

Planning Committee

19 March 2020

Reference:
APP/19/01876

Area Team:
**Development
Management Team**

Case Officer:
Mr B Bechka

Ward:
Heswall

Location:
Proposal:

6 COTTAGE DRIVE WEST, GAYTON, CH60 8NU
Erection of two-storey front and side extensions and part single part two-storey rear extension. Other works include raising of the ridge height by 0.912m and formation of roof terrace (amended plans).

Applicant:
Agent :

Mr & Mrs McKay
PDK Project Engineering Ltd

Qualifying Petition: No

Site Plan:



Development Plan designation:

Green Belt
Coastal Zone

Planning History:

None

Summary Of Representations and Consultations Received:**1.0 WARD MEMBER COMMENTS**

1.1 Councillor Andrew C Hodson has called in this application to go before Wirral's Planning Committee on the grounds that the proposed size of the property will have an effect on the local street scene and the effect this application will have on the water levels locally and the dispersal of the surface water .

2.0 SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATIONS

A total of 9 consultation letters were sent out to neighbouring properties. In addition to a site note was posted.

REPRESENTATIONS

2 no. representations were received from neighbouring properties . A summary of these representations are listed as follows:

- scale of extensions would be inappropriate within this setting, appearing disproportional and intrusive to surrounding properties
- increased ridge would alter skyline and appear intrusive
- increased ridge would allow for 2nd storey accommodation and impact on Highway
- development would result increased surface water flooding to road and neighbouring properties sited on lower ground
- new openings to front, especially 2nd floor will result in overlooking

CONSULTATIONS

Highways: No objections

Local Lead Flood Authority: No comments

Dwy Cymru: No objections

Heswall Society: Object

The Heswall Society Committee has discussed this application and wish to object on the basis of inappropriate development in a sensitive area. This property is located in the Green Belt and the Coastal Zone. The proposal seeks approval for an increase in habitable floor space from 151.25 m² to 394.38m², an increase of 160% plus an increase in the roof height by 1.212 m. This huge increase in floor space and volume is clearly disproportionate in a Green Belt setting and is more than three times the maximum of the additional 50% floor space permitted in retained UDP Policy GB5 Extension of Existing Dwellings in the Green Belt. The Society therefore requests that the application be refused as it clearly contravenes both national and local planning policy.

3.1 The Reason for Referral to Planning Committee

3.1.1 The application has been called in by Councillor Andrew C Hodson on the following grounds:

- The proposed size of the property and its effect on the local street scene.
- Concerns about the effect this application will have on the water levels locally and the dispersal of the surface water as conditions will be required to remove this problem.

3.2 Site and Surroundings

3.2.1 Sited to the north-eastern side of Cottage Drive West, the application site relates to a two-storey dwelling set within a large plot. Its front boundary is formed by a tall privet hedge. The existing pedestrian and vehicular access to the application site is via a long driveway leading off Cottage Drive West. Located within designated Green Belt land within Gayton, the application site is bound to all sides except its rear by residential properties. To its rear it is bound by farmland. Neighbouring properties are predominantly large two-storey dwellings set within spacious plots. Whilst traditional in appearance, there is no prevailing character or design to these surrounding properties.

3.3 Proposed Development

3.3.1 Planning permission is sought for the erection of a two-storey front and side extension and part single part two-storey rear extension to form a study, WC, large open plan kitchen/family area and dining room at ground floor level and 1 no. extended master en-suite bedroom with roof terrace balcony, 1 no. extended en-suite bedroom, laundry store and 1 no. extended bedroom at first floor level. It would have a part gable part flat roof design, introducing 2 no. rooflights. The ridge of the extended property would be raised by 0.912m in height as a result of the proposed development. In addition to the garage having recently been demolished, the existing porch would be demolished as part of the development.

3.3.2 Added value:

At the request of the case officer the applicant has reduced the internal habitable floorspace of the extended dwelling and therefore its scale, bulk and massing.

3.4 Development Plan

3.4.1 Policy HS11 - House Extensions
GB2 - Guidelines for Development within the Green Belt
Policy GB5 - Extension of Existing Dwellings in the Green Belt

3.5 Other Material Planning Considerations

3.5.1 Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD):
SPG House Extensions (2004)

3.5.2 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) was revised on 19 June 2019. The NPPF will be referred to as appropriate within this report.

3.6 Assessment

3.6.1 The main issues pertinent in the assessment of the proposal are;

- Principle of development;
- Design;
- Highways;
- Amenity

3.7 Principle of Development:

3.7.1 The application site is designated as part of the Green Belt in the Unitary Development Plan where limited extensions are permitted under the terms of UDP Policies GB2 and GB5.

