

Regeneration and Economic Development Department

APPLICATION NO: 21/00771/FUL

APPLICANT: Mr James Ross

WARD AFFECTED: Halewood North

DEVELOPMENT: ERECTION OF TWO STOREY SIDE EXTENSION AND PART SINGLE STOREY SIDE EXTENSION

LOCATION OF SITE: 11 Woodend, Halewood, L26 6BS

KNOWSLEY LOCAL PLAN ALLOCATION –

Sites for Housing Development - Sites Allocated For Housing Development

RELEVANT POLICIES

KNOWSLEY LOCAL PLAN: CORE STRATEGY

CS2 - Development Principles

CS19 - Design Quality and Accessibility in New Development

SAVED POLICIES - KNOWSLEY REPLACEMENT UNITARY DEVELOPMENT PLAN (ADOPTED JUNE 2006)

H5 - Development within Primarily Residential Areas

H8 - Extensions and Alterations to Residential Properties

TECHNICAL CONSULTATIONS:

Halewood Town Council - No Comments Received.

NEIGHBOUR NOTIFICATION:

This application has been publicised by letters sent to 11 neighbours.

There have been 3 letters of objection and 1 letter of support. The support just notes that the applicant should be allowed to build the extension. The objections are summarised as follows: -

1. The plans show a reduction of vehicle space that would only allow 1 car to park under a car port. This means one of the household cars would have to park either on the street or at the side of the house restricting access to our shared drives with the other neighbours. The close is already tight as it is and pushing vehicles to park on the street would cause issues for pedestrians, as a vehicle would need to be parked partway on the pavement so vehicles can actually pass through the road. This would also restrict visibility when reversing from driveways, potentially causing hazard's to children playing in the close.
2. The plans show a side 1st floor window overlooking towards objector's property and not currently overlooked from this side. The property was purchased in good faith that this would not be the case. Not happy to have a window that overlooks the property.
3. The plans do not show where the access to the rear garden sits. Currently there is a side gate opening out onto the current driveway near to the garage. The extension shows to be the full length of the house bordering right up to objector's land, with a gap between the rear of the property and the current garage. The gate cannot be moved as this will mean it opens over the boundary line onto the shared access drives.
4. The scale of the extension looks to be over half the size of the current house at double height. This will overpower and enclose the corner of the cul-de-sac, meaning the side wall of the property will be closer to objector's property. The Close is symmetrical and all houses are built exactly identical. Something of this scale will completely change the look of the Close and would make objector feel hemmed in and enclosed.
5. Currently the rubbish bins are stored at the side of the property where the planned extension would be built. Where will the bins be stored if this extension is built? There is no place at the front of the property to store them. If they are stored in the rear garden there is no way of bringing the bins out

Document Reference	Document Issue Number	Document Issue Date
PS/DC/OP04/05	003	23/9/02

unless they cross over the boundary onto objector's land. Objector was advised as part of the leasehold with Knowsley Council that bins should not be stored at the front of the property.

6. There is a tree situated on objector's land close to the boundary line. Objector would not want this tree removed or damaged. The construction of this extension would potentially damage the roots and may require it to be felled.

7. The scale of this construction means there would need to be a large amount of scaffolding built for the works to take place. This will be built on objector's land and infringe onto the shared access drive with other neighbours. The footing of this extension extends across onto objector's land, meaning shrubs and plants already there will be damaged and removed. Objector is concerned with where the construction vehicles would park along with any skips that will be needed plus the storage of materials as the Close is already small and enclosed. Objector works from home full time and the office is situated at the front of the house. The noise from the construction of this scale is going to cause interference with the objector's work for a lengthy period of time.

8. Concern that something of this scale could potentially reduce the value of objector's property. Reducing parking for other properties in this street will push more cars to park on the pavements. The fact that the proposed plan brings the structure of the property closer to my land meaning the brick wall of the side of the house will be closer to my property and all that I can see when looking out of the windows.

9. Currently no.11 has space for their 2 cars, the plans show that their new shortened driveway would not be big enough for both cars to park, so concern over where the second car would be parked as when people visit the close it can be difficult reversing in or out of drives.

10. On purchasing the property, a big part of buying the house was the aesthetics and layout of street which will be massively changed with the size of this extension being over half the size of the existing property.

With regard the objections the raised concerns are dealt with in the report where they relate to planning issues. Other concerns which do not relate to planning issues and concerns are as follows:

With regard to objections due to impact on house values this is not a planning issue and cannot be taken into consideration.

Concerns regarding damage to the land to the side of the application site and vegetation within it are a civil matter and in the event that such occurred would need to be taken up between the landowner and the applicant/builder if planning permission is granted. The tree is small and relatively young (although not a whip) and currently offers little amenity to the locality.

