

# Public Document Pack

Date: 9 April 2021  
Our Ref:  
Your Ref:

**Please contact:** Ruth Appleby  
**Contact Number:** 0151 934 2181  
**e-mail:** [ruth.appleby@sefton.gov.uk](mailto:ruth.appleby@sefton.gov.uk)

Dear Councillor

## **PLANNING COMMITTEE - WEDNESDAY 14TH APRIL, 2021**

I refer to the agenda for the above meeting and now enclose the following documents which were unavailable when the agenda was published.

<b>Agenda No.</b>	<b>Item</b>
4A	<u>DC/2021/00125 - 10 St Andrews Drive, Crosby</u> (Pages 3 - 8) <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Petitioner Statement in objection to the application</li><li>• Ward Councillor Christine Howard's statement in objection</li><li>• Applicant/Agent Response to Petitioner and Ward Councillor</li></ul>
4B	<u>DC/2020/02267 - 2 Argyle Road, Southport</u> (Pages 9 - 12) <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Petitioner Statement in objection to the application</li><li>• Applicant/Agent Response to petitioner</li></ul>
4C	<u>DC/2021/00270 – 12 Kew Road, Formby</u> (Pages 13 – 20) <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Petitioner Statement in objection to the application</li><li>• Ward Councillor David Irving's Statement in objection</li><li>• Applicant Response to Petitioner</li><li>• Applicant Response to Ward Councillor</li></ul>
5B	<u>DC/2020/00418 - Site Of Former Royal British Legion 326 Liverpool Road South, Maghull</u> (Pages 21 - 24) <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Ward Councillor John Sayers' Statement in objection</li><li>• Applicant/Agent Response to Ward Councillor</li></ul>
8	<b>Late Representations</b> (Pages 25 - 26) Late information received in respect of Item 5B

Yours sincerely,

*Ruth Appleby*

Democratic Services Officer

This page is intentionally left blank

## Item 4A

DC/2021/00125 – 10 St Andrew's Drive, Crosby. L23 7UX

### PETITIONERS' STATEMENT IN OBJECTION TO THE APPLICATION

WORD COUNT: 498

We thank you for the opportunity to present our objections to Planning Application DC/2021/00125 10 St Andrews Drive, L23 7UX.

We represent 12 units of 9 bungalows and 3 houses. The Drive's south side consists solely of bungalows including number 10, an attractive, well maintained bungalow. Its front garden contains 3 mature trees, a long, high beech hedge and bushes. Your Tree Survey will confirm, and Sefton's Tree Planting and Protection policy is clearly endangered.

The design of the two four bedroomed houses is inappropriate; it alters the vista line within the Drive, changing the character of the local environ in layout, density and appearance thus contravening 10/8 of the Local Plan EQ2. Some loss of ecological habitat would be inevitable and therefore a threat to wildlife in the area e.g. bats, sand lizards, red squirrels.

The loss of natural light and overshadowing will specifically affect numbers 12 and 8. Number 12 will be particularly badly affected, in the afternoons, spoiling quality of life with severe restriction of natural light to the lounge, bathroom, kitchen and utility room caused by a 30ft high building, extending 3 metres over the existing building line of the south side of St Andrews Drive. The invasion of privacy is of serious concern, including effecting solar panels and social usage with family visits.

The Road Safety Audit will show EQ3 is not complied with. Traffic generation and management could adversely affect highway safety. The Drive's through road is narrow and "on-road" and "part pavement" parking could become the norm leading to danger to pedestrians and inconvenience. Contra to the architect's conclusion, parking could cause problems for numbers 7, 9, and 11.

# Agenda Item 4a

Recently 2 owners have successfully altered and/or extended their property, yet still maintained the character of the Drive.

The demolition and re-building project is likely to take 12 months plus. Noise pollution, including piling, builder's heavy traffic and machinery on a narrow road will be severely disruptive for the local community. One resident is registered blind, another wheelchair bound, and several over 80 years old.

The rear of the proposed houses will adjoin a line of trees in number 10's back garden. Wind, often severe in this area, will be denied escape routes resulting in a wind vortex, which could cause severe damage. Such phenomena experienced by Rev. Douglas, number 12, during his long career as a Liverpool Marine Pilot.