Green Belt Impact Assessment:

3.7.2 The main considerations are whether the proposal would be inappropriate in the Green Belt and whether there would be any harm. Both UDP Policy GB2 and GB5 are consistent with NPPF in that there is a general presumption against inappropriate development and such development would not be approved, unless for exceptions including the limited extension of existing dwellings. Inappropriate development is by definition, harmful to the Greenbelt and

should not be approved except in very special circumstances (NPPF Paragraph 143 refers)

- 3.7.5 NPPF paragraph 145 states that 'a local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in the Green Belt', except where 'the extension or alteration of a building does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building'.
- 3.7.6 Policy GB5 of Wirral's UDP states that;
'the extension of existing dwellings in the Green Belt will be permitted, provided that the floor space of the resultant dwelling is no more than 50% larger than that of the habitable floorspace of the original dwelling and subject also to the enlarged dwelling not having a harmful visual impact on its surroundings'.
- 3.7.7 In this particular case, the applicant has put forward calculations to demonstrate the proposed increase in habitable floorspace could be achieved under the permitted development in some other format by virtue of Schedule 2 Class 1 of the General Permitted Development Order 2015 (as amended). However, this is not considered to be a determining factor, the main consideration is whether the proposal would result in appropriate development that is proportionate to the original dwelling in line with national policy.
- 3.7.8 There have been no previous extensions to the application property. Comprising two side extensions and a two-storey rear extension, the total additional habitable floorspace would be 132.96 sqm. Including the recently demolished garage, the total habitable floorspace of the original dwelling amounts to 186.04 sq.m.
- 3.7.9 The total habitable floorspace of the dwelling and the extensions proposed through this application would be 318.75 sqm.
- 3.7.10 The current proposal would amount to a 71% increase in the habitable floorspace which exceeds the 50% increase permitted by Policy GB5.
- 3.7.11 In this particular case, the extended property would have a slightly reduced width compared to the original dwelling, although the width and bulk of the building would increase with a two-storey side extension. The extended dwelling would also project further to its rear at single and two-storey level. Since the initial submission, the proposals have been amended so that the increase in the ridge height has been reduced to just 0.912m which is considered to be a modest increase to the original building.
Although the extensions will inevitably result in a larger property, the bulk of this is taken up by the increased depth of the property, as such the extent of the increase is not perceived from any public land.
- 3.7.12 Although the proposals would exceed the increase permitted through Policy GB5, the proposal would result in a compact tighter built form and uniform in its design, The footprint of the extended property would be similar in scale to other properties along Cottage Road Drive West.
- 3.7.13 In light of the above, it is considered that the proposed extensions would not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original two-storey dwelling, it would be comparable to neighbouring properties and would not have a harmful visual impact in particular Green Belt setting.
- 3.8 Design:
- 3.8.1 The design and the siting of the proposed extension are acceptable. The two-storey side extension would project 5m to the side of the two-storey element of the original dwelling, in place of the recently demolished single-storey garage.
- 3.8.2 At its deepest point the proposed extension would extend approximately 4.4m to the rear of

the original dwelling, stepping back in towards the rear of the original dwelling by approximately 1.75m towards its boundary with No.4.

- 3.8.3 The front elevation of the extended property would be defined by two large slightly protruding front gable ends to either side which extend forward of the main pitched roof of the property. The rear elevation would comprise of 3 no. gable ends, with one being smaller in scale where the extension steps back in towards the rear of the original dwelling.
- 3.8.4 As a result of the proposed development, the ridge of the extended property would sit 0.912m higher than previously. Having been amended, this now reduced ridge is considered a modest increase and given its setting within a large plot set back from the road, would not appear visually obtrusive or overly prominent within the street scene.
- 3.8.5 Although traditional in form, the extended application property would use a large amount of glazing to its front and rear elevations, giving it a contemporary feel. In terms of visual appearance, the design of the original dwelling is considered to have little architectural merit. The other properties within the street scene, whilst also traditional in their design and appearance, are not defined by any prevailing character or style. As such, the contemporary appearance of the extended property is unlikely to appear harmful to the character of the original dwelling or within the surrounding street scene.
- 3.8.6 Its part gabled part dual pitched and part flat roof design would be in keeping with the design of the original dwelling, whilst the proposed materials comprising of red facing brick and render facings, grey uPVC/aluminium openings and grey slate roof tiles would match that of the existing property.
- 3.8.7 It is considered that the proposed development seeks to reflect the character of the original property and surrounding area in terms of its design, materials and scale and street scene and as such is in accordance with Policy HS11 of Wirral's UDP.

