD SOUTH, KIDDERMINSTER DY101XH
Date Received:	22.09.05		
Agent:	Mrs C Walker		
Ord. Sheet:	383813.0,275709.0		
Policy:	D.1, D.3, D.17 (AWFDLP); Design SPG		
Case Officer:	Stuart Allum		
Ward:	Offmore & Comberton	Applicant:	Mrs S Wall

Site Location and Description: This application relates to 525A Chester Road South in Kidderminster which is a split level bungalow of similar design to the neighbouring property, 525B. The proposal is for a pitched roof dormer extension at the front of the bungalow and also for a first floor extension, dormer window and extension to existing balcony at the rear.

Planning History: WF 369/74 - Conservatory : Approved
WF 777/05 - New pitched roof dormer extension at front and first floor extension, dormer window and extension to existing balcony to rear : Approved

Consultations and Representations: Highway Authority – No objections
Neighbour– No representations received.

Officer Comments: This is a revised scheme following the withdrawal of a previous application for a similar type of development. The previous application was withdrawn due to discrepancies over the submitted plans. The plans submitted with the current application are now deemed to be accurate for the purpose of considering the application. The alterations to the rear of the property are in keeping with the main dwelling and do not harm the amenity of the neighbouring properties.

The proposed extension at the front of the property however is considered unacceptable. The extension would project 4.1 metres in front of the principle elevation and would measure 8.0 metres in width. The extension would have a pitched roof with the gable end fronting the highway. Dormer windows are also proposed on each roof slope of the extension. The height of the extension would be 5.6 metres.

It is considered that the extension, together with the dormer windows will significantly detract from the front elevation of the property which appears as a single storey bungalow at the front. It would also result in an incongruous feature within the street scene and will detract from the visual amenity of the area.

Conclusions and Recommendations: In view of the above I recommend **REFUSAL** of the application for the following reason:

1. The proposed front extension by virtue of scale, massing and design will represent an incongruous feature and detract from the character of the bungalow. It also fails to respect the local distinctiveness of the area and as such would have an adverse impact on the visual amenity of the area. The proposal would be contrary to Policies D.1, D.3 and D.17 of the Adopted Wyre Forest District Local Plan and also advice within the adopted SPG on Design Quality.

05/0972/FULL	Proposal:	Extension at first floor level (for clarification purposes the plans to be considered are those numbered 05.19.01/02/03/04/11A/12A/1 3A) at 3 NORTHGATE CLOSE, KIDDERMINSTER DY116JW
Date Received: 23.09.05		
Agent: Simon Fletcher		
Ord. Sheet: 381218.0,275988.0		
Policy: D.1, D.3, D.17, TR.9, TR.17 (AWDLP)		
Case Officer: Stuart Allum		
Ward: Sutton Park	Applicant:	Mr & Mrs Shaw

Site Location and Description: Number 3 Northgate Close is a detached dwelling located in a residential area to the west of Kidderminster town centre. There is a history of previous extensions (see below). The proposal on this occasion is to erect first floor pitched roof extensions over the existing flat roofed garage and study/hall. The current application is a re-submission of the previous withdrawn proposal, however the design of the extensions is unchanged.

Planning History:

3/72/211 - Garage : Approved
 WF.347/81 - Kitchen and lobby extension : Approved
 WF.126/02(TPO) - Lop and prune back 2 silver birch trees in front garden : Withdrawn
 WF.610/05 – First floor side and front extensions : Withdrawn

Consultations and Representations:

Highway Authority – No objections
Neighbour – No representations received to date

Officer Comments: The principle of providing additional first floor accommodation at this dwelling is acceptable. However, the design of the scheme, particularly the central forward projecting element at first floor is considered to be visually over dominant in relation to the original building. This is evident by an almost identical scheme of extensions at the next door property, which was approved in 1987. The approach to the design of residential extensions has changed in the intervening years, and is now clearly set out in Policy D.17 of the Adopted Local Plan and also within the Adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance. The Agent, on behalf of the applicants, to three alternative designs for consideration. However, he has indicated that the scheme shown on Drawing No. 13A to be the design he feels is acceptable to the client. The application is therefore being considered on the basis of the original scheme (Drawing 13A) and not either of the two other schemes which have been submitted.

Conclusions and Recommendations: This submission is currently contrary to that part of policy D.17 which requires extensions to residential properties to be subservient to and not overwhelm the original building, thereby allowing the original building to retain its visual dominance. I therefore recommend **delegated REFUSAL** subject to the expiry of the consultation period for the following reason, and in consideration of Articles 1 & 8 of the Human Rights Act 1998:

1. The design, scale and massing of the proposed first floor extension as shown on Drawing 13A is considered to visually overwhelm the forward pitched roof projection at the front of the property. The extension would create an incongruous feature which would detract from the character and appearance of the dwelling and represent an unacceptable intrusive feature in the streetscene. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies D.1, D.3 and D.17 of the Adopted Wyre Forest District Local Plan.