Flooding could also be a risk. The area is peat rich and heavy rains are now more common. Peat, in the immediate area, dried out following a decision to divert a tributary of the River Alt and lead to the collapse of 2 bungalows; sites which are now occupied by numbers 7 and 9 built in 2001-2.

Finally, we were under considerable pressure to prepare as the proposal letter arrived on 4/2/21 giving us 16 working days. Administration was difficult because of the pandemic. There was no other warning either on the property number 10, or community notices attached to lampposts etc..

W E Douglas

R D Atley

## Item 4A

DC/2021/00125 – 10 St Andrews Drive, Crosby

### WARD COUNCILLOR CHRISTINE HOWARD'S STATEMENT IN OBJECTION TO THE APPLICATION.

#### WORD COUNT: 219

Thank you for the opportunity to make this representation to planning committee.

As has been noted in the reports pack for this meeting, 'the rhythm, grain and density [of the proposed development] would not necessarily align with the majority of St Andrews Drive' but is considered to be consistent with Manor Road and the surrounding area. Residents have commented that they did not choose to live in St Andrews Drive because of the character of the surrounding area, but because of the character of St Andrews Drive itself. The character would be changed if the proposed development were to go ahead, not only because of the style of the buildings, but because of the distance between the two houses (1.199m).

The residents who live close to the site are also concerned about their privacy should the development go ahead. I welcome the fact that proposed condition number 7 includes a requirement for all first-floor side-facing windows to be fitted with obscured glazing, however, if these windows can be opened, near-neighbours will still be overlooked. I would therefore ask committee to consider a condition that first-floor side-facing windows be fixed instead of openable.

Finally, I would ask committee to consider a condition restricting permitted development to avoid near-neighbours' privacy from being compromised by future developments to the properties.

Thank you.

This page is intentionally left blank

## Item 4A

DC/2021/00125 - 10 St Andrews Drive, Crosby.

Mr Stephen Lavin (RAL Architects) –Response to Petitioner and Ward Councillor Statements

Word Count: 644

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to the objections raised against our application to replace 10 St Andrews Drive. The clearest way to respond is to address the issues raised by the neighbour's and Councillor Howard's objections point by point.

Whilst the houses in St Andrews Drive are typically bungalows many are not true bungalows and five present 2 storey gables to the street namely numbers 1, 3, 6, 7 and 9. Our drawing L05 shows how number 6 relates to our proposals and you will note the heights are almost identical. Both have a 'bungalow' element bookended with a taller structure.

The proposed houses are designed to avoid overshadowing neighbours. They do not extend 3m above other houses in the street. For the most part both the eaves and ridge of the proposed houses are lower than the surrounding houses. Where the proposed houses are taller, this is kept to the centre of the plot so that any shadow only shades within the plot and does not affect the neighbouring properties. It is important to reiterate that even at its highest point the proposed houses are follow the heights of other houses in the street.

There is absolutely no way the proposed houses could ever cast shade on solar panels on the roofs of any surrounding houses.

The proposed houses combined frontage is 22m. The combined frontage of number 10 St Andrews with its garage is also 22m and the combined frontage of number 8 and its garage is also 22m.

The two proposed houses are therefore extending no wider than the existing on the plot, are lower at the boundaries and the only difference is that there is a gap between them creating two houses rather than one. We do not believe the existence of this gap will adversely affect the quality of the street scene on St Andrews Close. Whilst on a map the properties may alter the urban grain people do not experience their neighbourhood through maps. Regardless, adding rear extensions to houses also changes the urban grain but this would never be considered detrimental to a street scene.

The houses have been designed on the plots to retain all the existing trees on site, and we would be open to a condition being added that states the beech hedge is also retained. Retaining the current driveway access positions ensure that the new development can be screened from the street in much the same way as it is now. The petition stating that trees are endangered by the proposals is not accurate.

The draft planning conditions require bio-diversity enhancement and proposals for this will include bat and bird boxes leading to habitat enhancement rather than harm. The Ecology

# Agenda Item 4a

report provided with the application found no protected species and the existing house has negligible bat roost potential.

