
ITEM	APP/2007/6148	WARD Heswall
------	---------------	--------------

Location: Redroofs 24 Broadmead Barnston Wirral CH60 1XD

Proposal: Erection of a two storey side/rear extension

Applicant: Kevin McAuley Redroofs 24 Broadmead Barnston Wirral CH60 1XD	Agent: Tony Haire 30 Caldly Road West Kirby Wirral CH48 2HQ
---	--

Development Plan allocation and policies: Primarily residential area. UDP policy HS11 (House extensions), SPG 11 (House extensions).

Planning History: Single storey rear extension (88/6324) approved 19th August 1988.
Conversion of existing garage into living accommodation and erection of a pitched roof (05/5821) approved 14th July 2005.

Representations and consultations received: Representations:
A total number of 7 notification letters have been sent to properties in the area. At the time of writing this report one objection document has been received from on behalf of 22, Broadmead and 17, Brimstage Close listing the following grounds:

overbearing;

overshadowing;

overlooking;

overdevelopment;

poor amenity level provided for occupants of 24;

inadequate amenity space retained for occupiers of 24;

loss of visual amenity;

detrimental to street scene;

mass/bulk of extension inappropriate to area;

substandard design

Email from Councillor Johnson requesting the application be taken out of delegation - unneighbourly development, alteration to the street scene

Consultations:

None.

Directors comments: Proposals

The proposal (as amended) is for the erection of single storey and two storey rear extensions at 24, Broadmead, Heswall. Part of the proposal is for a first floor rear extension above an existing single storey element that is sited centrally at the dwelling. This extension is to be sited in excess of 3m from the neighbour at 26, which has no windows facing the extension, and so will not have a detrimental impact on the neighbour.

The two storey extension is to be sited close to the boundary with 22, Broadmead but the impact on the property would be offset by the detached garage at the side of 22.

There are no windows in the side elevation of 22 facing 24 and there is a tall deciduous tree on the boundary which would reduce the visual impact of the extension towards 22 when in leaf. The impact on 22, however, is considered to be acceptable in planning terms. It is to be sited mainly to the side of 22 and only marginally to the rear of that neighbour.

The proposed conservatory extension is also to be sited close to the side boundary with 22, Broadmead. A dense hedge of in excess of 2m height marks the boundary between 22 and 24 adjacent to where the conservatory is to be. This will greatly screen the conservatory so that the impact on the neighbour would be minimal.

There is a dense hedge of approximately 3m height along the rear boundary of 24 and the rear boundary of the neighbour at 17, Brimstage Close. The proposed extensions are likely to be not visible at all from the ground floor level of 17. The extensions will retain rear to rear distances of greater than the acceptable 21m. In fact they would be easily in excess of 25m. Therefore no material overlooking would occur.

Some of the objections received referred to the larger development that was originally proposed. Given the siting on the proposal, set a metre or more off the boundary with 22, mainly to the side of the neighbour at 22 and substantially screened by the existing garage at 22, large tree at 22, the 2.5m high dense hedge to the 22/24 boundary and the large garden at the rear of 22, the overbearing impact of the extension towards 22, Broadmead would not be so great as to warrant refusal. Overshadowing similarly would not be so great as to warrant refusal. There may be some slight increase in overshadowing for a limited part of some days but given the existing dense hedge on the boundary, the distance from the boundary of the extension and the fact that to a great extent the extension would be in the lea of the shadow of the existing house, the impact would not be great. Material overlooking would not be created by any element of the extensions. Overdevelopment would appear to be an objection against the original, large proposal- the amended two storey / single storey side extension and first floor rear extension cannot be considered to be overdevelopment and, given the distance between the dwellings of 24 and 22, it would not create a cramped form of development.

The Internal amenity space of the house at 24 is to be improved by being increased, so it is not the case that the extension would be detrimental to the occupiers of the dwelling. In planning terms the proposal would provide an acceptable standard of accommodation. The loss of external amenity space would not be a reason to refuse the proposal. The remaining garden space would measure in excess of approximately 15m by 17m.

There would not be a loss of visual amenity to any neighbour. The extension is immediately adjacent to other residential structures at both 22 and 24 Broadmead. The impact of the extension on the street scene, and the impact of the mass/bulk of the extension would again apply more to the original proposal than the amended one. However, the area is characterised by large, individually designed dwellings. The proposed extended property would not be out of keeping with this.

The design of the extension is in keeping with the original dwelling - the paragraphs of PPS1 which are cited in the objection document refer in the main to the designs of new buildings and buildings in the public domain.

PRINCIPLE OF DEVELOPMENT

The development is in keeping with the requirements of the adopted Wirral Unitary Development Plan policy HS11 (House extensions) and Supplementary Planning Guidance Note 11 (House extensions).

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

Broadmead is a road of large detached dwellings set in quite large grounds. The property at 24, Broadmead has a dense hedge to the rear which is approximately 3m high and a similarly dense hedge to the side boundary with 22 Broadmead of 2m height. There is also a mature tree sited close to the side boundary and close to the position of the proposed two storey extension.

POLICY CONTEXT

The proposal is in keeping with UDP policy HS11 (House extensions) and SPG 11 (House extensions).

APPEARANCE AND AMENITY ISSUES

The impact on the amenity of neighbouring properties is acceptable in planning terms. There will be no detrimental impact on any neighbour. The proposed extended property would not be out of keeping with the existing street scene of large, individually designed dwellings set in quite large plots of land. Otherwise there will be no impact on local amenity arising directly from this proposal.

HIGHWAY/TRAFFIC IMPLICATIONS

There are no traffic implications arising directly from this proposal.

ENVIRONMENT/SUSTAINABILITY ISSUES

There are no environment/sustainability implications arising directly from this proposal.

HEALTH ISSUES

There are no health issues arising directly from this proposal.

CONCLUSION

The proposal will not be detrimental to the occupiers of the neighbouring properties of 24, Broadmead sufficient to warrant refusal and is in keeping with adopted policy and guidelines. The proposal is therefore considered to be acceptable.

Summary of Decision: The extensions will not have a detrimental impact on any neighbouring property sufficient to warrant refusal. The development is in keeping with UDP policy HS11 (House extensions) and SPG 11 (House extensions).

Recommendation: **Approve**

Condition(s):

- 1 Full planning permission: standard commencement date. (C03A)
- 2 Development according to plans received on 15 August 2007. (C24C)

Reason for conditions

- 1 Standard (CR86)
- 2 For the avoidance of doubt. (CR33)

Last Comments By: **19 July 2007**

56 Day Expires On: **15 August 2007**

Case Officer: **Mr J Mealor**