2014/4086/P	1 Bromwich	Erection of a single storey rear extension and installation of rear and side dormers	Rachel Miller

Object

Side Dormer

The HLE CAAMS state '*Dormer windows will normally be allowed at the rear and side if sensitively designed in relation to the building and other adjacent roofs. The particular character of the roofscape of that group of houses should be adhered to, and details such as the profile or splay of the roof slope, ridge tiles, and colour of clay tile must be matched.'* CPG1 states *'It is important to ensure the dormer sides ("cheeks") are no wider than the structure requires as this can give an overly dominant appearance. Deep fascias and eaves gutters should be avoided'*.

The location of the dormer is highly visible being on the first house in Bromwich Avenue with long views of the roof from Hillway.

The revised (from applications 2013/3215/P & 2013/3216/P) side dormer is of a more appropriate scale and has been stepped back from the side wall thus reducing the visual bulk. The distance of 500mm below the ridge of the main roof as proposed in CPG1 should be clearly stated and adhered to.

Although the dormer is 24m away from the properties on Hillway it does overlook the rear windows and gardens of these properties. Thus the window must be fitted at all times with obscuring glass as a condition of approval.

If PP is granted then #1 Bromwich would have approval for a side dormer and #3 would not (removed in approved drawings of 2014/1404/P). It would be preferable that both properties had the same roofscape.

Rear Dormer

The distance of 500mm below the ridge of the main roof as proposed elsewhere in CPG1 should be clearly stated and adhered to.

Rear Extension

The HLE CAAMS state '*Extensions and conservatories can alter the balance and harmony of a property or of a group of properties by insensitive scale, design or inappropriate materials. Rear extensions should be as unobtrusive as possible and should not adversely affect the character of the building or the conservation area. In most cases such extensions should be no more than one storey in height, but the general effect on neighbouring properties, views from the public realm, and relationship with the historic pattern of development will be the key factors in the consideration of their acceptability. Some rear extensions, although not widely visible, so adversely affect the architectural integrity of the building to which they are attached that the character of the conservation area is prejudiced.*

Extensions should be in harmony with the original form and character of the building and the

historic pattern of extensions within the group of buildings. The acceptability of larger extensions depends on the particular site and circumstances.

The topography increases the effect of a rear extension for those on the downslope side, with the impacts of height and bulk, overlooking and overshadowing being greater than a similar proposal on level ground. Original rear projections on houses avoid an overbearing effect on their downslope neighbours by being located on the upslope side of the house, and subsequent extensions have largely, but not always, followed this pattern. Development on the downslope side can result in a excessively high wall for the downslope neighbour and so increase in height on this side is unlikely to be acceptable.

Part width extensions are appropriate on houses that originally had a shallow part-width extension, but on flat backed properties a shallower full width extension is likely to be more suitable.'

The proposed full width of the extension is in accordance with the CAAMS being on an original flat back property. The scaled depth is 5m. It is preferred that the length be as approved in 1014/0851/P (i.e. 4m) matching the extension of #3 Bromwich.

If granted a condition should be included prohibiting the use of the flat roof as a terrace or balcony by the addition of any permanent access and/or railing.