05/0973/FULL
Date Received: 23.09.05
Agent: -
Ord. Sheet: 380108.1,270178.2
Policy: D1, NR11 (AWFDLP)
Case Officer: Julia Mellor

Proposal: **Variation of Condition 13 of WF 288/01 to enable building to be used between the following times :- 08:00-23:30 Mondays to Thursdays; 08:00-00:30 Fridays and Saturdays (on no more than 30 occasions in any one calendar year); 09:00-22:00 Sundays and Bank Holidays; 08:00-01:00 New Years Eve at ARELEY KINGS VILLAGE HALL ARELEY COMMON ARELEY KINGS STOURPORT-ON-SEVERN DY130NB**
Applicant: Mr R H Knott

Ward: Areley Kings

Site Location and Description: The application site accommodates the new village hall comprising hall, stage, meeting room with seating for 195 persons, buffet hall/store room, kitchen/bar, toilets and sports changing facilities. The application was approved in 2001 subject to conditions. Condition 13 states that the building shall only be open between 08.00-23.30 hours Mondays to Saturdays and 09.00 – 22.00 hours Sundays and Bank Holidays. The reason for the condition was to protect the amenity of occupiers of the adjoining properties. This submission to vary the hours is as a result of advice from Enforcement Officers following complaints regarding the breach of this condition. The Chairman of the Management Committee has advised that at present they have to inform people hiring the venue that their event must end between 22.30 and 23.00 to enable them to vacate and clean the building by 23.30. They advise they have been delighted with the amount of usage of the hall since opening in March 2004 and the venue is used among others by 14 regular community user groups whose charges are kept as low as possible by the income generated by private events and functions. During the past few months they have found that some inquiries have not become firm bookings due to the 2330 closing time. Wherever possible they allow hirers to clean up on Sunday mornings with no extra charge but due to other bookings this is not always possible.

Planning History: WF.288/01 – Village community hall with associated parking and relocated children’s play area – Approved 31.5.01

Consultations and Representations: Stourport on Severn Town Council – Awaiting comment

Environmental Health – Concerns of noise impact by local residents have been raised and were discussed in some depth with the Pollution Control section. However no formal complaints of noise have been made to date. Based on the evidence above I have little justification for opposing the application. We are satisfied that at this moment in time regarding sound proofing of the building with no outstanding issues, however this does not exclude the investigation of noise complaints under the statutory noise nuisance legislation in the future.

Neighbours/Site Notice – Six objections have been received raising the following concerns – music and people singing etc at times already offensive for us living in the village; when the summer arrives and doors are open the noise will continually be a nuisance – the windows have been fully open; no objections to extra hour at New Year’s Eve; original condition stipulated valid reasons and circumstances have not changed; breaches have occurred on several occasions to the extent of people sleeping over at night, parties still active at 12.30 – I have been in contact with Enforcement Officers on several occasions; Environmental Health Officers have been advising us with regards to sound problems – we are under the impression that the sound insulation in the building is far from adequate for the style of building and being in a residential area; the committee were asked to look at this by Environmental Health Officers but to date we are no nearer resolving this matter; to allow music to be played later into the night will be intolerable; people vacating the building, congregating, shouting, throwing cans and stones outside and on their way home on occasions is very disruptive; who is going to monitor the situation?; when breaches of conditions have been made in the past no one has notified us; there was never a problem with the old village hall; the applicant does not live anywhere near this hall; we were never consulted about the construction in the first place; prior to the building of the hall (in 2002/3) the Chairman of the self elected committee said that no function would be allowed to continue after 2330, furthermore doors and windows would be kept closed – the decision not to object was strongly influenced by this; not all residents in Bowpatch Road and in the immediate vicinity have been notified; why did we not receive letter, our garden adjoins the recreation ground and the building is well within site and earshot?; sound proofing does not seem to have been done; the sound carries over the recreation ground; concerned at potential highway hazard particularly with alcohol being drunk on the premises; insufficient parking.

Officer Comments: From the objections received it is clear that some neighbours are not happy with the current situation and object to any extension of hours leading to potential noise disturbance from both inside the building and outside as people leave. It should be acknowledged that the car park to the hall lies approximately 40 m from the common boundary to the adjacent property at 10b Areley Common with the footprint to the building at approximately 30 m. However these effects have to be balanced against the benefits of encouraging the full use of this community facility which is also promoted by the policies of the Adopted Local Plan.

Conclusions and Recommendations: Having taken all consultation responses on board I am persuaded to recommend approval to encourage the optimum use of this community facility. Furthermore the additional hour on Fridays and Saturdays is to provide additional time for cleaning purposes rather than for events to continue and the applicants are agreeable to conditions to this effect. Whilst taking Articles 1 and 8 of the Human Rights Act 1998 into account I recommend **delegated APPROVAL** subject to no new objections being received within the consultation period and subject to the following conditions:

1. A6 (Full with No Reserved Matters);
2. Building only used between 0800 – 2330 Mondays to Thursdays, 0900 – 2200 Sundays and Bank Holidays and 0800 – 0100 New Year’s Eve.
3. On Fridays and Saturdays events/parties to end by 2330 with use of building ending by 0030.

Reason for Approval

The consideration of the extension to hours has been balanced against the amenity of neighbours however in this instance it is considered that loss of amenity due to an additional hour on Fridays and Saturdays, and at New Year’s Eve would not cause a loss of residential amenity to the extent that refusal could be maintained.

05/0974/FULL

Date Received: 26.09.05
Agent: -
Ord. Sheet: 380232.0,270281.0
Policy: H2, D1, D3, D4, D10, D13,
TR9, TR17, NC4 (AWFDLP)
Case Officer: Julia Mellor
Ward: Areley Kings

Proposal:

Demolition of existing dwelling & construction of 2 detached houses (re-submission of WF488/05) at 17 ARELEY COMMON STOURPORT-ON-SEVERN DY130LF

Applicant:

Mr J Hudson

Site Location and Description: The application site currently accommodates a detached dwelling with detached garage and has a frontage to Areley Common just south of the junction with Abberley Avenue. The application seeks consent for two four bedroom dwellings with integral garages and a turning area at the front of the site. The site is enclosed by existing residential properties to the front side and rear.