The houses include windows to their side elevations, of these windows the only ones to an elevation overlooking a neighbour are to landings. We have no objection to these being both obscured and fixed.

Both the proposed houses will have the required three off-street parking spaces and there should not therefore be a need for on-street parking.

There is no evidence to suggest that the proposed development would create a wind vortex as suggested in the neighbours' petition.

Unfortunately building works create a degree of disruption to neighbours for a limited period but this is not a valid reason to refuse a planning application as it would effectively become a moratorium on all development.

We are familiar with the geology of the area and the high possibility of peat deposits. Prior to works commencing a site investigation would be carried out and the foundations designed to reflect the findings.

A sustainable drainage system for surface water will ensure the development does not create a flood risk, all hard surfaces will be permeable.

Thank you for your attention.

Stephen Lavin

RAL Architects.



## Item 4B

DC/2020/02267 – 2 Argyle Road, Southport

### MS PHILIPPA LANDOR - STATEMENT ON BEHALF OF PETITIONERS IN OBJECTION TO THE APPLICATION

WORD COUNT: 648

Chair, and members of the Committee good afternoon. This Statement is submitted on behalf of the owner-occupier of the adjacent property, who is strongly opposed to the application proposal and has made written representations to the Council covering matters which will be highlighted for the benefit of Members in this Statement.

Firstly, it is important that Members of the Planning Committee are aware that the application which you are being asked to approve is not accurately described in the Committee Report. The purpose of the Report provided by Officers is to provide all of the information that is relevant to the application in order that the local authority may lawfully grant planning permission and avoid legal challenge via Judicial Review.

You will see that the proposal development is referred to in the Report simply as, “the erection of a semi-detached dwelling.”

However, as a matter of fact, the proposal is a revision of a previous scheme to create a flat within the basement, with external alterations to the existing building including rear dormers, demolition of the chimney stack and alterations to existing windows (on lower ground floor, ground, first and second floor) in conjunction with a proposed part 3/part 4 storey side extension to create a new C3 dwellinghouse, with associated subdivision of curtilage, construction of new vehicular access and associated car parking.

Given the scope of the proposal, we have suggested that the applicant ought to provide the following information in order for the impact of the proposal to be properly assessed:

- Detailed design of new vehicular access, including visibility splay,
- Scaled Drawing of Proposed Street Scene,
- Elevations of new boundary treatment to Argyle Road,
- Landscaping Scheme,
- Tree Survey and Method Statement,
- Bat Survey for Roost Potential of Trees to be felled,
- Design and Access Statement.

Unfortunately, none of these documents has been provided.

In any event, we consider that planning permission must be refused for the development as proposed. The reasons for refusal should relate to the impact on neighbouring occupiers residential amenity and to the impact of the development on the character of the area.

# Agenda Item 4b

The development proposal is contrary to development plan policy HC3 and it would not protect the residential amenity and living conditions of neighbouring occupiers.

The proposed dwelling is significantly taller than, and is sited 2.5 metres from the boundary shared with 2A Argyle Road. The height and proximity would be significantly overbearing and oppressive. In addition, there are side windows on the neighbouring property which would be impacted by overlooking, overshadowing, loss of light and loss of privacy and outlook.

The basement flat would depend on daylight from just two windows (one at the rear of the living room and one in a bedroom). The size, position and potential for obstruction of the lightwells at the front means that natural lighting is likely to be inadequate. A lack of natural light and or any appreciable view can in time lead to feelings of isolation and psychological effects such as depression. This would constitute a hazard under the Housing Health and Safety Rating System – Part 1 Housing Act 2004.

In addition, the proposal would be contrary to development plan policy EQ2 as it does not respond positively to the character, local distinctiveness and form of its surroundings.

The proposed dwelling would infill the existing side garden, disrupting the rhythm of the street scene and eroding the spaciousness between buildings. The proposals result in the loss of the existing prominent chimneys, which are a characteristic feature of Edwardian properties in the area. Trees and green garden space would also be lost to a large expanse of tarmac at the front of the site to the detriment of the visual amenity and character of the areas.

For these reasons, we urge the Planning Committee not to take the advice in the Office's Report and to refuse planning permission for this application.

