

Committee: **PLANNING**

Date of Meeting: **15 September 2010**

Title of Report: **S/2010/0985**  
**13 Prestwick Drive, Crosby**  
(Blundellsands Ward)

Proposal: Alterations to the roof from a hip to a gable together with the installation of 3 no dormer windows to the front and 3 no to the rear together with a extension to the side / front of the existing garage and a pitched roof over the existing flat roof (Resubmission of S/2010/0542, Withdrawn 19/05/2010)

Applicant: Mr I Mutch

## **Executive Summary**

This application is for alterations to the roof from a hip to a gable together with the installation of 3 dormer windows to the front and rear with an extension to the side/front of the existing garage and a pitched roof over the existing flat roof and is a resubmission of S/2010/0542 which was withdrawn on 19/05/10. The issues are the effect that these proposals will have on the visual amenity of the street scene and on the amenities of the adjoining premises.

**Recommendation(s)          Approval**

## **Justification**

It is considered that this proposal, if allowed, would have no significant detrimental affect on either the visual amenity of the street scene or on the amenities of the adjoining premises and therefore it complies with UDP Policy MD1.

## **Conditions**

1. T1 Time Limit - 3 years
2. X1 Compliance
3. The facing and roofing materials to be used in the external construction of this extension shall match those of the existing building in respect of shape, size, colour and texture.
4. The bedroom window facing No 15 shall be fitted with non opening obscure glazing and shall be maintained as such thereafter.

## **Reasons**

1. RT1
2. RX1
3. To ensure a satisfactory external appearance and to comply with Sefton UDP Policy MD1.
4. In the interests of privacy of the neighbouring property and to comply with Sefton UDP Policy MD1.

## **Drawing Numbers**

Drawings 935/06A, 935/03J, 935/02H, 935/01 and 935/05 submitted on 13th July, 2010.

## Financial Implications

<b>CAPITAL EXPENDITURE</b>	<b>2006/ 2007 £</b>	<b>2007/ 2008 £</b>	<b>2008/ 2009 £</b>	<b>2009/ 2010 £</b>
Gross Increase in Capital Expenditure				
Funded by:				
Sefton Capital Resources				
Specific Capital Resources				
<b>REVENUE IMPLICATIONS</b>				
Gross Increase in Revenue Expenditure				
Funded by:				
Sefton funded Resources				
Funded from External Resources				
Does the External Funding have an expiry date? Y/N	When?			
How will the service be funded post expiry?				

## List of Background Papers relied upon in the preparation of this report

History referred to  
Policy referred to



# Sefton Council

**Planning & Economic  
Regeneration Department**  
Andy Wallis - Director  
Planning & Economic Regeneration is part of the  
Regeneration & Environmental Services Directorate

S/2010/0985  
13 Prestwick Drive  
Crosby  
L23 7XB  
OSGR: 331183, 400695    **Sheet(s):** 147A    **Area:** 797 sqm

## Standard Site Plan

Scale: 1:1250  
Date: 2/9/2010  
Drawn By: EBERT on



**Ward(s):** Blundellsands  
**Postcode Sector(s):** L23 7  
**Polling District(s):** M2  
**Parish(es):** None Found

This map is reproduced from Ordnance Survey material with the permission of Ordnance Survey on behalf of the Controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office © Crown copyright. Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings. Sefton Council Planning & Economic Regeneration Department using MapInfo  
Sefton Council Licence No. 1000181921

This application has been called in by Councillor Paula Parry

## **The Site**

Comprises a detached dwellinghouse on the north side of Prestwick Drive, Blundellsands.

## **Proposal**

Alterations to the roof from a hip to a gable together with the installation of 3no dormer windows to the front and 3no to the rear together with a extension to the side/front of the existing garage and a pitched roof over the existing flat roof (Resubmission of S/2010/0542, Withdrawn 19/05/2010).

## **History**

S/2010/0542 - Alterations to the existing roof incorporating 3 dormer extensions to the front and three dormer extensions to the rear together with a link extension to the side of the dwellinghouse. Withdrawn 19/5/2010.

## **Consultations**

None.

## **Neighbour Representations**

Last date for replies 11<sup>th</sup> August, 2010.

Six letters of objection from Nos 15,16 and 17 Prestwick Drive and from Nos 119, 125 and 127 Manor Drive re over-development, out of character, not in keeping, effects on amenities of neighbouring properties, overshadowing and against advice contained within MD1 and SPG. One letter of support from No 14 Prestwick Drive.

## **Policy**

The application site is situated in an area allocated as residential on the Council's Adopted Unitary Development Plan.