Planning History: (of relevance) WF.488/05 Two detached dwellings – Refused 11.7.05

Consultations and Representations: Stourport on Severn Town Council – Awaiting comment

Highway Authority – Awaiting comment

Arboricultural Officer – I do not consider the presence of the Hazel coppice to be of major significance in amenity terms and in this suburban context.

Disability Action Wyre Forest – New dwellings to be designed in accordance with requirements of Part M
Environmental Health Officers – No adverse comments

Worcestershire Wildlife Trust – The Bat Survey submitted indicates that bats are not likely to be using the site and therefore I suggest an informative note.

Severn Trent Water – No objections subject to conditions.

Neighbours/Site Notice – Five letters of objection have been received raising the following concerns: loss of light due to height of properties; side windows will cause loss of privacy; excessive development of site will not allow the construction or maintenance without damage to existing boundaries; not in keeping; how is the new property to be built and maintained without rear access being required? What provisions would there be to prevent further development?; Loss of privacy in our garden; The properties have been pushed back to overcome highway issues and we object to our privacy being compromised; overdevelopment; extra vehicles, noise and disruption; negative impact on village and street scene; developer has not consulted surrounding owners allowing developers to make a quick buck and cause misery without consultation; invite Committee to come and view proposed development from our property; properties will still overlook our property; safety issues regarding increased traffic movements at the junction of Abberley Avenue and Areley Common; very little space between properties, plans misleading; direct overlooking of our bedroom, side living room kitchen and main living room; cause parking in Swiss Heights.

Officer Comments: As Members will note the previous application for two dwellings was refused for the following reasons (1) lack of clarity and correlation on plans to assess scheme; (2) cramped appearance with overbearing and overshadowing effect on private gardens associated with 15 Areley Common and No. 1 Swiss Heights; (3) poor design in terms of elevational treatment and roofscape. It is considered that the current application overcomes these previous three reasons by virtue of the following: (1) The plans submitted are now clear and correlate with each other; (2) The distance between the side boundaries and the two storey parts of the proposed dwellings has been doubled and the overall height of the dwellings has been reduced from approximately 8.1 m to 7.3 m as a result of reducing the accommodation from two and a half storeys to two storeys. In addition the orientation of the roof ridges have been changed so that the roofs slope away towards the side boundaries thereby reducing the impact upon the outlook from the gardens to No. 15 Areley Common and Nos. 1 and 3 Swiss Heights. Furthermore the plans show that the slab level to the two properties will be 500 mm lower than the ground level of the existing house on site. It is considered that the siting of the properties meets the 45/25° guide. With respect to (3) the elevations have been simplified and the awkward roof design to the plot adjacent to No. 1 Swiss Heights has been removed. It is considered that the siting of the properties meets the 45/25° guide. Finally the submitted section through the site indicates that the properties would have 10 m rear gardens and there would be no significant adverse impact to the adjacent properties. The windows to the side elevations are all shown to have frosted glass.

Conclusions and Recommendations: In view of the above I consider that the previous reasons for refusal have been overcome and as such I recommend **APPROVAL** subject to the following conditions:

1. A6 (Full with No Reserved Matters);
2. A11 (Approved Plans);
3. B1a (Samples/Details of Materials);
4. B11 (Details of Enclosure);
5. Levels as shown on drawings;
6. Retention of existing Hazel tree;
7. E2 (Foul and Surface Water);
8. H13 (Access, Turning and Parking);
9. H6 (Vehicular Access Construction);
10. H27 (Parking for Site Operatives);
11. J (obscure glazing)

Reason for Approval

The proposed dwellings are considered to be well designed and will have an acceptable appearance in the street scene. The impact of the dwellings upon neighbouring properties has been carefully assessed and it is considered that there will be no undue impact upon their amenity. For these reasons the proposal is considered to be in accordance with the policies listed

above.

05/0979/FULL

Date Received: 04.10.05
Agent: Terry Preece
Ord. Sheet: 380909.3,271002.2
Policy: CA.1,NR.5,LR.8,TM.1,TC.1,STC.5
(AWFDLP), CTC.20, RST.8, RST.9,
RST.14, RST.15 (AWCSP)
Case Officer: Julia Mellor
Ward: Mitton

Proposal: **Boat mooring pontoon with access
walkway for visitors at
THE RIVERSIDE
STOURPORT-ON-SEVERN
DY138UY**

Applicant: P Evans

Site Location and Description: The application seeks consent for a boat mooring pontoon on the northern side of the river bank, east of the bridge, in front of the Shipley's amusement park building. The site lies within the Stourport on Severn Conservation Area No. 1. The pontoon would provide a permanent mooring for the applicant's current visitor or shuttle service which provides trips to and from The Angel public house to the caravan parks at Lickhill Manor, Allens Caravan Park and Redstone Caravan Park. The operator also offers trips to existing pubs at Shrawley, Astley Burf and Holt Fleet.

Planning History: WF.1080/00 – Landscaping and environmental improvements : Approved 16.1.01

Consultations and Representations: Stourport on Severn Town Council – Comments awaited
Environment Agency – Comments awaited

British Waterways – Comments awaited. Worcestershire Wildlife Trust – Comments awaited

Conservation Officer – Recommend refusal. Whilst I appreciate the history of Stourport, and its continuing relationship with both the River and the canal, and the inter-relationship of these latter two, I feel that the use in this area of an extra pontoon will be detrimental to the character and appearance of the CA, and on views into and out of the Conservation Area. There are already several mooring positions in this location, and this extra one will add to this, but with an almost permanent fixture of a boat moored alongside. This will inhibit views along the river, from the canal basin area through to the Bridge, and vice versa. These views out of, and through, the Conservation Area add to its setting, and help to create an important link between Stourport and the surrounding country-side. It is my opinion that through an increase in permanent boat moorings, and their natural use, this will start to obscure these important views, something that I consider as an important feature of the Conservation Areas. Perhaps more could be made of the current pontoon closer to the bridge, or perhaps the other side of the bridge?