Thank you.

## Item 4B

DC/2020/02267 – 2 Argyle Road, Southport

Applicant – Mr Black's response to Petitioner Statement

WORD COUNT: 617

Chair and members of the committee thank you for allowing me to address the concerns raised by the petitioners. I strongly believe that there are little grounds for their concerns as they have been thoroughly examined and addressed by at least four different planning inspectors and officers that have been involved in this process from day one. Namely, David Atherton, Liz Beard, Neil Mackie and finally the Chief Planning Officer. To suggest that they have somehow negated to ask for vital information baffles me. For example, suggesting that the planners should have asked for a tree report when there are no trees on this plot, apart from the saplings that I planted late last year, is a complete mystery to me as is asking for a Bat Survey? Indeed, if the planners deemed it necessary for any of the reports in which the petitioners' claim should have been requested, we would of course have complied in full. The fact that they did not, demonstrates that the planning process in Sefton is based on common sense and does not discriminate between those that can afford many expensive unnecessary drawings/reports and those that cannot.

The plot width from my Gable end to the shared boundary at number 2a at present is 11 meters. I do not know what the average is between houses in Southport but I would hazard a guess at around 1 - 2 meters including down this street also. When myself and my architect designed this house, we left 2.5 meters in order to be more sympathetic towards the neighbours. This then ensures that the street scene continues to flow in accordance to every other building on this side not to mention 99% of other houses in this town. A quick look at the location plan will confirm this.

The claim that the build will be overbearing and oppressive was also addressed and satisfied by the planning officers during their site visits based on the fact that the proposed build is to the North East of 2a therefore no overshadowing is even possible. At present there is a large window on the upper gable that directly overlooks 2a's back garden therefore providing no privacy for them whatsoever. The proposed plan removes this window to create a rear dormer facing 90 degrees away from the gable therefore (and for the first ever time), ensuring that there is complete privacy regarding number 2a's back garden. This should be commended.

Regarding the character and appearance of the new build, this side of the road is comprised of 8 detached and 6 semi-detached houses of varying design and year of build. Opposite there are mainly large purpose-built flat complexes that have been built mainly over the last 50 years. On our side, 13 of these properties (including mine) are 4 stories high which accounts for 87% of all the buildings. The plot width is roughly the same as all the other plots that have a pair of semi-detached houses on Argyle Road and the proposed build matches that of the width and height of every one of these semi-detached pairings. As was summarised in the planning report, the proposal responds positively to the character of the area.

# Agenda Item 4b

The claim that the basement flat will only have two windows is wholly inaccurate. The submitted plans show four windows plus a door that is double glazed also. Chair and members, the information in this petition is largely inaccurate or misleading. Additionally, the suggestion that they make regarding trees being lost in order to create a large tarmac area for parking is just simply untrue as there are no trees at the front of this plot.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

## Item 4C

DC/2021/00270 - 12 Kew Road, Formby

MR JOHN ROBINSON - PETITIONER STATEMENT IN OBJECTION TO THE APPLICATION

WORD COUNT: 645

The council has admitted mistakes granting DC/2020/00847 stating "given the distance to your side elevation was under 12 metres...would normally be that it was unlikely to be acceptable if it had been understood that it was adjacent to the primary window of habitable rooms". Bizarrely the council stated "I am not of the view that the extension would result in a significant loss of light" despite a report from a specialist surveyor showing a reduction in light to 21% in the dining room (less than 50% is deemed unacceptable). 12 Kew Road acknowledged the new amendments still reduce light to 10 Kew Road (below 50%).

This site has history, initial plans for 12 Kew Road proposed the garage at the front of the property, subsequently the council on 26th May 1988 considered the garage at the back. On the 28th August 1990, Mr K.H. Woods acting for Sefton Planning recommended that the garage be moved forward to a more central position (inline with the rear end of number 12) and some 18 inches from the boundary. This was done to retain the open aspect between the two properties. This became what is now the extended lounge, because the extension was too narrow for a garage.

Mr Woods recommendations were to "prevent over-dominance in the street scene", something he reiterated. These concerns related to the rejected single storey development, the proposed new extension is at the same location but its double storey and closer to the boundary.

