

Planning Committee

15 February 2011

Reference:
APP/10/01323

Area Team:
North Team

Case Officer:
Miss K Elliot

Ward:
**Greasby Frankby
and Irby**

Location: 7 HALTON CRESCENT, GREASBY, CH49 3PG
Proposal: Demolition of an existing single storey extension and erection of a two storey, part single storey, rear extension. (Amended plan)
Applicant: Mr P Hanks
Agent :

Site Plan:



© Crown copyright. All rights reserved. Licence number 100019803. Published 2010.

Development Plan allocation and policies:

Primarily Residential Area
Policy HS11 House Extensions
SPG11 House Extensions

Planning History:

07/07440 Erection of a two-storey rear extension to replace existing single storey, with alteration to side elevation (additional escape window) - Not an application 06/12/07

Summary Of Representations and Consultations Received: REPRESENTATIONS

Five letters of notification were sent to the occupiers of neighbouring properties and a site notice was displayed. At the time of writing this report five separate letters of objection had been received and these can be summarised as follows:

1. the proposed extension would result in a loss of privacy and light to the rear of neighbouring properties;
2. the proposed side facing window would overlook No.6 when opened;
3. neighbouring gardens would become cooler and damper;
4. the proposal will directly overlook neighbouring properties at the rear;
5. the proposed extension is large and out of keeping with surrounding properties;
6. the proposal will compromise the open aspect of the area;
7. if granted, the proposal will set a precedent for future development on the estate;
8. the proposal extends beyond the building line and will over-dominate the area.

As a result of the amendments made to the proposal a further three letters of objection were received and these can be summarised as follows:

- the revised proposal will still over-shadow and result in a loss of light to the rear of No.6;
- the proposed extension should be reduced further to the allowed 3 metres to give a clear 45 degree outlook;
- the revised proposal will set a precedent for future extensions on the estate which is unacceptable;
- the side facing bathroom window should open towards the front of the property and not the rear;
- the revised proposal is to include a wood burning stove and there is no ventilation for this;
- that the previous objections raised remain.

CONSULTATIONS

Director of Technical Services, Trees/Landscaping Division have no objection to the proposal.

Director's Comments:

The application was deferred from Planning Committee on 25th January 2011 for a Committee Site Visit.

REASON FOR REFERRAL TO PLANNING COMMITTEE

The application was removed from delegation by Councillor Gardiner on behalf of local residents on the grounds that the proposed extension would overshadow, and appear over-dominant from, No.6 Halton Crescent.

INTRODUCTION

The proposal is for the demolition of the existing single storey outrigger and the erection of a two storey, part single storey, rear extension.

PRINCIPLE OF DEVELOPMENT

The principle of the development is acceptable subject to Policy HS11 and SPG11.

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

The site comprises a semi-detached render property situated within an area of similar design properties. The property has an ample rear garden with fencing, and vegetation in parts, to all boundaries. There are other two storey side and rear extension in the immediate vicinity.

POLICY CONTEXT

Policy HS11 and SPG11 are directly relevant in this instance.

APPEARANCE AND AMENITY ISSUES

The rear elevation of the dwelling is slightly recessed on one side and thus the proposed two storey rear extension appears to project further in depth on the side closest to No.6 than No.8. The wall of the extension follows that of the existing side wall of the house and remains set away 2 metres from the side boundary with No.6, which is also set back the same distance from the common boundary.

The plans originally submitted have been amended to reduce the overall bulk of the extension when viewed from No.6. Although it has no side facing windows it is important to ensure that the rear facing windows of the neighbouring property retain a sufficient outlook. The revised proposal is set back 1 metre at first floor, reducing its projection to 4.5 metres on the side closest to No.6, and the roof of the extension has been converted to a hip design. In addition the location of bedroom 4 has been swapped with the bathroom to ensure it has a sufficient outlook. The revised proposal retains a 2.5 metre set back from the party boundary with No.8 at first floor and the single storey element remains 1.2 metres from the party boundary at ground floor. The proposed extension projects a further 0.3 metre at ground floor than previously for construction purposes. The revised proposal also includes an alcove in the side of the extension however the applicant is aware that planning permission would be required for a chimney or flue on the extension should this accommodate a wood burning stove in the future. This is not currently part of the proposal.