MD1	House Extensions
CS3	Development Principles
DQ1	Design
SPG	House Extensions

## Comments

The issues to consider are the affects of this proposal on the visual amenity of the street scene and on the amenities of the adjoining residential premises.

The property to be extended is a detached dwellinghouse No13 Prestwick Drive, Blundellsands.

There are two main elements to this proposal –alterations and extension to the garage at the side and re roofing the main house to include 3 dormers at both front and back.

The existing detached garage is to the right hand side of the property and is currently separated from the original dwelling by a side passageway of 1m. The proposal is to fill this gap by constructing a side extension to form a garage and study with a utility room to the rear. The garage would also be extended forward towards the highway by 0.7m at 4.3m wide. Above the garage it is intended to provide a walk-in wardrobe with shower/bathroom facilities within the roof space. The overall height would be 5.46m.

With regard to side extensions, the SPG gives the following advice :

A side extension should use the same design details, features and materials to match the existing property, having window styles to match also.

Any side extension should have pitched roofs of a matching slope and shape to the main house roof and should have a lower ridgeline.

Wherever possible, side extensions should retain rear access and at ground floor level, should be set back by at least one course of brickwork so as to avoid the meeting of old and new brickwork.

In the event of a two storey extension being proposed there is additional advice contained within the SPG. Where there is an existing ground floor extension, the proposed first floor element should be set back by 1.5m from the main front wall of the property to avoid the potential for any terracing effect. However, in this case the garage would appear visually as single storey and would be brought forward but would still incorporate a set back of 450 mm from the main wall. This is considered to be acceptable as this dwelling and the neighbouring property are detached and there is not a unified appearance of properties within the street scene. Consequently, the proposed extension would not result in a 'terracing effect' in the street scene of Prestwick Drive.

In terms of the re-roofing of the dwelling, the ridgeline of the property would be heightened by 1m and there will be three bedrooms created within the roof space with the addition of three dormers to the front and rear elevations. The proposed extension and alterations will therefore give the appearance of a large dormer bungalow and this is considered to be appropriate to the street scene of Prestwick Drive which contains a mix of properties.

The advice within the SPG concerning dormers suggest that dormer extensions should be positioned and designed so as to minimise their effect on the appearance of the property and the street scene as well as protecting neighbouring properties from unreasonable overlooking. Dormers should always be placed on the rear elevation unless front dormers are present in the area and within the street scene. Dormer extensions should not protrude above the ridgeline and the face of any dormer should be positioned at least one metre from the main wall. The materials used in their construction should match those of the existing house and the windows should follow the vertical lines of the windows within the existing house.

The principle of the installation of the front and rear dormers is acceptable as there are already dormers present within the street scene. The proposed dormers comply with the Council's guidance and the alterations to the roof are considered visually acceptable.

Policy MD1 states that extensions should be minor in relation to the existing dwelling. In this case the extensions are of significant scale but effectively replace an existing garage and change the design of the roof of the main dwelling to provide useable roofspace. However given that the area includes single storey and two storey properties and the sizeable plot on which this dwelling sits, the proposed extensions are considered to be acceptable in terms of their overall character of the area.

There have been six letters of objection from neighbouring properties with one letter of support. The objections are that the proposals will not be in keeping with the area, there will be overdevelopment of the site and that the proposals will affect the amenities of the adjoining premises. The occupier of No 15 Prestwick Drive is particularly concerned about a potential loss of light to his main lounge and dining room and to his rear patio area alongside the boundary with No 13.

The extension of the garage further forwards within the street scene may affect the light to a side window of No 15. However, there is a front window to this lounge which will afford a good deal of natural daylight to this room. As such the level of amenity experienced by occupiers of this room will not be unduly affected.

Furthermore, at a distance of 9m from the extended first floor element of the application premises, the side dining room window at No 15, is considered to be sufficiently far away from No 15, as to not cause undue loss of light. The objector refers to the requirement for a 12m separation, where a habitable window in a room looks directly onto a two storey gable. In the case of side windows these criteria cannot always be achieved and the actual situation needs to be considered. The window in question already looks out onto a single storey extension and there is also a window to this dining room on the rear elevation. The outlook to the room overall would not be so adversely affected as would justify refusal.

The proposed side window at first floor level is to be opaquely glazed and non opening and therefore will not result in any overlooking.

Having taken all of the above into account, it is considered that this proposal, if allowed, would have no significant effect on either the visual amenity of the street scene or on the amenities of the adjoining and surrounding premises and it is therefore recommended that planning permission be approved subject to conditions.

Contact Officer:                   **Mrs S Tyldesley    Telephone 0151 934 3569**

Case Officer:                       **Mr P Negus           Telephone 0151 934 3547**