Inland Waterways Association – Welcomes the provision of additional facilities for visiting river users, especially as in this case where they will help to reduce the present shortfall in existing facilities, and therefore support the applicant's proposals.

Disability Action Wyre Forest – Careful consideration to be given to design of walkway to ensure that it will be accessible to all.

Economic Development and Tourism – As long as the applicant is offering a quality product of benefit to the tourism market at Stourport on Severn and he is fully licensed, I have no further comments and see no reason to object

Site Notice : one letter of objection received – I wish to object due to grave concerns regarding safety to the public. I am sure that our two operations will not cause any problems with one another, however should the applicant begin to offer a round trip to the general public, I believe there could be a major loss of life. With the proximity of the narrow locks and the Stourport boat club opposite, there is often congestion. I have been operating 40 minute trips to the general public for over 30 years. We make a point of turning the boats well away from any areas where other boats are manoeuvring. Should I need to shorten the trip due to commercial pressure from other operators, I have concerns that there could be a major accident. My two passenger boats carry up to 130 passengers and weigh around 80 tonnes each. In the event of a collision a smaller vessel is likely to capsize trapping anyone unfortunate to be on board.

Officer Comments: As the letter of objection indicates above, there are existing moorings in Stourport on Severn along this part of the River Severn – both to the west and east of the bridge and in front of The Angel public house. The objector, Stourport Steamer Company, already offers trips to Worcester and day cruises in the summer months. In this case the potential benefits of this tourism related service which may also reduce car usage in the town centre needs to be balanced against the visual impact of the pontoon and the associated additional boats. The site lies within the Conservation Area and has a backdrop to the riverside walk. It would be prominently positioned when viewed from the bridge, an important view acknowledged in the character appraisal for the Conservation Area.

Conclusions and Recommendations: In the absence of any positive feedback from British Waterways or the Environment Agency and acknowledging that there are existing pontoons along the River Severn, precedence is given to the views of the Conservation Officer who considers that the proposal would visually detract from this riverside walk and views into and out of the area. In view of this I therefore recommend

REFUSAL for the following reason:-

1. The provision of an additional pontoon would fail to preserve or enhance the existing character of the Stourport on Severn Conservation Area No. 1, and would by virtue of additional clutter detract from views into and out of the area. As such, the proposal is considered contrary to Policies CA.1 and TM.1 of the Adopted Wyre Forest District Local Plan, Policies CTC.20 and RST.14 of the Worcestershire County Structure Plan and the objectives of the Character Appraisal of the Conservation Area

05/0984/FULL	Proposal:	Removal of Condition No. 4 of Planning Permission WF 309/91 and Condition No 3 of WF 677/98 (These conditions control the hours of operation) at MIRAGE NIGHT CLUB DIXON STREET KIDDERMINSTER DY101AL
Date Received: 27.09.05		
Agent: -		
Ord. Sheet: 383204.3,276178.2		
Policy: D1, D16, KTC4, TR17 (AWFDLP)		
Case Officer: Paul Wrigglesworth		
Ward: Greenhill	Applicant:	Mirage Night Club

Site Location and Description: The Mirage Night Club is located on Dixon Street opposite the Shipley's Bingo building. The two conditions referred to in the description of development limit the hours of opening (see below). The reason that there are two conditions is because the first application was for the night club and the second was for an internal extension which repeated the opening hours restriction.

Planning History: WF.309/91 Night Club – Approved 24.12.91
WF.677/98 – Change of use of former dental laboratory to lounge area with bar – Approved 20.10.98

Consultations and Representations:

Highway Authority – Views awaited
Environmental Health – No objections
Crime Risk Manager – Views awaited
Neighbour/Site Notice – No representations received.

Officer Comments: This application has been submitted as a result of the new licensing regulations. The conditions on the previous applications limited the opening hours to between 6.30 pm and 2:00 am. The reason these conditions were imposed was 'to prevent conflict of use and over development of the site and to enable adequate car parking to serve the development'. The current application seeks to remove these conditions which could be argued to result in conflict with existing users of the site in terms of car parking provision. However, it transpires that the applicants only in fact want an extension of time and I am anticipating that the application will be amended to extend the opening hours from 2am to 6am. With these opening hours there would be no car parking related problems arising from the application because existing car parking would still be freely available. In all other respects, including impacts on neighbouring property and the town centre in general the application is judged to be acceptable.

Conclusions and Recommendations: Provided that the application is amended as described above I recommend **delegated** authority to **APPROVE** the application and that the conditions be varied to extend the opening hours by 4 hours (i.e. until 6.00 am).

Reason for Approval

The proposed extension of time is considered to be acceptable in terms of car parking, impact on neighbouring properties and town centre in general. For these reasons the proposal is considered to be in accordance with the policies listed above.

05/0987/RESE

Date Received: 27.09.05
Agent: Michael Baynton
Ord. Sheet: 383644.5,276987.9
Policy: H2, D1, D3, D4, D10, D11,
TR9, TR17 (AWFDLP)
Case Officer: Paul Wrigglesworth
Ward: Broadwaters

Proposal: **Erection of a Detached House at
43 COVENTRY STREET
KIDDERMINSTER
DY102BT**

Applicant: Mr S Potts

Site Location and Description: The site comprises the bottom part of a long garden of a property situated in Elderfield Gardens which is a cul-de-sac off the Birmingham Road. The proposal is for reserved matters for a detached house. The dwelling would face Harold Evers Way which is located off Gilbert Scott Way. Adjacent to the proposed house is a pair of semi detached town houses on one side and a garden of a property in Elderfield Gardens on the other. This Reserved Matters application is for the design, external appearance and landscaping of the development. The site is well treed and the proposal would involve removing seven trees including three Silver Birch, a Pear, a Goat Willow, a fruit tree and a Laurel.

