

Planning Committee

07 September 2010

Reference:
APP/10/00722

Area Team:
North Team

Case Officer:
Miss K Elliot

Ward:
**Moreton West and
Saughall Massie**

Location: 110 BORROWDALE ROAD, MORETON, CH46 0RQ
Proposal: Erection of a two storey side extension over existing store room with link corridor between dwelling house and single storey outbuilding

Applicant: Mrs J Spotswood
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:

APP/92/05975	Erection of a building to enclose swimming pool	Approve	10/07/92
APP/99/06712	Erection of a single storey front extension and build roof up to first floor level over existing garage	Approve	08/11/99

Summary Of Representations and Consultations Received:

REPRESENTATIONS

Ten letters of notification were sent to the occupiers of neighbouring properties and a site notice was displayed. Five letters of objection were received from neighbouring properties and these can be summarised as follows:

- the proposed extension would result in a loss of privacy;
- the application site is already overdeveloped;
- the proposed extension would exacerbate existing problems with noise and nuisance at the property;
- the proposal will result in increased levels of traffic and parking congestion at the site;
- the proposal will result in the loss of valuable trees at the adjacent site;
- the proposed extension will result in a loss of light and outlook from No.112;
- the property has already undergone various extensions without planning permission.

CONSULTATIONS

None required.

Director's Comments:

REASON FOR REFERRAL TO PLANNING COMMITTEE

The application was removed from delegation by Councillor Stephen Williams on behalf of local residents on the grounds that the proposal will result in an un-neighbourly development.

INTRODUCTION

The proposal is for the erection of a first floor side extension over the existing store room with a link corridor between the main dwelling house and the single storey outbuilding.

PRINCIPLE OF DEVELOPMENT

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

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

The site comprises a detached brick property in an area of mixed design. The dwelling is part of a small cluster of properties set back from Borrowdale Road with a narrow vehicular access serving them. There is a large existing outbuilding situated along the eastern boundary of the site adjoining that of No.112, which is a bungalow. There is established vegetation of varying heights along this side of the application site and a 1.5 metre fence.

POLICY CONTEXT

Policy HS11 and SPG11 are directly relevant in this instance.

APPEARANCE AND AMENITY ISSUES

The proposed first floor side extension and link corridor will fill the gap between the main dwelling and the side boundary with No.112. The corridor will serve to provide a link between the main dwelling and existing outbuilding at the site. The proposed extension continues the roof line of the existing dwelling. The upper floor study would be served by a roof light to the front elevation and the existing store room retained at ground floor. The profile of the building would remain largely the same although the front extension appears as a canopy with a pillar supporting the upper floor. It is considered that a set back is therefore not necessary as the proposed extension is not conventional. Taking in to account the height and design of the existing house, and mixed design of properties in the immediate vicinity, it is considered that the inclusion of a lower ridge height would not serve to improve the overall appearance of the extension in relation to the existing dwelling. The proposal is not considered excessive in terms of the scale of the existing property or the size of the site and

therefore is not considered to represent an over-development of the site. In terms of the potential impact of the proposal on neighbouring properties, the only dwelling that could be affected is No.112. However due to the already long elevation facing this property, and established vegetation at the side of the site, the proposal is not considered to exacerbate impacts on this side of the site. Although the 1.5 storey gable end will be closer to No.112 than at present, the window closest the proposed extension serves a kitchen which is not considered a habitable room. Levels of overshadowing would not increase significantly beyond levels currently experienced at the site considering the width of the proposed extension in the context of the existing dwelling.

The issues raised in the objections regarding loss of privacy to properties in Raby Drive is not directly relevant as there are no proposed windows to the rear. In addition there are no windows facing No.112 and permitted development rights can be removed to prevent the insertion of windows in this elevation at a later date. The concerns raised over parking congestion do not relate to the proposed extension as there is no change or loss of parking space at the site. As the proposals relate to the enjoyment of the existing dwelling the concerns over noise and nuisance emanating from the site are a civil matter and the proposal could not be refused on these grounds. In terms of the extensions to the property carried out without planning permission this would have to be addressed by enforcement. However it is not considered that the proposals would result in the over-development of the site. The applicant has indicated that no trees would be remove or pruned to facilitate the extension. There are trees to the boundary between the application site and No.112 that, though not protected by a Tree Preservation Order, could be retained to screen part of the proposed extension. It may be argued, however, that these overshadow the rear of No.112 to a certain degree at present.

In conclusion it is not considered that the proposed extension would have significantly more of an impact than the existing dwelling and outbuilding do in their current position adjacent to the eastern boundary of the site. The proposed extension is not considered excessive in size in the context of the existing dwelling and surrounding site. The proposal remains subordinate to the existing dwelling and is not considered to have a detrimental impact on neighbouring properties or the character of the area. Overall the proposal is acceptable in terms of scale and design and is recommended for approval.

SEPARATION DISTANCES

SPG11 recommends that habitable room windows directly facing each other should be at least 21 metres apart. The proposed extension has no rear or side facing windows and the proposed roof light does not face directly on to neighbouring properties. The proposal is therefore not considered to result in direct overlooking.

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.

2. 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 east facing elevation 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.

Last Comments By: 22/07/2010 16:02:05

Expiry Date: 05/08/2010