Taking in to account the fact that a two storey extension of 3 metres in depth could be constructed under permitted development, the revised proposal is not considered unreasonable. It only projects 3.2 metres at first floor from the existing rear elevation closest to No.8 and the ground floor extends to 4.5 metres. There is no statutory or accepted depth for two storey rear extensions and each one is assessed on its own merits. The proposal is considered capable of retaining a sufficient outlook from the neighbour at No.8. Following the revisions made to the proposed extension retains a 45 degree outlook from No.6 and is not considered to appear over dominant when viewed from the neighbouring property. The proposal is set back from the boundary and the side facing window will be obscurely glazed by condition to prevent overlooking which is an issue raised in the objections received. The rear facing windows are not considered to result in overlooking to properties at the rear in Abingdon Road and retain a good separation distance. Concerns were raised over the proposal disrupting the open aspect and building line at the rear however this is more commonly associated with the front of houses. There are several other properties in the immediate vicinity which have two storey side and rear extensions thus the proposal is not the first of its kind in the area as suggested.

The proposal does not set a precedent as each is assessed on its own merits. The main issue is any possible impact on the neighbour at No.6 which is situated to the north east of the proposal. However it is considered that with the revisions made the proposal will not be detrimental to the amenities of the neighbouring property. It would be difficult to sustain refusing the application on the grounds of loss of light and the main issue is the potential for loss of outlook from the rear of No.6 or the proposed extension being over dominant when viewed from the neighbouring property. The proposal does however retain a sufficient outlook from the rear windows of No.6 as recommended in SPG11 and is set away from the common boundary. The potential for overshadowing is not considered significant and the proposal is not considered to impinge on the garden areas of neighbouring properties. In conclusion the proposal is capable of remaining subordinate to the original property and is recommended for approval.

SEPARATION DISTANCES

SPG11 states that habitable room windows directly facing each other should be at least 21 metres apart. Main habitable room windows should be at least 14 metres from any blank gable. The rear facing bedroom window of the extension retains a separation distance of approximately 47 metres from the rear elevations of properties in Abingdon Road. The location of the previously side facing bedroom 4 has been swapped with the bathroom in order that it retains a sufficient outlook and so that the side facing window may be obscurely glazed. The revised proposal is therefore not considered to result in direct overlooking to neighbouring properties.

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 proposal is not considered to have an adverse impact on the character of the building or on the

amenities that the occupiers of neighbouring properties can reasonably expect to enjoy. The proposal is acceptable in terms of scale and design, complies with Policy HS11-House Extensions of the adopted Wirral Unitary Development Plan and SPG11-House Extensions.

Summary of Decision:

Having regards to the individual merits of this application the decision to grant Planning Permission has been taken having regards to the relevant Policies and Proposals in the Wirral Unitary Development Plan (Adopted February 2000) and all relevant material considerations including national and regional policy advice. In reaching this decision the Local Planning Authority has considered the following:-

The proposal is not considered to have an adverse impact on the character of the building or on the amenities that the occupiers of neighbouring properties can reasonably expect to enjoy. The proposal is acceptable in terms of scale and design, complies with Policy HS11-House Extensions of the adopted Wirral Unitary Development Plan and SPG11-House Extensions.

Recommended Decision: Approve

Recommended Conditions and Reasons:

1. The development hereby permitted shall be commenced before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

Reason: To comply with Section 91 (as amended) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

2. The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the details shown on the plans received by the Local Planning Authority on 22/12/2010.

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt.

3. Prior to the proposed extension being brought in to use the north east facing first floor side window shall be obscurely glazed and retained as such thereafter.

Reason: To safeguard the amenities of adjoining occupiers and to accord with Policy HS11 of the Wirral Unitary Development Plan.

4. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2008 (or any order revoking or re-enacting that Order), no window or other openings other than those shown on the approved plan(s) shall be inserted in the north east or south west facing elevations of the building hereby permitted.

Reason: To safeguard the amenities of adjoining occupiers and to accord with Policy HS11 of the Wirral Unitary Development Plan.

Further Notes for Committee:

Last Comments By: 20/01/2011 10:54:46

Expiry Date: 30/12/2010