Kew Road residents support developments, but this development is oppressive, so much so that the previous resident of 10 Kew Road left before the wall was complete.

General Design Principles:

- 1) Conformity with existing property 2.2: The extension should be a small addition to the existing property rather than an excessively large or disproportionate addition.

*It is a recorded fact that this development is over 100% bigger than the proposals Mr. Woods rejected so as to prevent over-dominance of the street scene. The development is not the same angle and shape as the existing property and instead of the development getting set back it significantly protrudes from the front of the building by several meters.*

# Agenda Item 4c

- 2) Effect on the surrounding area 2.3: Extensions should not detract from the overall character of the street. Extensions should take into account the spacing between buildings and the front line of buildings in the local area.

*The development also brings forward the building line, moving 75% of the property forward of the building line. No other property is developed to the border, this would create a 'terrace' effect. Should the council allow this, it would be a landmark ruling, effectively putting residents on notice that they need to "land grab" to their borders before their neighbours do.*

- 3) Effect on neighbours 2.4: extensions should not negatively impact the amenity or living conditions of neighbours. 2.6: Extensions should not overshadow neighbouring habitable rooms private gardens to an unreasonable degree.

*Mr. Woods made it clear that development to the border or next to 10 Kew Road would over-dominate. It would also breach the standard distance of 12 meters from blank walls of two storey extensions to the habitable room of nearby homes. Steve Matthews Planning Manager's response dated 11th December 2020 admits "I am of the opinion that the extension would have a greater impact on the outlook of the window and that it would appear overbearing as seen from these side windows"*

This development includes two side extensions, the guidance House Extensions SPD 2018 states side extensions should be set back from the main front wall by at least one course of bricks or for two storey extensions should be set back at least 1 meter from the front wall. The proposed side extensions are both forward of the building line, completely out of character with the street, and looks like unsupervised children's lego play.

## Item 4C

DC/2021/00270 - 12 Kew Road, Formby. L37 2HB

### WARD COUNCILLOR DAVID IRVING'S STATEMENT IN OBJECTION TO THE APPLICATION

WORD COUNT: 614

In early March 2021, I spoke to Mr. David Formby who is the owner of property No. 10 Kew Road, Formby, L37 2HB. He complained to me about a planning application that had recently been submitted for the property next to his home at No.12 Kew Road. He explained that he lives in Formby but No. 10 was his family home for 70 years which he has rented out for many years. On the 23<sup>rd</sup> July 2020 a Planning Application DC/2020/00847 was approved to allow a large extension to be built on the rear of No. 12 Kew Road. He had complained to Sefton Council on numerous occasions about this and asked for the planning officer to make a visit as the development would cause a loss of light in his rear ground floor habitable room as it faced towards this proposed extension and that it had only one window in it. As a result of it being approved he contacted his solicitor to seek advice which resulted in correspondence taking place between Sefton Council Planning Department, the applicant and Mr. Formby's solicitor. As a result, work was stopped immediately because of the 'Right to Light' issue.

I have examined the drawings of the new application which have some minor changes to the design. It still has a dominant effect on No 10 with very little difference in natural light emanating into this room. The whole extension reminds me of a Prison Wall. There are no windows in this new design and it will certainly look out of place in this well-established rural area.

There are several policies in both Sefton Councils Local Plan and Formby and Little Altcar Neighbourhood Development Plan to justify refusing this application. Sefton's Local Plan. Policy HC4. House Extensions. Item 1. Policy c.ii ii says no significant loss of light/over shadowing for neighbors should occur. Local Plan Policy EQ2. Design in section 2 (c ) says, Development will only be permitted which protects the amenity of those within and adjacent to the site. The Formby and Little Altcar Neighbourhood Plan has similar Policies H.1 Density, High Quality design that respects local character and residential amenity. The original application way back in July 2020 should have not been approved as it contrary to the policies I have mentioned. The planning officer has failed to take these into account. It was regrettable mistake as he thought that the rear dining room of No 10 Kew Road had two separate windows in it.

