

2015/0472/P	10 Hillway	Replacement of rear conservatory with a single storey rear extension	Fiona Davies
-------------	------------	--	--------------

Object

The proposed rear extension, which would be highly visible from Bromwich Avenue, is not in keeping with the character of the estate. The impact can be assessed looking at the photos included in these comments and the two side elevations included with the application, drawing 04 existing & 17 proposed.

The existing conservatory appears to be timber.

The existing windows on the south elevation are the original timber casement windows with the small ‘georgian’ panes.

The proposed extension has on the south & east faces a white rendered wall (type of render not specified but should be rough cast to match main building) and a large picture window in a metal frame coloured metal (?) and a sliding/folding set of doors. As such this ‘contemporary styled’ extension does not comply with the HLE CAAMS which state;

Rear extensions

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 depth of the extension is appropriate, matching as it does that at #12 Hillway.



Views from Bromwich Avenue