Planning History: WF.447/03 Outline: Erection of one detached house on land to the rear of 43 Elderfield Gardens – Approved 17.6.03

Consultations and Representations:

Highway Authority – Views awaited

Arboricultural Officer – No objection to outline application subject to suitable replacement tree planting (views awaited on current scheme)

Neighbours/Site Notice – No representations received.

Officer Comments: This is a Reserved Matters application with outline planning permission having been approved in June 2003 (Planning Application WF.447/03). The application has been submitted in order to establish the design, external appearance and landscaping of the site. In terms of design and external appearance the dwelling is of a similar height and style as the pair of dwellings adjacent and consequently the development would look acceptable in the street scene. The proposed building will have an impact on the side elevation of the adjacent property but as was stated in the report on the Outline application all but one of the windows are to non-habitable rooms. The habitable room in question is a small study and this is so dark due to the level of the window, the boundary wall/fence and adjacent trees that it already requires artificial light to supplement the light coming through the window. The design of the house being proposed, although tall, is the only style of property that would look in keeping in this location and a house with a lower roof line would make very little difference to the daylight entering the affected room. The development has side facing windows but these are to be obscure glazed and with an appropriate condition in place there should be no overlooking of the adjacent property. With respect to the landscaping and removal of existing trees a detailed landscaping scheme is to be submitted by the date of the meeting.

Conclusions and Recommendations: Provided that an acceptable landscaping scheme is submitted it is recommended that **delegated Authority** be given to **APPROVE** this Reserved Matters application subject to the following conditions:

1. B1 (Samples/Details of Materials);
2. Obscure glazing to side facing windows (top open lights) no further windows without planning permission;
3. Landscaping to be implemented.

Reason for Approval

The external appearance and design of the property are considered to be acceptable in terms of the appearance in the street scene. The impact on neighbouring property is considered to be within acceptable tolerances when taking account of the existing situation. The landscaping is judged to be acceptable and the development is considered to be compliant with the above mentioned policies.

05/0989/FULL

Date Received: 28.09.05
Agent: P. Pantelli
Ord. Sheet: 385822.0,275007.0
Policy: D1, D17, GB1 (AWFDLP)
Case Officer: Joanne Howells
Ward: Blakedown and
Chaddesley

Proposal: **Erection of two storey and
single storey extensions,
front porch at
98 STANKLYN LANE
STONE, KIDDERMINSTER
DY104AP**
Applicant: Mr A Yates

Site Location and Description: This application relates to No 98 Stanklyn Lane in Stone, which is a semi-detached property. The adjoining property is of a slightly different design. The proposal is for a first floor extension over an existing flat roof extension at the side together with a single storey extension to the rear of the property. The extensions will create a dining room, study and utility room at ground floor and two further bedrooms at first floor level.

Planning History: WF/0037/83 – Extensions and alterations : Approved

Consultations and Representations:

Stone Parish Council – Awaiting comments

Disability Action Wyre Forest – comments to be dealt with by building regulations

Highway Authority – Awaiting comments

Neighbour - One letter of objection received from No 96 concerned with the following: The side extension on the neighbour's house will create a very oppressive presence dominating the area at the side and rear of our house. This will also affect the light entering the side bedroom and kitchen area at the rear of the house making these areas dark and cold. The proposed extension would extend the size of the house out of proportion with the original character of the house and the neighbouring houses.

Officer Comments: The design of the proposed extensions are considered to be subservient to the original dwelling and the first floor extension has a lower ridge height. The ground floor extension 'in fills' a gap at the rear, next to the existing single storey kitchen. This single storey extension is not considered to impinge on the 45 degree code. The cumulative effect of the existing and proposed extensions is not considered to overwhelm the original property. There is also a precedent within the street scene for a similar side and rear extension at No 88.

With regard to the neighbours concerns about loss of light, No 96 is the nearest adjacent property, and there is a single source of light to the side bedroom by a window on the side elevation. The first floor extension is not considered to comply with the 45 degree code with respect to that window and therefore unacceptably restricts daylight to this habitable room. In addition, due to the proximity of these two properties which are located at an angle to each other (the distance narrows towards the rear) the side extension will also create an overbearing and adverse impact on the neighbouring property.

Conclusions and Recommendations: In view of the adverse impact on the neighbouring property I recommend the application for **REFUSAL** for the following reason:

1. The proposed first floor extension would harm the amenities of the neighbouring property by unacceptably restricting daylight to the side bedroom of No. 96 and due to its siting and height would have an overbearing impact on the adjacent property. The proposed development is therefore contrary to Policies D.1 and D.17 of the Adopted Wyre Forest District Local Plan.

05/0998/FULL and 05/0999/LIST

Date Received: 04.10.05
 Agent: -
 Ord. Sheet: 379818.0,275412.0
 Policy: GB1, GB6, RB1, LB1, LB2,
 D1, LA2 (AWFDLP)
 Case Officer: Joanne Howells
 Ward: Wribbenhall

Proposal:

Installation of doors to create access to garden via rear elevation of property at RYE COTTAGE BEWDLEY BYPASS. SPRING GROVE BEWDLEY DY121LQ

Applicant:

Mr R Hingley

Site Location and Description: Rye Cottage is a Listed former Cow House and one of several previously converted barns situated near Spring Grove Farm off the A456 Bewdley Bypass. The application site is also within the designated Green Belt and Landscape Protection Area. This proposal seeks consent for the insertion of a new opening on the rear elevation of the property to gain access to the garden at the rear of the property.