I have read the officers latest report and have noted that there is no mention in it about a substantial amount of money being offered by Sefton Councils Planning Department to pay towards Mr. Formby's legal fees in bringing this issue to their attention. I am also dismayed that in the planning officers report under Living Conditions (see Page 41) in which he states "this development will lessen the impact on outlook and overshadowing to the first floor window and potentially based upon

# Agenda Item 4c

the seasons, the ground-floor window. This is an improvement over the existing permission and is acceptable in this regard. But does this mean that natural light can only be enjoyed in the rear living room during the summer months? It is appalling to say that this is acceptable when the first application should have been checked out properly and this committee should not be in this position today. This Planning Committee should face up to its responsibility to look at the policies in their Local Plan and Formby's Neighbourhood Plan that respect people's amenity and restrict this type of development from being approved. This application should now be refused based on the policies I have mentioned.



## Item 4C

DC/2021/00270 – 12 Kew Road, Formby, L37 2HB

Applicants' Response to petitioner's statement

WORD COUNT: 650

Our intention when planning our extension was to provide for the needs of our family, this has become more pressing with Covid and lockdowns. We're a close family; we have 3 grown up children and we want to be able to accommodate, and regularly (restrictions permitting) have our parents and brothers/sisters-in-law come stay. We want to create a welcoming family home where we enjoy Christmas and all our other family occasions together.

We set out then to add an additional bedroom/en-suite, a good size dining room that would fit us all, as well as space for our dogs and a car.

The existing house layout is unusual. We expended considerable effort with our architect, to come up with a design that fulfilled our needs. This meant however, that the only practical place to fit an additional bedroom was over the garage on the north of the building. It was never our intention to upset our neighbours; indeed we consulted with them in November 2019, before we submitted our first planning application. They confirmed they were completely happy with our proposal – although they omitted to tell us they were a tenant and not the owner!

Our redesign focused on this two-storey area adjacent to 10 Kew Road. The sole reason for this redesign is to reduce any impact upon this neighboring dwelling to an acceptable level, specifically light levels in the ground floor room served by the side window; which we consider it now does [pending final checks on levels and dimensions]. In making these changes we have had to accept some significant compromises in the internal layout and head heights in the affected rooms.

Overall, the proposed amendment to the approved scheme reduce its impact in terms of both massing and overall height.

Eaves height of the approved extension was approximately 300mm below the eaves level of number 10, the amended eaves height is now approximately 1,000 mm lower. The approved design had an increased ridge height of around 300mm, the ridge height is not increased in the amended proposal. The approved elevated ridge height of 12 Kew Road was still some 300mm lower than that of 10 Kew Road. Number 12 could therefore be considered less dominant than number 10 in regard to the street scene, the amended proposal being lower and of less mass is now even more subservient to number 10.

# Agenda Item 4c

There are examples of more dominant previous extensions on Kew road. The extension over the garage at number 11 being full height of the original building at both eaves and ridge; the side extension at number 9 being particularly dominating, being much higher than number 11 and having a full height gable rather than a hip.

The approved extension extends to the front (East) but is still behind the building line for its side of the road which is established by the first two houses at the Northern end, the amended proposal maintains this position.

The approved plans extended the existing dwelling by approximately 33% in line with council guidance, the amendment extends the property by slightly less.

The approved and amended design both incorporate roof pitches that match the existing; bricks, feature bands, roof tiles and windows have been selected to match as closely as possible the existing building. These materials, features and character match closely those of both 9 and 11 Kew Road and are similar to the properties at 15 and 17 Kew Road. It should be noted that Kew Road in general is not characterised by any particular style and consist of a wide variety of building designs and types all constructed from a broad range of different materials.

There are references in the petitioner's statement to applications from 1988. Some 33 years ago; planning policies and guidance has changed many times since then and we don't see how they have any bearing on this application to amend an already approved scheme.

## Item 4C

DC/2021/00270 – 12 Kew Road, Formby, L37 2HB

Response to ward Councillor David Irving's statement of objection

WORD COUNT: 647

As per our accompanying response to the petitioner it has never been our intention to upset our neighbours when extending our house.

It should be noted that until we received the statements from Councillor Irving on 7<sup>th</sup> April 2021 we were unaware that Sefton Council had admitted they had made an error in approving our planning application (DC/2020/00847) and that the application should have been refused. Nor were we aware that the owner of 10 Kew Road had been offered a substantial amount of money by Sefton Council as a result of their admitted mistake.

