

Background Papers:

The following papers are available for inspection by contacting the above officer(s).

History and Policy referred to in the report

Deferred Item

This item was deferred at the last meeting for clarification of the width of the rear eastern boundary of the site. The case officer visited the site to measure the boundary and it is confirmed that it is 8m wide. The agent has withdrawn the plan annotating the boundary as 7.2 metres wide.

The Site

The site is an infill plot on the eastern side of Ridge Close and to the rear of 169 Rufford Road, Crossens. Part of the site comprises garden area to 169 Rufford Road and a small section fronting Ridge Close does not form part of the residential curtilage of 169, nor any of the properties surrounding it, but has, it is understood, been maintained by neighbours in recent years.

Proposal

Erection of a detached two storey dwelling adjacent to 5 Ridge Close (re-submission of S/2011/0308 withdrawn 3 March 2011)

History

- | | |
|--------|--|
| 22758 | Erection of one detached 2 storey dwellinghouse. Refused 14/11/84 |
| 91/827 | Outline application for 1 detached 2 storey dwellinghouse. Withdrawn 12/05/92. |

Consultations

Head of Service – Environment – No objection in principle subject to piling condition.

Assistant Director (Transport and Spatial Planning) – No objections subject to condition relating to new access and informatives.

Neighbour Representations

Last date for replies: 16 June 2011

Received: Letters of objection received from 3, 5, 7, 17, 23, 25 Ridge Close raising the following concerns:

- Loss of privacy and light in adjacent gardens.
- May cause structural damage to neighbours garage.
- Inadequate services (sewers / drains etc) cannot cope with more dwellings, already an additional one approved which is currently under construction. Original plans for Ridge Close were for 13 houses, not 14 as existing and 15 as proposed.
- Strip of land fronting Ridge Close does not belong to 169, owner unknown.
- Plan shows the plot of 169 extending through to Ridge Close but this is not the case due to strip on land unclaimed at front.
- Parking is already a problem in this cul-de-sac, more dwellings will make it much

worse and cause further disruption.

- Will reduce area for on-street parking if this area of frontage is taken up by a dwelling.
- Question 15 on the application form states there are no trees on the site which is not correct.
- Advertisement placed in local paper regarding land ownership was not seen by anyone given its size and position in the newspaper.
- Dwelling is far too big for the size of plot, too close to adjacent dwellings and out of character with existing houses.
- Plans do not appear accurate.

1 letters stating no objection received from 169 Rufford Road.

Policy

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

AD2	Ensuring Choice of Travel
CS3	Development Principles
DQ1	Design
DQ3	Trees and Development
H10	Development in Primarily Residential Areas
SPG	New Housing Development

Comments

Main issues – principle of development in residential area, design and impact on the street scene and character of the area, impact on residential amenity, compliance with tree planting policy.

Principle

The site lies within a primarily residential area where residential development is appropriate in principle subject to other policy and site constraints.

The scheme has been amended to reduce the size of the dwelling following concerns of potential impact on neighbours. The two storey rear outrigger has been reduced to single storey only, which reduces its bulk and the length of the side elevation facing no. 5 at first floor level.

Design and impact on the street scene and character of the area

Policy DQ1 requires new development to make a positive contribution to its surroundings through the quality of their design in terms of scale, massing, form, style, detailing and use of materials.

The dwelling is of an appropriate scale and massing to the street scene of Ridge Close. The street is a cul-de-sac of two storey dwellings, some of which are detached and some are semi-detached. This proposal seeks consent for the erection of a two storey detached dwelling with a maximum ridge height of 8.6 metres, which is equal to that of adjacent dwellings as demonstrated on the street scene elevation submitted. The form of development is acceptable in this location as the site is an infill plot in-between two

existing dwellings. There is a large gap between numbers 5 and 7 and there are no other gaps of this nature elsewhere within the Close in between dwellings. As such the gap is not a particular characteristic of the area that should be retained or protected.

The design of the dwelling is simple with a projecting two storey bay, constructed of traditional materials and has a hipped roof. The dwelling is appropriate in this location and acceptable in terms of scale, design and the character and form of the surrounding area. The proposal therefore complies with policy DQ1.

