

Planning Committee
26 July 2012

Reference:
APP/12/00625

Area Team:
North Team

Case Officer:
Mrs S Williams

Ward:
**Greasby Frankby
and Irby**

Location: 90 DINGWALL DRIVE, GREASBY, CH49 1SQ
Proposal: Loft conversion
Applicant: Mr Richard Avery
Agent : M Survey Chartered Surveyors

Site Plan:



Development Plan Designation:

Primarily Residential Area

Planning History:

APP/2000/7223 - Erection of two-storey extension to the side - Approved 08.02.2001

APP/11/00775 - Proposed loft conversion and erection of a sloping roof over existing rear extension - Refused 11.08.2011

LDP/11/01315 - A loft conversion, replacing flat roof for sloping roof and making the rear of the garage storage area flush with the rear of the house - Certificate Issued

Summary Of Representations and Consultations Received:**REPRESENTATIONS**

Having regard to the Council's Guidance on Publicity of Planning Applications, 7 letters of notification were sent to occupiers at neighbouring properties and in addition a site notice was displayed. No representations have been received.

CONSULTATIONS

None required.

Director's Comments:**REASON FOR REFERRAL TO PLANNING COMMITTEE**

Councillor Clements requested this application be removed from delegation and considered by the Planning Committee following representations she has received from local residents on the grounds that the application should be approved, given the policy contained within the National Planning Policy Framework at paragraphs 7 and 61.

Paragraph 7 outlines that there are three dimensions to sustainable development: economic, social and environmental. These dimensions give rise to the need for the planning system to perform a number of roles, and in this case the social role is considered to be a material consideration:

"A social role – supporting strong, vibrant and healthy communities, by providing the supply of housing required to meet the needs of present and future generations; and by creating a high quality built environment, with accessible local services that reflect the community's needs and support its health, social and cultural well-being."

Paragraph 61 states:

"Although visual appearance and the architecture of individual buildings are very important factors, securing high quality and inclusive design goes beyond aesthetic considerations. Therefore, planning policies and decisions should address the connections between people and places and the integration of new development into the natural, built and historic environment."

INTRODUCTION

The proposal seeks planning permission to convert the loft of the building, including a hip to gable roof extension. The proposal is a resubmission of a previously refused planning application, referenced APP/11/00775. The original application was refused as it was considered that the hip to gable alteration would have a negative impact to the streetscene, unbalancing the pair of semi-detached properties, in conflict with Supplementary Planning Guidance SPG11 and with UDP Policy HS11.

It should be noted that a Lawful Development Certificate (LDP/11/001315) has been issued for a loft conversion without a hip to gable alteration (including a flat roof rear dormer and other alterations such as the replacement of a flat roof for a sloping roof and making the rear of the garage storage area flush with the rear of the house). It was deemed that planning permission was not required for this development, and the Certificate was consequently issued. The proposed development currently

sought does, however, require planning permission given the volume of the resulting roof when compared to the original dwelling.

The proposed development introduces a hip to gable extension and would convert the loft of the property to accommodate two extra bedrooms, a shower room and additional storage. The application includes a statement in support of the proposed development, outlining that the need for the extra habitable space arises from the applicant's commitment to giving a secure, safe, comfortable and spacious home to foster children and a growing family, and the current state of the housing market, which is preventing the applicants from successfully relocating. It is outlined that other options for providing the additional space have been exhausted through existing extensions. Implementation of the development for which a Lawful Development Certificate has been issued would result in very restricted head height and would create no real additional living space. There are a very limited number of seven bedroom properties in the locality, and the applicant is committed to the local area.

PRINCIPLE OF DEVELOPMENT

In principle house extensions within Primarily Residential Areas are acceptable subject to consideration of the National Planning Policy Framework and policy HS11 of Wirral's Unitary Development Plan. Supplementary Planning Guidance SPG11 offers supplementary advice on the interpretation of UDP Policy HS11.

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

90 Dingwall Drive is a traditional semi-detached dwellinghouse located within a primarily residential area. The original property was extended following the grant of planning permission APP/2000/07223. The hip to gable alteration would be above this two-storey extension to the side of the property. The properties within the immediate area vary from semi-detached to detached two-storey dwellinghouses. A number of properties in the vicinity have been extended.

The rear boundaries of the site contain wooden fencing and sporadic vegetation screening. The rear elevation of the adjoining property, 92 Dingwall Drive matches the rear elevation of the application property.

The neighbouring property, 88 Dingwall Drive contains a two-storey side extension. There is a clear glazed first-floor window located on the side elevation of this property facing towards No.90. This window is a secondary window serving a room within the building.

POLICY CONTEXT

The application property is located within land designated as a Primarily Residential Area in Wirral's Unitary Development Plan. UDP Policy HS11 – House Extensions and SPG11 – House Extensions are directly relevant in this instance.

APPEARANCE AND AMENITY ISSUES

The design of the hip to gable was the reasons why the original application was refused. UDP Policy HS11 outlines, at criteria (iii) the requirement that design features such as roof form and line match or complement those of the existing building, and the supporting text to the policy makes it clear that extensions should be designed in such a way as to have no significant adverse effect on the appearance of the original property, or an adverse effect on the area in general. SPG11 offers further guidance, noting that "Side dormers or proposals to create gable end roofs on one side of pairs of semi-detached and detached dwellings where both sides were originally hipped will not be allowed".

Having regard to the Policy and Guidance, planning application APP/11/00775 was refused planning permission. The current application is very similar in form - all that has changed is the proposal to install several front facing rooflights. Due to this, the same reason for refusal is considered valid.

It is noted that there are some examples of other residential properties within the surrounding area of the application site (20-22 Dingwall Drive and properties sited in Brookdale Avenue South) have undertaken hip to gables. However, the Local Planning Authorities records show that relevant planning applications for these extensions were not received and therefore suggests that these extensions were undertaken under permitted development.

The introduction of a gable end does not match the adjoining property and will therefore have a negative impact on the appearance of the pair of semi-detached dwellings and consequently to the

wider street scene. The applicant has submitted an appendix to their supporting statement detailing alterations to properties at Lloyd Drive, Caulfield Drive, Dinwall Drive and Brookdale Ave South (all Greasby), each of which includes a hip-to-gable roof alteration to one of a pair of semi detached properties. Although it is accepted that there is some variety of roof types and a number of similar extensions have been constructed within the surrounding area it is not considered that the character of the streetscene has altered sufficient to warrant approval contrary to the UDP Policy and Guidance, especially given that the adjoining property roof type remains as a hip.

SEPARATION DISTANCES

All required separation distances would be met.

HIGHWAY/TRAFFIC IMPLICATIONS

There are no highway implications relating to this proposal.

ENVIRONMENTAL/SUSTAINABILITY ISSUES

There are no environmental/sustainability issues relating to these proposals.

HEALTH ISSUES

There are no health implications relating to this application.

CONCLUSION

The introduction of the gable would have a negative impact on the appearance of the pair of semi-detached dwellings and therefore on the street scene itself. The proposal is therefore contrary to policy HS11 of Wirral's Unitary Development Plan and SPG11: House Extensions.

Recommended Refuse
Decision:

Recommended Reason:

1. The proposed hip to gable extension would have a negative impact to the streetscene by virtue of unbalancing a pair of semi-detached properties in conflict with Supplementary Planning Guidance SPG11 and UDP Policy HS11 of Wirral's Unitary Development Plan.

Last Comments By: 20/06/2012 16:12:44

Expiry Date: 05/07/2012