

Report to: PLANNING COMMITTEE **Date of Meeting:** 13 April 2022

Subject: [DC/2022/00111](#)
[Poplar Lodge 15B Green Lane Formby Liverpool L37 7DJ](#)

Proposal: Erection of a two storey side extension, a porch to the front, a first floor extension and first floor glass balustrade to the rear, alterations to the roof to form a double-pitch and insertion of sunken swim spa and hot tub to the rear following the demolition of the existing garage

Applicant: Mr & Mrs Martin **Agent:** Mr S McGarrick
TwentySix Architects

Ward: Harington Ward **Type:** Householder application

Reason for Committee Determination: Referred to Committee by Chief Planning Officer

Summary

The application is for the erection of a two storey side extension, a porch to the front, a first floor extension and first floor glass balustrade to the rear, alterations to the roof to form a double-pitch and insertion of sunken swim spa and hot tub to the rear following the demolition of the existing garage.

The main issues to assess are the impact of the proposal on the character of the area including the Conservation Area/adjoining Listed Building and the living conditions of neighbouring properties.

For the reasons set out within the report it is considered that the bulk and mass of the proposed two storey side extension to the south side would create an adverse impact on the living conditions of the occupiers of May Cottage that sits next to the application site and fails to comply with Local Plan Policy HC4.

Recommendation: Refuse

Case Officer Joy Forshaw

Email planning.department@sefton.gov.uk

Telephone 0345 140 0845

Application documents and plans are available at:

<http://pa.sefton.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=summary&keyVal=R60ETYNWGGQ00>

Site Location Plan



Sefton Council



Reference: Map reference
Date: 04/04/2022
Scale: Scale: 1:1250
Created by: Initials

The Site

A detached two storey dwellinghouse situated on the west side of Green Lane. A mix of residential properties surround the site, including two storey houses and bungalows.

History

Planning permission was refused in January 2022 for the erection of a two storey extension to the side following demolition of the existing side extension/garage, porch to the front and first floor extension to the rear of the dwellinghouse in addition to alterations to the roof to form a double-pitch (app.ref: DC/2021/01434). This application was similar to that currently under consideration and is subject to appeal (albeit a decision has not yet been made).

In April 2014, planning permission was granted for the construction of a pitched roof extension over the existing garage to the side and erection of a two storey extension to front the dwellinghouse (app.ref: DC/2014/00312). This proposal has been implemented.

Planning permission was also granted in February 2010 for the erection of a two storey extension at the front and erection of a part first floor part two storey extension at the side of the dwellinghouse (app.ref: S/2010/0007). This proposal was not implemented.

Consultations

Highways Manager

No objections to the proposals.

Conservation

No objection.

Neighbour Representations

One email received from a property in the area, objecting on the following grounds:

- This is the second application submitted in the last 12 months and is significantly larger than application DC/2021/01434 which was refused.
- The proposal will have a detrimental impact upon our living conditions. The Local Plan policy requires that extensions and alterations will not significantly reduce the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring properties, it is difficult to comprehend how permitting the erection of a sunken swim spa , hot tub and first floor balustrade will not affect our living conditions. The first floor balustrade will result in overlooking which will be intolerable.

- Will result in a significant loss of privacy and loss of enjoyment of our own outside space and impact on our living conditions.

Policy Context

The application site lies within an area designated as residential and lies within the Green Lane Conservation Area as designated in the Sefton Local Plan which was adopted by the Council in April 2017. It lies adjacent to a Listed Building, May Cottage, to the south.

The Formby and Little Altcar Neighbourhood Plan was 'made' (i.e. adopted) on 21st November 2019 and carries full weight in decision making.

Assessment of the Proposal

The proposal is for a two storey side extension projecting from the south gable on a larger footprint than the single/two storey side extension it replaces, a glazed flat roofed porch to the front elevation and a first floor extension over a single storey element to the northwest rear corner to the dwelling. Alterations are also proposed to the roof forming a double pitch, a Juliette balcony to the rear elevation and a sunken swim spa and hot tub. The proposal is very similar in design to the recently refused application which is subject to appeal (app.ref: DC/2021/01434), the main difference being the two storey side extension being reduced in width by approximately 0.75m and the height of the wall closest to May Cottage reduced by approximately 0.45m.

The main issues to assess are the impact of the proposal on the character of the area including the Green Lane conservation area and the living conditions of neighbouring properties.

Character of the area, conservation area and setting of a Listed Building

Local Plan Policy HC4 (House Extensions, Houses in Multiple Occupation and Flats) requires extensions and alterations to be of high quality design that match or complement the style of dwelling and the surrounding area.

The design of all elements of the proposal would complement the host dwelling. The proposed rendered facing with wood detail and roof tiles matching the host dwelling create a unified appearance and would not adversely affect the character of the area.

Local Plan Policy NH11 (Works affecting Listed buildings) advises that works affecting the setting of a Listed Building should respect and conserve the historic and positive existing relationships between the listed building and its surroundings. Policy NH12 (Conservation Areas) advises development will only be permitted where the proposal is of high quality design and preserves or enhances the character or appearance of the conservation area.

The proposed alterations do not significantly alter the footprint of the existing building or create any additional impact upon the setting of the adjacent listed building than what already exists. The design as proposed is considered to be an improvement on the existing building.

It is proposed that new external walls will be finished to match existing with matching slate roof tiles above. This will maintain the existing character of the property and maintain the aesthetic link with its more historic neighbours. UPVC is not a traditional material and it is noted in the Conservation Area Appraisal that traditional materials (timber, slate, etc) make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the conservation area. However, for this existing modern property, the continued use of UPVC is acceptable at this specific site for the proposed contemporary design. The use of timber to the double-height front screening is a welcome addition, blending a traditional material with a contemporary design, as are the stone surrounds within windows to the front elevations and sills.