Councillor Irving also suggests that correspondence had taken place between the Councils planning department and the applicant (i.e. myself, the owner of 12 Kew Road). The Councils planning department has never entered into any correspondence whatsoever with us since it granted planning in July 2020.

If the Council had refused our application, as it now concedes it should have, (remembering that there have been two applications; in the first one which was refused, as it was joint for a new house, there was no suggestion that the extension should be refused on any grounds) we would have gone back to the "drawing board" and looked at a different design, that would have met our needs but be able to be approved without impacting on number 10.

We are not sure when the owner of number 10 first raised his concerns with the Council but building work did not commence until more than 3 months after approval was granted. If the Council had told of its mistake prior to commencement, we could have looked at an alternative design and not incurred the substantial costs we have to date in part constructing the extension along with all the fees associated with the redesign.

As detailed in our other response, the sole reason for the proposed amendment is to improve light levels in the ground floor room at the side of number 10. We believe that the redesign now provides for acceptable light levels. The amended design being of less mass and lower in height will lessen the impact and outlook on number 10.

The changes made have been fairly substantial and have severely compromised the design and therefore usage of the rooms above the garage. We would have liked to

# Agenda Item 4c

have maintained the windows to these rooms, but the extent of the changes means we can only have roof windows.

We believe that the amended design is a somewhat less pleasing and less well balanced than that originally approved but this is born purely of the necessity to lessen the impact on number 10 and isn't our preferred choice. Indeed, some neighbours actually commented on how nice the original design looked when it was passed and how it would enhance the street scene.

Again, as per our accompanying response, we don't consider that the originally approved extension dominated number 10, with its lower eaves and ridge heights. The proposed amended design is significantly lower still and so we cannot see how it could possibly dominate number 10 being smaller still.

The wall adjacent to number 10 itself is typical of side gable walls to the majority of houses in the Formby area, and in fact throughout the country. Indeed, the extensions in both numbers 9 and 11 Kew Road feature no windows in their side elevations and are higher than that both approved and proposed in the amendment being considered here.

We have tried to add some relief to the wall by including the various contrasting coloured brick bands at various levels, matching the rest of the building. We would though welcome any suggestions as to how the appearance of the wall could be improved further. We contest also that the houses are in a rural area, they are part of a fairly substantial town, all be it on the periphery of it.

## Item 5B

DC/2020/00418 – Site of Former British Legion, 326 Liverpool Road, Maghull

### WARD COUNCILLOR JOHN SAYERS' – STATEMENT IN OBJECTION TO THE APPLICATION

WORD COUNT: 180

In respect of the planning application at the Former Maghull British Legion Site, as Ward Councillor I wish to make an objection to the proposal as re submitted.

I am aware residents are making cogent objections to the design of the proposal, I am aware they have been ignored by the developer.

I am aware the Maghull town Council have made objections to the design, and offered a meeting with Town council or myself as ward Cllr, that too was ignored.

I am aware this Planning Committee deferred the previous proposal on the Grounds of design, it appears the Committee has been also ignored.

The Design has not altered, and no consultations have taken place with interested parties to my knowledge.

I am not against the proposal per se, but I am against this awful design and the impact it will have on neighbours. I am also bewildered at the lack of consultation and why this has been allowed to return so quickly with no attempt to redress the criticisms of planning committee members at its last appearance for consideration.

Cllr John Sayers

Park Ward

This page is intentionally left blank

## Item 5B

DC/2020/00418 – Site of Former Royal British Legion, 326 Liverpool Road South, Maghull

Mr Chris Butt (Agent) – Response to Ward Councillor Statement

WORD COUNT: 650

The Applicant conducted a comprehensive community engagement programme including holding 1 to 1 meetings with key stakeholders and neighbours and a wider public exhibition prior to lodging the planning application. Changes to the scheme were made in direct response to the feedback received. Following submission there has been full engagement with your officers and the scheme's design has been amended after the discussion at the February Committee meeting and further amended to accommodate feedback from your officers. Contrary to the allegations that have been made, the Applicant has gone above and beyond the requirements within your Statement of Community Involvement and fully engaged.

