

Planning Committee

07 September 2010

Reference:
APP/10/00734

Area Team:
North Team

Case Officer:
Miss K Elliot

Ward:
Hoylake and Meols

Location: Thurston, BIRKENHEAD ROAD, MEOLS, CH47 0LE
Proposal: Demolition of existing outbuildings and conservatory to rear and erection of single storey rear and new entrance to side

Applicant: Mr D Schiller
Agent : GU2 Design and Build

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:

2009/5806 Erection of a single storey rear extension Approve 18/08/09

Summary Of Representations and Consultations Received:

REPRESENTATIONS

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

- the proposed extension could compromise the structure and stability of the corresponding outrigger at No.110;
- the proposal may result in damage or gradual degradation to No.110;
- the plans appear to show that the existing outrigger chimney is to be removed, including the corresponding stack at No.110;
- there are inaccuracies in the plans submitted in relation to the height of the extension and location of the party wall;
- the proposal would be oppressive and result in a loss of light to neighbouring properties;
- the proposed side entrance would result in a loss of privacy and increase in noise levels.

CONSULTATIONS

None required.

Director's Comments:

REASON FOR REFERRAL TO PLANNING COMMITTEE

The application was removed from delegation by Councillor Ellis on behalf of local residents on the grounds that the proposal would have an overshadowing and oppressive profile when viewed from neighbouring properties and would also lead to a loss of privacy.

INTRODUCTION

The proposal is for the demolition of the existing outbuildings and conservatory to the rear and erection of a single storey rear extension and new entrance to side.

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 semi-detached brick property. The immediately adjoining property at No.110 has an existing single storey outrigger, which matches that of the application site and there is a 1.5-metre high fence beyond this along the party boundary. The property has an existing rear conservatory and rear outrigger which is to be demolished. There is a 1.8 metre wall with trellis above between the application site and adjacent property at White Lodge. The rear garden and patio at the application is of varying levels.

POLICY CONTEXT

Policy HS11 and SPG11 are directly relevant in this instance.

APPEARANCE AND AMENITY ISSUES

Due to the staggered rear wall of the application property the proposed extension varies in projection. The proposed extension measures 6.4 metres in depth from the rear wall of the existing entrance lobby on the side closest to White Lodge. The proposed extension will have the same projection on the side closest to No.110 which has a corresponding outrigger of the same proportions. Therefore the proposal is not considered to have a detrimental impact or loss of outlook on No.110. The plans originally submitted incorrectly showed the distance of the boundary wall with White Lodge from the proposed extension. This has since been amended and the correct distance of 2.1 metres is now shown. In addition an issue was raised over the height of the proposed extension and that the side and rear elevations did not match. This has been clarified and the plans amended to show the correct height of 3.9 metres which is considered acceptable.

The objection received from the occupiers of White Lodge relate largely to the impact of the proposed extension when viewed from their property. There are kitchen and utility windows facing the proposed extension from White Lodge which also has a large garage situated further along the boundary with the application site. Due to the proposal being situated to the east of these windows, and the proposal

only being single storey, it is not considered to result in a loss of outlook or have an overbearing visual impact on these rooms. In addition the existing boundary wall will screen some of the proposal from view. The siting of an access door facing the kitchen window is acceptable and not considered to result in increased levels of noise or disturbance. The design of the proposed extension as presented is considered acceptable and it would not be reasonable to request this to be amended. The proposed extension remains approximately 5 metres from the kitchen window which faces the two storey wall of the existing house at present. Therefore it would be difficult to sustain refusing planning permission on the grounds that the proposal would lead to a loss of outlook, light or privacy to White Lodge and namely the kitchen and utility area.

The proposed extension is not considered to impinge on the outlook of habitable rooms at White Lodge. The windows facing the proposal serve the kitchen and utility room at the property which are not considered habitable rooms under SPG11. The others issued raised in the objections relating to damage to neighbouring properties or the loss of the chimney stack are civil matters. The proposal retains a sufficient gap to the boundary with White Lodge and is not considered to have an adverse impact on the amenities of the immediately adjacent neighbours. In response to the issue over the proposed extension being marked at 4.2 metres on the ground, it is only possible to assess the proposal on the basis of the information submitted and if the proposed extension is in breach of this at a later date this would have to be addressed through a separate submission or by enforcement. Overall the proposal is considered acceptable in terms of scale and design, remains subordinate to the original property and is recommended for approval.

SEPARATION DISTANCES

Separation distances do not apply in this instance, as no residential properties will be affected by the proposed development.

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 plan(s) received by the Local Planning Authority on 17/08/2010.

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt.

Last Comments By: 23/07/2010 09:15:52
Expiry Date: 09/08/2010