Residential Amenity

The dwelling will be sited in between two existing dwellings at 5 and 7 Ridge Close. The scheme has been amended to remove the first floor to the two storey rear outrigger originally proposed which was considered to have a detrimental impact on no. 5. The reduced scheme has three bedrooms now instead of four and is now more appropriate for a site of this size and as a result of being reduced in size will not significantly overshadow no.5.

The siting of the dwelling meets the minimum interface distances to surrounding dwellings and their gardens as set out in SPG New Housing Development. The size of the dwelling is large in relation to the plot but on the basis that a rear garden size of 80 sq m is provided which is in excess of the minimum 70 sq m required, the size is considered acceptable. No side windows to habitable rooms are proposed and so no overlooking issues are raised by the proposal.

In terms of impact on no. 7 the proposed dwelling is set further forward of the front elevation of no. 7 by 3.2 metres. However, this is not considered to cause significant harm to their outlook or amenity on the basis that there is a row of large conifers along the boundary between the dwellings which already obscures the view from no. 7. The side of number 7 has a number of windows which are obscurely glazed and as such the dwelling will not directly affect the outlook from any habitable room windows. The dwellings will be 2.8 metres away from the side elevation of no. 7 which is considered sufficient spacing between dwellings in this locality.

Objections raised relating to services and utilities are not a material planning consideration and an application cannot be refused on this basis alone.

Objections have been submitted relating to parking and congestion which neighbours fear will worsen if this application is granted consent. The proposal provides 1 parking space which meets the Council's standards for parking provision on new dwellings and Highways have stated that there are no highway safety implications as a result of the application.

Trees

Policy DQ3 requires the provision of 3 new trees to be planted on the site for each new dwelling, and 2 trees to be planted for every tree removed as part of the proposal. In this case 3 new trees are required to be planted and these are shown on the amended site plan submitted. Furthermore four conifer trees are being removed, requiring eight new trees to be planted on site giving a total of 9 trees required to be planted. An amended site plan showing existing and proposed tree planting is awaited. Provided this plan is received and acceptable, the proposal complies with policy DQ3 in respect of tree planting.

Conclusion

The proposal is acceptable in this primarily residential area and complies with policy H10. The issues of design, residential amenity and impact on existing dwellings have been considered in accordance with the New Housing SPG and policies CS3 and DQ1. The proposal is considered acceptable. A revised landscaping scheme has been submitted which satisfies the requirement for replacement and required tree planting within the proposed garden areas. On balance the proposal is acceptable and is recommended for approval with appropriate conditions removing permitted development rights for further extensions and alterations.

Conditions & Reasons

1. T-1 Full Planning Permission Time Limit
2. Before the development is commenced, details of the facing/windows/roofing materials to be used in the external construction of this development shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
3. M-6 Piling
4. H-2 New vehicular/pedestrian access
5. R-2 PD removal garages/ extensions/outbuildings
6. R-3 PD removal windows
7. Prior to the commencement of the development:
 - a) Full details of proposed boundary treatment for the front, rear and side boundaries of the development site shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
 - b) The boundary treatment shall be implemented in accordance with the approved scheme and retained thereafter.
8. L-5 Landscape Management Plan
9. L-4 Landscape Implementation

Reasons

1. RT-1
2. RM1
3. RM-6
4. RH-2
5. RR-2
6. RR-3
7. In the interests of visual amenity and to accord with policies CS3 and DQ1 of the Sefton Unitary Development Plan.
8. RL-5
9. RL-4

Drawing Numbers

A1 plan and proposed landscape plan received 12/07/2011

Existing site plan



Sefton Council

Department of the
Built Environment
 Jane Gowing
 Head of Planning Services

S/2011/0639
 Land adjacent to
 5 Ridge Close
 Southport
 PR9 8JU

OSGR: 337386, 420009

Sheet(s): 5536

Area: 238 sqm

Standard Site Plan

Scale: 1:1250
 Date: 12/12/2011
 Drawn By: EBRRT on



Ward(s): Meols
 Postcode Sector(s): PR9 8
 Poling District(s): Y2
 Parish(es): None Found

© Crown copyright and database rights 2011. Ordnance Survey 100018192

Created by Sefton Council Planning Services
 using MapInfo Professional

Proposed site plan