3.9 Highways:

- 3.9.1 The proposal would not result in any additional bedrooms and as such there are no Highway Implications relating to this proposal.

3.10 Ecology/ Flood Risk:

- 3.10.1 A number of objectors, including Councillor Hodson, have voiced concern as to the impact the proposed development would have on surface water flooding. That No. 6 already has drainage issues to its rear and that any development would lead to flooding to the road and neighbouring properties that lie at a lower level to that of the application property.
- 3.10.2 It should be noted that neither the application property or other properties within the road are situated within a flood risk zone.
- 3.10.3 Following comments received from neighbours, the Local Lead Flood Authority were consulted. They have not raised any concerns in relation to the proposals. The Environment Agency website which deals with surface water flooding, also shows that this area is of low flood risk from surface water flooding.
- 3.10.4 Whilst the applicant has made mention of their intention to use a French drain pumping system, and whilst still in discussion with Dwr Cymru, they are still to gain their express permission for this system to be linked to Dwr Cymru's network. Given that neither the Environment Agency or the Local Lead Flood Authority have shown there to be any significant surface water flooding issues, conditioning that such a drainage system be implemented as a requirement of any planning permission could not reasonably be justified by the Council.

3.11 Amenity:

- 3.11.1 Given the siting of the proposed development in relation to neighbouring properties, it is unlikely that it would appear overbearing or visually intrusive to those properties or their garden areas. Furthermore, it would not result in any undue overshadowing or loss of light to neighbouring properties.
- 3.11.2 A minimum separation distance of approximately 5.3m would be achieved between the proposed development and the boundary to No. 8 and given the orientation of the application property away from No. 8, the bulk of the extended property would face away from No. 8. The proposed roof terrace would face away from No. 8's dwelling, whilst achieving an approximately 15m separation distance to the shared boundary.
- 3.11.3 At its closest point the two-storey rear extension of the proposed development would sit within approximately 3.5m of the boundary to No. 4. However, given the orientation of the properties away from one another, the bulk of this extension would face away from No. 4's dwelling. The habitable windows to the rear of No. 4 face onto No. 4's rear garden area. The rear habitable window (bedroom 3) sited closest to the shared boundary with No. 4 would achieve approximately 8.5m to this boundary. Whilst leading to some overlooking onto No. 4's rear garden area, it would look indirectly towards the garden and not onto the private outside amenity space sited immediately to the rear of No. 4's property. to the proposed habitable window. On balance, it is considered that the level of overlooking to the rear garden area of No. 4 is not so significant to warrant a refusal and is therefore acceptable. A minimum separation distance of approximately 11m would be achieved between the proposed rear roof terrace of the development and the shared boundary to No. 4's rear garden area.
- 3.11.4 The proposed extended property would retain sufficient separation distances to all other neighbouring properties.
- 3.11.5 As such, the proposed development would not result in any significant or adverse impacts on the residential amenity of neighbouring properties in terms of overlooking, loss of privacy, overshadowing or appearing visually intrusive or overbearing.

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 policy advice. In reaching this decision the Local Planning Authority has considered the following:-

The proposal is contrary to UDP Policy GB5, in that the resultant dwelling would be more 50% larger than the existing habitable floorspace. However, in this particular case, current proposals are considered to be proportionate in relation to existing detached property within its large plot and would constitute appropriate development in the Green Belt under the terms of NPPF paragraph 145. The application is considered otherwise to be in accordance with Policies HS11, GB2 and GB5 of Wirral's Unitary Development Plan and the Supplementary Planning Guidelines: House Extensions and the National Planning Policy Framework- in that proposed development would not have a harmful visual impact, it would reflect the character of the existing property and the surrounding area in terms of design, materials and scale with adverse impact on the amenity of neighbouring residents.

Recommended Decision: Approve

Recommended Conditions and Reasons:

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of 3 years from the date of this permission.

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

2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans received by the local planning authority on 13th December 2019 and listed as follows:

4590/102/A, received 20th February 2020; and
4590/103/A, received 20th February 2020.

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and to define the permission.

3. The external finishes of the development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with those showing on drawing no. 4590/102/A received 20th February 2020.

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory appearance to the development in the interests of visual amenity and to comply with Policy HS11 of the Wirral Unitary Development Plan.

Further Notes for Committee:

Last Comments By: 13/03/2020 13:54:08

Expiry Date: 07/02/2020