Planning History: Extensive, of relevance

WF.124/79 – Change of use from farm building to domestic : Approved

WF. 673/88 – Change of use to five units : Approved

WF. 1214/88 – Change of use of barns to five units : Approved

WF.1020/89 – Modifications to approved, one extra unit : Approved

WF.1074/89 – Alterations to existing to form two dwelling units : Approved

WF.1332/89 – Change of use into five dwellings : Approved

WF.686/00 – Creation of new opening in rear elevation for installation of new door : Refused

WF.53/02 – Conversion of barn to dwelling (amendment) : Approved

WF.1070/03 – Alteration to front elevation to replace window with door : Approved

WF.779.04 – Installation of new door and roof lights in rear elevation : Approved

WF.772/05 – Erection of single storey extension - Approved

Consultations and Representations: Bewdley Town Council – Awaiting comments

Conservation Officer - I recommend refusal in view of the previous applications and appeal of which I was previously unaware. The Inspector during the appeal for the previous application stated that the blank wall, as mentioned in the List Description, was an important feature worthy of being retained.

The impact of the door on this elevation will still be significant, and as such I will not be able to support the application. I recommend refusal, on the grounds that the proposals will be of detriment to the character and appearance of the Listed Building, and the proposals have altered little since the previous refusal and unsuccessful appeal for similar works.

Site Notice/Neighbour - No representation received

Officer Comments: Dwellings are permitted in the Green Belt only under very special circumstances such as the conversion of a barn and Policy RB.1 (ii) of the adopted Local Plan states that rural buildings are suitable for conversion only where they are suitable for re-use without extensions or extensive alterations. The rear elevation does not currently have any openings and access to the rear is gained by a route around the adjacent cottage. The insertion of the door into the property would have a material adverse impact on the converted barn. Additional openings are considered to further detract from the character and appearance of the original barn building and would therefore also harm the visual amenity of the surrounding landscape. In addition to insert a new door into the blank rear elevation of this Listed Building described as a 'blind ashlar front' in the Listing would also be contrary to Policy LB2. Furthermore the insertion of a door at this location has already been considered as part of the original planning permission, and within a previously refused planning application (WF/684/00, WF/685/00). For these applications the door was considered to be contrary to policy and was subsequently dismissed at appeal.

Conclusions and Recommendations: In view of the above the proposal is considered contrary to local plan policy and I recommend **REFUSAL** of planning application 05 0998 FULL for the following reasons:

1. The proposed opening on this blank rear elevation would have an adverse impact on the character and appearance of the listed barn. The proposal is therefore contrary to policies CB1, CB2 and RB7 of the Adopted Wyre Forest District Local Plan.

2. The proposed opening within this barn conversion would detract from the character and appearance of the original barn and would subsequently harm the setting of the barn and the visual amenity of the sensitive area in which it is located. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies D1, GB6, RB1, LB5 and LA2 of the Adopted Wyre Forest District Local Plan.

and **REFUSAL** of application 05 0999 LIST for the following reason:

1. The proposed opening on this blank rear elevation would have an adverse impact on the character and appearance of the listed barn. The proposal is therefore contrary to policies CB1, CB2 and RB7 of the Adopted Wyre Forest District Local Plan above.

05/1003/FULL

Date Received: 30.09.05
Agent: M Burnand
Ord. Sheet: 378915.0,275029.0
Policy: D.1, D.17 (AWFDLP)
Case Officer: Joanne Howells
Ward: Bewdley & Arley

Proposal: **Two storey extension to front at
30 GARDNERS MEADOW
BEWDLEY
DY122DG**

Applicant: Mr G Paddock

Site Location and Description: No. 30 Gardners Meadow is a large detached property located in the centre of Bewdley. This application seeks consent for a two storey extension on the north west elevation of the property, to provide a living room with utility above.

Planning History: WF.279/99 Extension to form entrance hall and cloakroom to link with conversion of garage to a sitting room – Approved 11/05/99
WF.372/02 Erection of two storey extension – Approved 10/06/02

Consultations and Representations:

Bewdley Town Council – Awaiting comments

Ramblers Association – Awaiting comments

Neighbour – One letter of objection received from No. 27: The proposed extension is visible but will not affect us. However the 6 houses in the development are all well designed in relation to one another. The fact that No. 30 incorporates another plot originally intended for another house is not a reason for it to grow out of all proportion with adjacent houses. I believe there have been previous extensions to the house that blend in well but this proposal even with matching brickwork would add a prominent addition that intrudes on the overall balance. I am concerned there might be over-development of the site in relation to its environment. The growth of this house puts it at variance with its surroundings. An overlarge house can be disproportionate. The house serves at times as a B&B contrary to the lease, but it could generate additional traffic along overcrowded roads. There can be no confidence about the future should the house be sold to less careful owners.

One letter of support – no harmful affect on their amenity

Officer Comments: The property has been developed previously. However the proposed extension although two storey, is only 4.3m x 4.5m in floor area and has a much lower ridge height than the original dwelling. The proposal is considered subservient to the original dwelling even taking into account the accumulation of existing extensions on the property. The study and hall are only single storey extensions and the previous two-storey extension is of a similar size. The proposal is not considered intrusive in the street scene and is acceptable in design terms. It is not considered to affect neighbour amenity in terms of loss of light or privacy, as the nearest neighbours are some distance away. Overall the proposal complies with local plan policies and is considered to be in scale and character with the original dwelling. With further regard to the neighbour comments the extension is considered to complement and respect adjacent development and harmonise with the surrounding townscape, as it is not considered visually intrusive within the street scene.

