

Planning Committee

07 September 2010

Reference:
APP/10/00655

Area Team:
North Team

Case Officer:
Miss K Elliot

Ward:
Upton

Location: Sandbrook, 27 MOUNT ROAD, UPTON, CH49 6JA
Proposal: Erection of a two storey side extension and first floor extension over existing garage and erection of detached garage

Applicant: Mr D Hardisty
Agent : Mr Voas

Site Plan:



Development Plan allocation and policies:

Primarily Residential Area
Policy HS11 House Extensions
SPG11 House Extensions

Planning History:

2009/5733 Erection of a two storey side extension and first floor extension over existing garage, first floor rear balcony and detached double garage to the front – Refused 12/08/09

Summary Of Representations and Consultations Received:

REPRESENTATIONS

Eight letters of notification were sent to the occupiers of neighbouring properties and a site notice was displayed. Three separate letters of objection and a non-qualifying petition of objection containing ten signatures were received and these can be summarised as follows:

- the proposal would compromise highway safety in terms of vehicles parked outside the property;
- the proposals are out of character with the surrounding area;
- the proposed garage projects forward of the building line;
- the proposal is un-neighbourly and would have an adverse visual impact by reason of its design;
- the proposals would be detrimental to neighbouring properties;
- the proposal would result in additional noise and disturbance;
- the proposals would result in the loss of valuable trees and a general loss of amenity.

CONSULTATIONS

Director of Technical Services (Traffic Management) - no objection to the proposal.

Director's Comments:

REASON FOR REFERRAL TO PLANNING COMMITTEE

The application was removed from delegation by Councillor Anderson on behalf of local residents on the grounds that the proposal is large, projects beyond the building line and would thereby impose on neighbouring properties.

INTRODUCTION

The proposal is for the erection of a two storey side extension and first floor side extension over the existing garage, and the erection of a detached garage. The proposal represents a re-submission of a previous application which was refused on the grounds of design and that the proposed balcony would result in overlooking to neighbouring properties from a higher level.

PRINCIPLE OF DEVELOPMENT

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

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

The site comprises of a large detached brick property within an area of mixed design. There is substantial vegetation to the front and rear boundaries. The side boundary with properties in Green Mount is heavily screened by vegetation and the side boundary with No.25 has a 2-metre fence and more sporadic vegetation. No.25 has an existing two storey, part single storey side extension situated along the same side as the proposal. The properties in Green Mount are mostly detached bungalows. The property has a large rear garden and extensive front lawn. There is also a large detached outbuilding situated along the rear boundary of the site.

POLICY CONTEXT

Policy HS11 and SPG11 are directly relevant in this instance.

APPEARANCE AND AMENITY ISSUES

The proposed two storey side extension and first floor side extension over the existing garage retains largely the same footprint as the previous proposal except the extension now remains flush with the main front elevation of the property and incorporates a lower ridge height to ensure it remains subordinate to the existing property. The roof design of the proposed extension also reflects that of the main dwelling and has thereby overcome the first reason for refusal. The original proposal also incorporated a rear balcony at first floor which has been removed and has therefore overcome the other original reason for refusal. The proposed detached garage remains in the same position as the previous application and there was no objection to this as part of the previous proposal and this is maintained. The proposed garage is not considered excessive in size considering the size of the main dwelling and surrounding plot. The proposed garage measures 5.3 metres in width and 4.3 metres in height with a pitched roof. Although the proposed garage is forward of the building line it remains set back from the front boundary of the site by approximately 12 metres and is tucked away along the

side boundary of the site. There is established vegetation at the front and side of the site which would screen the bulk of the garage from view and all but the roof slope will not be visible. The siting and size of the proposed garage is not considered to have any highway safety implications. The property closest to the proposed garage at No.1 Green Mount has patio doors in its north elevation however due to the garage being situated to the north east of the property it is not considered to be over-dominant when viewed from No.1, or to lead to overshadowing. In addition the proposed garage is not considered to lead to a loss of outlook or appear over dominant when viewed from No.1 Green Mount as its bulk will be screened by the established vegetation along the shared boundary.

The proposed side extension retains the existing 1 metre gap to the side boundary with No.25 which has an existing two storey, part single storey, side extension that is flush with the front elevation. However the only window facing the proposal at No.25 is a first floor bathroom window. This does not serve a habitable room and there are rear facing windows serving this room also. The existing extension at No.25 projects slightly beyond that of the proposed extension and therefore is not considered to result in a loss of outlook or overshadowing to No.25. One of the main objections received from local residents is that the proposed extension is out of scale and character with the existing property. However it is considered that due to the size of the property it can easily accommodate the proposed extension and it would not detract from visual amenity. The concerns raised in the objections relating to highway safety along Mount Road are not sustainable. The garage is sited well within the site and still retains considerable parking space at the front of the property. The projection of the garage beyond the building line is justified due to the mixed design of the area and large plot size. The proposed garage is not considered to have a detrimental impact on the street scene and will not impact on the junction of Mount Road and Green Mount. The objections relating to noise, nuisance and the existing outbuilding at the rear of the site do not directly relate to the proposals.

In conclusion it is considered that the proposal has overcome the reasons for refusal of previous application APP/09/05733, and the site can easily accommodate the proposals. The proposed extension remains subordinate to the original property and the design has improved from the original refusal. The proposed garage is acceptable in terms of scale, siting and design and is not considered detrimental to the character of the area. Overall the proposals are not considered to have an adverse impact on neighbouring properties and are recommended for approval.

SEPARATION DISTANCES

SPG11 states that habitable room windows directly facing each other should be at least 21 metres apart. In this instance the proposed two storey side extension retains a separation distance of approximately 45 metres to No.9 Green Mount at the rear and 47 metres to No.26 Mount Road. Thus the proposal meets the required separation distances and is not considered to result in a 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 a harmful visual impact on the general street scene or have an adverse impact 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 a harmful visual impact on the general street scene or have an adverse impact 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.

Last Comments By: 02/08/2010 13:03:20

Expiry Date: 25/08/2010