With regard to scaffolding, a landowner does not have to agree to allow it on their land, so that would be a civil matter between the two parties.

There is no proposal to move the rear garden gate.

Concerning construction traffic and noise all building works will generate such, it is the nature of the works. If works noise starts or extends beyond reasonable times Environmental Health regulations with regard noise could be enforced if appropriate. Skips have to have a highways licence if not located on private land.

ARTICLE 35

The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by identifying matters of concern within the application (as originally submitted) and negotiating with the applicant, acceptable amendments to the proposal to address those concerns. As a result, the Local Planning Authority has been able to grant planning permission for an acceptable proposal, in accordance with the presumption in favour of sustainable development, as set out within the National Planning Policy Framework.

ISSUES AND ASSESSMENT:

PROPOSAL

Document Reference	Document Issue Number	Document Issue Date
PS/DC/OP04/05	003	23/9/02

The application seeks planning permission for a two storey extension to the side of a modern detached house on Woodend, a small cul-de-sac of Lightoaks Drive in Halewood. In addition, a single storey extension is proposed at the rear of the two storey extension linking in with an existing single storey rear extension, and a small extension at the front of the two storey element. The application site is adjacent the turning head and a private drive serving three properties which face the side of the application dwelling and rear curtilage.

The two storey extension would have a depth of approximately 8.25m, set back 0.5m from the front of the existing house and a width of 3.5m with a pitched roof tied in with the roof of the existing house, ridge being 0.2m lower. The single storey rear extension would have a depth of approximately 2.1m with the same width and a sloping roof with rooflights tied into the sloping roof of the existing rear extension. The small extension to the front of the two storey extension would extend to the front elevation of the house with a depth of 0.5m, accounting for the first floor set back, and with the same width and a sloping roof. The ground floor would comprise a car port and small utility room/extension to the dining room with the first floor comprising an extension to the bathroom and a bedroom.

POLICY CONSIDERATIONS

The application complies with the above noted planning policies and the Householder Development SPD.

DESIGN, ACCESS AND CRIME PREVENTION

The design of the application is acceptable and broadly in character with the existing house. Some objections note that the aesthetics and layout of street will be changed with the extension being over half the size of the existing property, and that the extension will "overpower and enclose" this corner of the cul-de-sac, and the side wall of the property will be closer to the houses which face the site. Objections note the close is symmetrical and all houses are built exactly identical, and something of this scale will completely change the look of the close and would make the objector feel hemmed in and enclosed. The extension would be approximately 56% of the current width of the house and is similar in scale to many such side extensions throughout the borough and region; it would not be disproportionate or overly dominant with regard to the existing dwelling. Within the Close there are a number of differing house styles, with the proposed extension is of a type and scale commonly found on detached and semi-detached houses. Whilst there would be some change to the streetscape this is inevitable for any extension to the side of a house, particularly one on a corner or quasi-corner plot, and would not be a reasonable reason to resist a scheme. In this case whilst the extension would extend to the boundary there is a small vegetated area adjacent before the edge of the hard surface of the private driveway. Whilst an extension on a corner plot usually is required to have a distance between the side of the extension and the side boundary the application site is not a true corner plot, having a very short length of turning head and private drive adjacent with separating vegetated border between plot and the drive. As such it is considered that the proposal would not impact adversely on the street scene as most of the side extension would be adjacent the drive, together with the context of the extension siting within the street.

With regard to the objection on the grounds of the objector being "hemmed in and enclosed" there would be a distance of approximately 11.2-11.5m between the gable of the extension and the front elevation of 8 and 9 Woodend, the properties that would directly face the extension. The accepted interface distance between front elevations and gables in new housing developments is 12m minimum (being new there is no extensions on new developments), but given that the buildings are off set it is considered that the distance that would be maintained between the extension and the existing houses is acceptable and would not cause unacceptable loss of outlook.

Due to the position of the house and extension, and the juxtaposition of both with the driveway and the houses facing the proposal would not initiate a terracing effect.

The application does not raise crime or anti-social behaviour issues.

The application therefore complies with policies CS2 and CS19 of the Local Plan and saved Policies H5 and H8 of the UDP.

Document Reference	Document Issue Number	Document Issue Date
PS/DC/OP04/05	003	23/9/02

HIGHWAYS

The car port would be 10m minimum length (along the internal side of the gable) and would be approximately 3.2m internal width; as such the car port could accommodate two cars in accordance with the Council's usual requirement for parking for a three bedroomed house. A car could drive straight off the carriageway into the car port as there would be no door to open. If planning permission is granted a condition should be attached that a door is not installed to the car port to ensure that this aspect could continue.