This is a modern property within the conservation area and the application as submitted would enhance the property itself and cause no further harm to the character and appearance of the area, wider conservation area or setting of the adjacent listed building.

Living conditions of neighbouring properties

Local Plan Policy HC4 requires extensions and alterations to be designed so that there shall be no significant reduction in the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring properties. In particular, extensions must not result in:

- i. loss of outlook from main windows of neighbouring habitable rooms
- ii. a significant loss of light/overshadowing for neighbours
- iii. a significant loss of privacy for neighbouring residents

May Cottage to the south of the site is a low single storey cottage set forward of the site and separated by a footpath with shrubs either side of the existing boundary fence and a number of large trees adjoining in the garden of May Cottage. The layout of May Cottage is such that main habitable windows are in the north side elevation facing the application site with lounge and dining room windows facing the front garden/drive area of the site, kitchen window/door and bedroom window facing the side elevation of the application property where the two storey side extension is proposed.

The Council's guidance for house extensions is that to ensure extensions do not have an overbearing or oppressive effect on nearby properties, blank walls of two storey extensions should be located at least 12m from habitable rooms of nearby homes.

The host dwelling is angled away from the joint boundary with May Cottage. As a result the interface distance between the proposed two storey side extension and the bedroom window of May Cottage, towards the rear of the property, is less than 9m and around 10.4m distance between the kitchen window and proposed extension. This is significantly less than the 12m

recommended in the Council guidelines to reduce possible impact on outlook from neighbouring properties.

The proposed two storey side extension would replace a low pitched single/two storey side extension approved in 2014, extending it to the rear. The height of the proposed blank side wall would be increased from 3m to over 4.7m, whilst the ridge height of this part of the property would also be increased to that of the existing ridge significantly increasing visual dominance on outlook from the bedroom and kitchen windows of May Cottage and creating significant harm to the standard of living currently enjoyed by the neighbour. This would be more noticeable due to the low single storey design of the cottage with low eaves and window levels and the existing outlook towards the boundary fence/ top area of the existing side wall and the roof sloping away from the boundary.

The proposal includes a row of 3.3m high pleached trees to the boundary with May Cottage. These trees may provide some screening/softening of the lower part of the proposed two storey side extension from the bedroom and kitchen windows of May Cottage, but the visual impact of the blank top part of the wall on outlook from these low windows would still appear dominant and create significant harm to residential amenity. Furthermore, the neighbour would have no control over the retention of these trees, which could be removed.

The impacts on overshadowing are assessed in the same manner as overbearing. In this instance, and as recognised above, the extension would be within the 12m distance recommended in the Council's guidelines. That said, May Cottage is located to the south of the application site and as such it is not considered that the proposed side extension would cause an unreasonable degree of overshadowing to the habitable room windows that face the application property.

The dwellings to the rear of May Cottage, known as Bridge Cottages, are situated at right angles to the rear garden of May Cottage and are two storey with the blank gables which extend across the rear boundary of May Cottage closest to the application site. The proposed high blank side wall, which extends beyond the rear of the existing side extension, will enclose the residents living at May Cottage and, coupled with the cottages located to the rear, will create an overbearing and oppressive impact on the living conditions of the occupiers of May Cottage both in relation to the bedroom and kitchen windows and also the rear garden area.

The proposed glazed porch to the front elevation is situated sufficient distance from both side boundaries not to impact on outlook or cause overshadowing to May Cottage and would not present any privacy concerns. The north side of the porch facing the front drive of no. 15c creates no impact on the neighbour having regard to matters of overshadowing, outlook or loss of privacy.

The proposed first floor rear extension, squaring off the northwest rear corner, extends towards the boundary with no. 15c by some 2.2m. As the site is set south of the joint boundary the host dwelling will already create some overshadowing to the 'courtyard' area between the recessed front elevation, which has a small bedroom window, and its detached garage which is set forward, virtually in line with the front elevation of the application site. Given the restricted width of the

proposed first floor extension it isn't considered overshadowing to this area or the bedroom window will be significantly increased over existing.

Outlook from the small bedroom window to no. 15c is already restricted and looks towards the rear of the detached garage to no. 15c, as noted above given the restricted size of the proposed first floor extension it isn't considered impact on outlook from this small bedroom will be greatly increased over existing. The blank side wall of the proposed extension maintains privacy to no. 15c.

Conclusion

The proposal is of a design that would create no adverse impact to the character of the area, wider character and appearance of the Green Lane Conservation area or setting of the adjacent listed building, May Cottage . However, the bulk and mass of the proposed two storey side extension to the south side of the application property would appear overly dominant and would create an adverse overbearing impact on the living conditions of the occupiers of May Cottage, particularly when viewed from the bedroom and kitchen windows. The proposal fails to comply with Local Plan Policy HC4.

Recommendation - Refuse

Reason for Refusal

This application has been recommended for refusal for the following reason:

- 1) The proposed two storey side extension, by reason of its height, mass and siting would appear dominant and create an adverse impact on outlook from the kitchen and bedroom windows in the north elevation and the rear garden area of May Cottage to the detriment of the living conditions of the occupiers. The proposal fails to comply with Local Plan Policy HC4 and associated SPD House Extensions.

Informative

- 1) For the avoidance of doubt this decision relates to plan refs:-

P_01 Location plan

P_03A Proposed ground floor plan

P_05A Proposed first floor plan

P-07A Proposed front elevation

P_09A Proposed rear elevation

P_11A Proposed side elevation 1

P_13A Proposed side elevation 2

P_20A Site interface plan.