2014/5151/P	23 Bromwich Avenue	Erection of a single-storey rear and side extension to existing dwelling house (Class C3)	Mandeep Chagger
-------------	-----------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------

## **Object**

### Side Extension

## a) Relocation of the front door

# b) Destruction of symmetry

Under Porches (page 46) the CAAMS state 'There are a variety of porch designs in the Conservation Area that make a valuable contribution to the rich and characterful appearance of the buildings and the area. Planning Permission is not required for single family dwellings for their construction or extension (subject to size restrictions), but if you are considering work of this kind you are strongly encouraged to have consideration for the symmetry of pairs of houses, the retention of original porch structures that contribute to the historic and architectural significance of the building, and that your new work does not hide or destroy important and attractive detailing. Planning permission is required for the construction or extension of porches on flats, and they are important elements which require careful attention to detail in the case of the mansion blocks'. The relocation of the front entrance is again totally at odds with maintaining the symmetry of 21 & 23 Bromwich Avenue. The need for this symmetry is the reason that for planning applications 2012/3064/P (21 Bromwich) 2012/3709/P (23 Bromwich) a S106 Agreement was demanded requiring both properties to be developed simultaneously (section 3.6 of the Officers Delegated Report for 2012/3064/P).

Considering the examples of previously approved side extensions quoted in the Design and Access statement

- 65 Hillway, approved 2010 prior to the adoption of the CAAMS on 6-Dec-2012, and was a conversion of an existing garage not a new build.
- The other examples given in the Design & Access statement, although not accurately identified are most likely garage conversions and pre-date the adoption of the CAAMS.

### c) Unsympathetic finishes

Finally the design of the side extension does not preserve nor enhance the appearance of

the estate. To the front, the finish, timber beams in-filled with glazing clashes with the render of the main house. The glazing detail ignores that of the main building. The rear of the side extension stands overly tall, in line with first floor windows as a rendered wall unbroken with any detail.

### Rear Extension

The 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.

As a full width extension on a flat backed property the structure appears to meet the requirement of the CAAMS, however the width is extended to include the side extension to which we object.

The depth of the extension in comparison to that of 21 Bromwich is not shown, it is preferable that it is no deeper than that of 21 Bromwich.

The choice of finishes, grey horticultural timber is very different to the materials used in the original house. As the Design and Access statement identifies the Central Government Town Planning changes introduced in 2013 require 'the materials to be similar in appearance to the existing house' (Section B, 2). Equally the CAAMS require the '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', and CPG1, Section 4, that 'Windows, doors and materials should complement the existing Building'.

# Over Development

Although the development falls within the 50% restriction (mainly by virtue of being on a triangular plot), it almost doubles the foot print of the original building and significantly reduces the green space of the garden, especially as a new patio terrace is proposed across the widened building and extending towards Swain's Lane.