

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.

- 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.