Conclusions and Recommendations: In light of the above comments the extension is not considered to have an adverse impact on neighbour amenity or the character of the area. Therefore I recommend the application for **APPROVAL** subject to the following conditions:
1. A6 (Full with No Reserved Matters); A11 (Approved Plans); B3 (Finishing Materials to Match); Note SN12

Reason for approval:

The proposed extension is considered to be of an appropriate scale and design to the main dwelling and will have an acceptable appearance in the street scene. The impact of the extension upon neighbouring properties has been carefully assessed and it is considered that there will be no undue impact upon their amenity. For these reasons the proposal is considered to be in accordance with the policies listed above.

05/1004/OUTL

Date Received: 10.10.05
Agent: -
Ord. Sheet: 380284.9,276488.6
Policy: H.2, GB.1, GB.2, GB.6,
LA.1, LA.2, D.4, TR.9
(AWFDLP), SD.2, CTC.1,
CTC.4, D.12, D.39 (WCSP),
QE.1, QE.3, QE.6 (RPG11),
PPG2

Case Officer: Stuart Allum
Ward: Wribbenhall

Proposal:

Erection of detached dwelling at
WOODLAND COTTAGE NURSERY
HABBERLEY ROAD
BEWDLEY
DY121LA

Applicant: Nick Hart

Site Location and Description: Woodlands Cottage Nursery is located in the Green Belt and Landscape Protection Area, to the North East of Bewdley Town Centre, and in the 'open area' between the built up areas of Bewdley and Kidderminster. The area shown to be occupied by the proposed dwelling is well covered by trees, and the vast majority of the application site is covered by a Tree Preservation Order'. The applicant has submitted a brief supporting statement, to summarise:

Nursery is currently owned by the applicant's parents – now both in their 70s – and the nursery is becoming too much to maintain. Building a property in the nursery grounds would not only give peace of mind to the owners but could also ensure that the woodland would be protected and enhanced. A high quality dwelling is proposed (oak framed). Deeply concerned about the future. Land cannot be farmed and needs constant maintenance – may prove difficult for applicant's parents. Want to ensure that the natural beauty of this land is maintained and we would introduce methods to encourage native wildlife/plants – only developing under 0.1 hectare from a total site area of 5 acres.

Planning History: WF.832/90 Projecting non-illuminated sign – Approved

Consultations and Representations: Bewdley Town Council – Views awaited

Highway Authority – Views awaited

Arboricultural Officer – Views awaited

Severn Trent Water – Views awaited

Worcestershire Wildlife Trust – Views awaited

Neighbour/Site Notice – No representations to date.

Officer Comments: PPG2 and Green Belt policy state that inappropriate development in the Green Belt is, by definition, harmful unless very special circumstances can be demonstrated by the applicant to show why permission should be granted. In this case, the justification presented by the applicant, as summarised above, is unsustainable in my view. To allow a dwelling within the site would seriously harm the openness and visual amenity of a particularly sensitive area of the Green Belt, located between the Bewdley and Kidderminster urban areas, and furthermore would visually damage a Landscape Protection Area.

Conclusions and Recommendations: This proposal is clearly at variance from the principles of Green Belt policies and PPG2. I therefore recommend **REFUSAL** for the following reasons, and in consideration of Articles 1 and 8 of the Human Rights Act 1998:

1. The application site is within the West Midlands Green Belt. The proposed dwelling would constitute inappropriate development and the applicant has failed to demonstrate the very special circumstances for why this inappropriate development should be permitted. As such the proposal would be harmful to the openness and visual amenity of the Green Belt, contrary to government advice in PPG2, Policies D.12 and D.39 of the Worcestershire County Structure Plan, and Policies H.2, GB.1, GB.2 and GB.6 of the Adopted Wyre Forest District Local Plan.
2. The application site lies within an area designated as a Landscape Protection Area. The development proposal is considered inappropriate in this location as it would harm the wooded character of the area. This is contrary to Policies QE.1, QE.3 and QE.6 of the Regional Spatial Strategy : RPG11, Policies SD.2, CTC. 1 and CTC.4 of the Worcestershire County Structure Plan and Policies LA.1 and LA.2 of the Adopted Wyre Forest District Local Plan.

05/1010/FULL

Date Received: 06.10.05
Agent: Barnett Taylor Associates
Ord. Sheet: 380037.0,270425.0
Policy: D.1, D.17 (AWFDLP)
Case Officer: Joanne Howells
Ward: Areley Kings

Proposal:

Single storey extension to link garage
(to be converted) to main dwelling;
conservatory to rear at
10 HEIGHTINGTON PLACE
STOURPORT-ON-SEVERN
DY130BE

Applicant:

Mr & Mrs Sinclair

Site Location and Description: No. 10 Heightington Place is an 'L' shaped detached property located in the South Western area of Stourport on Severn. This application seeks consent for a single storey extension to link the garage at the front of the property to the main house, and a conservatory at the rear of the property. The garage would also be converted to a bedroom, however this element does not require planning permission.