With the width of the garage the bins could be stored at the rear and cars would still be able to park. Bins are approximately 0.75m deep so if you take a depth of 1m to allow for a slight clearance the back of the garage would be able to accommodate the bins on the side and the back or front end of a car, with the door opening slightly further down.

The application therefore complies with policies CS2 and CS19 of the Local Plan and saved Policies H5 and H8 of the UDP.

RESIDENTIAL AMENITY

The proposal would be 11.2-11.5m from the front of 8 and 9 Woodend, the houses which would directly face the extension, and it is considered that the proposal would not affect the light of neighbouring properties. A window is proposed in the gable of the extension at first floor level. However, the window is shown as being opaque glass with a high level opening so that it would not impact on the privacy of the houses facing the application site. No other residential amenity concerns are raised. Concerns raised regarding development works, noise etc are considered in the representations section as such are not planning issues and considerations.

CONCLUSION

The proposal is acceptable in terms of design and would have acceptable visual and residential amenity impacts. Two parking spaces would be able to be accommodated within the car port (given that car park spaces are 4.8/5m deep) and including the land to the back of footpath, and the width of car port allows the bins to be accommodated along either side at the rear where the parking width required is lesser as it just needs to accommodate the front or back end of a car (door opening further down). As such the application complies with planning policies and is therefore recommended for approval.

RECOMMENDATION:

That Planning Permission be granted subject to the following condition(s):-

- 1) The development must be begun not later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date of this permission.

Reason: In order to comply with the requirements of Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).

- 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans and documents listed in Schedule 1.

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt.

- 3) Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that order), no windows or openings shall be inserted in the gable (side) elevation of the extension hereby permitted other than those shown on the approved plans.

Reason: In the interests of privacy having regard to Policies CS2 and CS19 of the Knowsley Local Plan Core Strategy adopted January 2016 and saved Policies H5

Document Reference	Document Issue Number	Document Issue Date
PS/DC/OP04/05	003	23/9/02

and H8 of the Knowsley Replacement Unitary Development Plan adopted in June 2006.

- 4) No part of the development hereby permitted shall be used or occupied until the proposed window on the gable elevation as indicated on the proposed elevation drawing referenced Sheet 3 of 3 Rev C received 14 January 2022 has been glazed with obscure glass to level 4/5. The window shall have a high level opening top hung as shown on the said drawing and shall be retained as such with level 4/5 obscure glazing at all times thereafter.

Reason: In order to safeguard the residential amenities enjoyed by the occupants of adjacent residential properties and to ensure the development complies with Policies CS2 and CS19 of the Knowsley Local Plan Core Strategy adopted January 2016 and saved Policies H5 and H8 of the Knowsley Replacement Unitary Development Plan adopted June 2006.

- 5) The car port hereby permitted shall be retained at the depth shown on the Proposed Ground Floor Plan and Site Layout drawing referenced Sheet 4 Rev C received 28 January 2022 at all times and no door or other means of closure shall be installed to the car port at any time.

Reason: To ensure that the car port has sufficient depth for the parking of two cars and can be accessed without obstructing the highway to comply with Policies CS2 and CS19 of the Knowsley Local Plan Core Strategy adopted January 2016 and saved Policies H5 and H8 of the Knowsley replacement Unitary Development Plan adopted June 2006.

- 6) Notwithstanding any submitted details the materials to be used on the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match those of the existing building in type, size, colour and texture.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity and to comply with Policies CS2 and CS19 of the Knowsley Local Plan Core Strategy adopted January 2016 and saved Policies H5 and H8 of the Knowsley Replacement Unitary Development Plan adopted in June 2006.

SCHEDULE 1

Date Received	Ref. No	Version	Drawing/Document Title
14/01/2022	SHT 2 OF 3	REV C	EXISTING AND PROPOSED FIRST FLOOR PLAN ONLY
14/01/2022	SHT 3 OF 3	REV C	EXISTING AND PROPOSED ELEVATIONS
14/01/2022	SHT 1 OF 3	REV C	SECTIONS AND PROPOSED FIRST FLOOR PLAN (FLOOR STRUCTURE REMOVED)
28/10/2021	-	-	LOCATION PLAN
28/01/2022	SHT 4	REV C	PROPOSED GROUND FLOOR PLAN AND SITE LAYOUT

Document Reference	Document Issue Number	Document Issue Date
PS/DC/OP04/05	003	23/9/02

Lee Osborne

2 February 2022

Alan Kilroe

3 February 2022

Document Reference	Document Issue Number	Document Issue Date
PS/DC/OP04/05	003	23/9/02

c:\users\kilroea\appdata\local\microsoft\windows\inetcache\content.outlook\1fi4xgbr\21-00771-ful 11 woodend dlp.doc.rtf