The Applicant has consulted an Urban Designer and the revised scheme now before you has been enhanced with the grey cladding removed and replaced by sandstone brick – the local use of sandstone is specifically identified in the Parkhaven Area section of the Neighbourhood Plan. Together with other modifications such as the introduction of a cornice and additional fenestration on the Liverpool Road South facing elevation, the scheme's design has been improved to better respect the character and appearance of this part of Maghull and bearing in mind its canal-side location. Your officers are fully supportive of the high quality design before you.

The Applicant has also provided your officer with the additional information requested by Members in respect of car parking and sales prices at its previous development at Mayhall Court – a scheme that was completed in August 2000 and sold out in August 2002.

The scheme will also represent a multi-million pound investment that will deliver numerous planning benefits. These include:

### **Health and well-being:**

- Each person living in housing specifically designed for later life enjoys a reduced risk of health challenges, contributing to fiscal savings to the NHS and social care services of c.£3,500 per year.
- Those in specialist housing are half as likely to have falls with resulting fractures, injuries and costly inpatient bed stays.
- Building 30,000 more retirement housing dwellings every year for the next 10 years, the estimated demand, would generate savings across the NHS and social services of £2.1 billion annually.

# Agenda Item 5b

- The Council's own Strategic Housing Market Assessment identifies a 33% increase in the over 65 years old population and a need for between 1,319 and 1,324 units of the type proposed here up to 2036.
- Based on established national well-being criteria such as happiness and life satisfaction, an average person aged 80 feels as good as someone 10 years younger after moving from mainstream housing to housing specially designed for later living.

## Housing market:

- Every retirement property sold generates at least two moves further down the housing chain. This development of 44 apartments could therefore result in **88 additional moves** further down the chain.
- Roughly two in every three retirement properties built releases a home suitable for a first-time buyer. This development could therefore release at least **29 first time buyer** properties onto the market.

## Economic benefits:

- Retirement housing creates more local economic value and more local jobs than any other residential development type.
- People living in each retirement development generate £550,000 of spending per year, £347,000 of which is spent on the local high street. Some £225,000 of this is new spending, directly contributing to keeping local shops open.
- The development will provide around **85 construction jobs** for the duration of the build, as well as **six permanent jobs and £13m in gross value added** over the lifetime of the development.

The Applicant is very keen to commence the regeneration of this site and deliver all these tangible benefits that substantially outweigh any allegation of harm.

In fact there have been no objections from the statutory consultees and there will be no adverse impact upon neighbouring residents' amenities in terms of privacy or overshadowing. Following a thorough analysis your officer has recommended approval and we respectfully request that you endorse this recommendation and grant permission for this high quality proposal.



### Late Representations/Information

#### Appendix 5

##### Item 5B

**DC/2020/00418 - Site Of Former Royal British Legion 326 Liverpool Road South, Maghull L31 7DJ**

a) Maghull Town Council have submitted further comments which are summarised below:

- current design is too tall and there are privacy issues for residents
- other McCarthy and Stone buildings have a more sympathetic design eg Coronation Court in Ormskirk
- disappointing that little change has been made to the design

b) Additional written objections have been received from residents of 3 local addresses and one with no address given, the main points of which are summarised below:

- Overlooking, noise and intrusion of privacy including from large balconies
- The removal of mature trees on the canal towpath will add to this loss of privacy as replacement trees will take several years to grow
- The proposed shadow elevation document does not state at what time of day or what season it is calculated from
- We appreciate the value of developments such as this give to the community but feel this one is still too large and intrusive for this site
- Design shows tree coverage which doesn't exist
- Loss of light, loss of sunlight and overshadowing
- Re-design has ignored previous comments and is still large, high, ugly, has a flat roof and is incongruous with majority of other architecture in the town in conflict with Local Plan, Neighbourhood Plan, NPPF and SPD
- Loss of outlook/overbearing
- Inadequate parking
- Plans should incorporate step-free access to the canal and concerns about loss of access to the canal
- Disruption during building works
- Lack of consultation and insufficient time to make objections

This page is intentionally left blank