Planning History: WF.340/86 Detached garage – Approved

Consultations and Representations:

Stourport on Severn Town Council – Awaiting comments

Highway Authority – Awaiting comments

Neighbour – Two letters of objection:

The conversion of the garage has begun; the boundary wall that is to be retained is the property of No. 12 and any building over this is unacceptable such as the roof overhang, fascias and guttering; concern with adequate parking at the property; the bricking up of the garage is out of character with the rest of the properties; there are 3 cars and one large commercial van is parked on the corner of the road; access to the converted garage is only from an outside door – is this for a lodger? Concern over the parking of a commercial vehicle on the pavement and road outside the adjacent property of No. 10; this is already an accident prone corner and is not only dangerous, but contravenes the covenant in clause 6 for owners of these properties. Will the proposed extension contravene the building line rules?

Officer Comments: Although an unusual 'L' shaped design, the only previous extension to the property has been a detached garage. The proposed single storey 'link' extension to the rear elevation of the garage would be attached to the original property with a lower ridge height. This is not considered intrusive within the street scene, as it would be largely hidden by the existing garage and would be only single storey (3m to ridge height). The proposal is subservient to the original property. The existing wall and fence on the south east side is to be retained and would further obscure the proposed extension. It is not considered that it would be a visually intrusive feature or that it would alter the character of the area. The conservatory at the rear of the property would be situated within the internal corner of the 'L' shaped design and it is not considered that it would have an adverse impact on neighbour amenity. Overall the proposals are considered acceptable and are in scale and character with the original dwelling. The proposals are acceptable in design terms and are not considered to affect neighbour amenity. The proposal is therefore not considered to be an over-development of the site.

With regards to the neighbours' concerns, a note will be added to any planning permission in order to point out that third party permission is needed to build on or over a neighbour's land. The parking of a commercial vehicle on the highway is not a material planning consideration. The council has no involvement in checking or enforcing covenants and private rights. The onus is on the applicant to ensure they have all the necessary permissions. Planning permission is not required to let a room to a lodger, unless it would be a self-contained residential unit.

Conclusions and Recommendations: In light of the above comments I recommend this application for **APPROVAL** subject to the following conditions:

1. A6 (Full With No Reserved Matters); 2. A11 (Approved Plans); 3. B6 (External Details – Approved Plan); Highway conditions; Note SN12.

Reason for approval

The proposed extension is considered to be of an appropriate scale and design to the main dwelling and will have an acceptable appearance in the street scene. The impact of the extension upon neighbouring properties has been carefully assessed and it is considered that there will be no undue impact upon their amenity. For these reasons the proposal is considered to be in accordance with the policies listed above.

05/1035/LIST

Date Received: 14.10.05
 Agent: -
 Ord. Sheet: 383146.0,276554.0
 Policy: LB.1, LB.2, LB.3
 (AWFDLP) & PPG15
 Case Officer: Claire Bishop
 Ward: Greenhill

Proposal: **Removal of wall to courtyard, rebuild removed wall, repointing/maintenance works at WYRE FOREST DISTRICT COUNCIL, TOWN HALL VICAR STREET KIDDERMINSTER DY101DB**
 Applicant: Harper Group Construction

Site Location and Description: Kidderminster Town Hall, which is currently vacant, is a grade II Listed Building located on the west side of Vicar Street immediately adjacent to the Corn Exchange. Planning Permission and Listed Building Consent has recently been granted to alter and extend the building to allow the Worcestershire Hub to operate from the ground floor. This application proposes to demolish and rebuild a 4 metre section of walling, which forms part of the courtyard, with associated re-pointing/ maintenance works.

Planning History: WF.1163/87 LBC Alterations and extensions – Approved;

WF.90/88 Alterations – Approved;

WF.868/02 LBC Relocate flag poles, internal alterations to convert cloakroom to superintendent office, external changes – Approved;

WF.495/03 LBC 'Façade' brick flank wall, repair to return flank of the tower to town hall and new stone work to ground floor return – Approved;

WF.470/05 General Regulations 3 Formation of Worcestershire Hub within ground floor including extension at ground floor and first floor levels and internal alterations – Approved;

WF.471/05 LBC Formation of Worcestershire Hub within ground floor including extension at ground floor and first floor levels and internal alterations – Approved;

WF.802/05 Construction of 1st floor corridor, alteration works to give disabled access to 1st floor and new entrance ramp – Approved;

WF.803/05 LBC Construction of 1st floor corridor, alteration works to give disabled access to 1st floor and new entrance ramp – Approved.

Consultations and Representations: Highway Authority – Views awaited

Conservation Officer – No objections subject to conditions

English Heritage – Views awaited

Neighbour/Site Notice – No representations received

Officer Comments: The section of walling to be removed currently forms the boundary of the courtyard area between the Town Hall and the Corn Exchange. The section of wall is rendered on the elevation facing the courtyard and is brick/part rendered on the outward elevation. It would appear that the wall has been the subject of numerous alterations in the past, which has included modern piers possibly to help support the wall. The section of walling to be removed is of a particularly poor quality and in its current form does not contribute to the importance of this grade II Listed Building. It is proposed to retain the bricks and re-use them when re-building the structure. In view of the current poor quality of the section of walling to be removed, it is felt that its re-construction would make a positive contribution to the special architectural and historic interest of this Listed Building.

Conclusions and Recommendations: In view of the above I recommend that **delegated** authority be given to **APPROVE** this application subject to no new objections being received following the expiry of the consultation period, and subject to the application being referred to the Secretary of State (in accordance with Environment Circular 14/97) and subject to the following conditions:
 1. A7 (Listed Building Consent); 2. A11 (Approved Plans); 3. B2 (Sample Brick Panel).

Reason for Approval

The proposed demolition and replacement boundary wall is considered to be acceptable in terms of its impact on the character and appearance of this Grade II Listed Building. For this reason the proposal is considered to be in accordance with the policies listed above.