

<u>APPLICATION NO:</u>	22/00643/FUL	<u>CASE OFFICER:</u>	John Fleming
<u>WARD:</u>	Halewood North	<u>PARISH:</u>	
<u>LOCATION:</u>	23 Woodbridge Avenue, Halewood, Knowsley, L26 7XH		
<u>PROPOSAL:</u>	ERECTION OF TWO STOREY REAR EXTENSION AND ERECTION OF FIRST FLOOR EXTENSION ABOVE GARAGE TOGETHER WITH A FRONT AND REAR DORMER EXTENSION INCLUDING LOFT CONVERSION		

Site Description

The application property is located within a residential area. The application property is a detached dwelling in an L shape arrangement and occupies a corner plot set back from the neighbouring properties in the street scene. The property's northeast side elevation is located within close proximity to the common boundary with the properties located off Blackberry Grove.

The application property is brick facing together with mock Tudor panelling and white UPVC windows and doors typical of 1990s design.

The property includes an attached double garage together with hardstanding capable of accommodating 3 vehicles within the curtilage of the property. The property has previously been extended at the rear in the form of a conservatory which spans the full width of the rear elevation.

Proposal

Following the demolition of the rear conservatory, this application seeks permission for the erection of a two-storey rear extension, together with the erection of a first-floor extension above the garage including dormer windows and a loft conversion including front and rear dormers at the main dwelling house.

The front extension would include a new gable bay window which would project .25m beyond the front elevation of the ground and first floor windows.

The proposed two storey rear extension would span a depth of 3.9m depth and span full width of the rear elevation at 9.3m. The ground floor would occupy a larger footprint than the first floor and would accommodate a small pitched roof measuring 2.8m at the eaves and 3.4m at its highest point. To the first floor, the depth is reduced to 2.8m. The existing gable roof would be altered to a part hip part gable and increased marginally in height.

As part of the alterations to the roof the applicant is also seeking to convert the existing roof space with front and rear dormers. The front dormer measures 3.2m in width, 2.7m in depth by 1.4m height and would include two double windows. The rear dormer would measure 5m in width by 1.1m in height by 2.6m in depth.

The first-floor extension above the existing garage would provide occupy the same

footprint as the existing garage and hallway. It would also accommodate an asymmetric roof including 2 forward facing window dormers. The roof would measure 2.5m – 4.4m at the eaves and attain an overall height of 5.5m. The two window dormers would measure 1.7m in width, 1.2m at the eaves and an overall height of 2.3m.

The proposals would include a complete reorganisation of the existing internal layout. To the ground floor the proposals would provide utility, new hallway, lounge and kitchen and family room. To the first floor are 4 bedrooms including a laundry room, 2 en-suites and family bathroom. To the second floor, a fifth bedroom is proposed including en-suite.

Consultations

None.

Representations

This application has been publicised by letters sent to 6 neighbours. Two letters of objection and three letters of support (albeit one was submitted by the applicant) have been submitted.

In support of the application comments have been made concerning the improved look of the property, that it would not impact privacy to a property on Woodbridge Avenue, should not affect daylight and comments made in respect of local policy and would improve the housing stock in Halewood.

Objections are raised in respect of the submissions made in respect of the previous application under 21/00883/FUL. Objections are raised regarding loss of light and visual amenity. The proposed extension would alter the view to just a brick wall. It is suggested single storey would be acceptable but the secondary storey would dramatically cut into view to just brick. Concerns are also raised in respect of overlooking from gable windows to neighbouring windows and gardens and that the proposed development would cause an unduly overbearing effect to residential amenity of neighbouring residents.

Planning History

The application property has a number of applications associated with the construction of the wider housing estate. Applications relevant to the individual property are as follows:

Ref: 21/00883/FUL – Erection of a part two storey/part single storey extension to the rear (demolition of existing conservatory), plus rear dormer, together with the addition of a first-floor extension over the existing garage with alterations to the existing roof and windows to the front of dwelling, increase in size of bay window to the front elevation.

This application was refused on grounds of scale, height and massing due to its close proximity to the common boundary with neighbouring properties at Blackberry Grove and would give rise to overshadowing, visual intrusive and overbearing effect on amenity. In addition, it was considered that the previous application would result in incongruous design features which were found out of keeping with the existing dwelling.

Relevant Policy

Paragraph 11 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states that planning decisions should apply a presumption in favour of sustainable development. This means approving development proposals that accord with an up-to-date development plan without delay; or where the development plan is absent, silent or out of date planning permission should be granted unless the application of policies in the NPPF that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a clear reason for refusing the development proposed; or any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the NPPF taken as a whole.

Paragraph 12 of the NPPF clarifies that the presumption in favour of sustainable development does not change the statutory status of the development plan as the starting point for decision making. Where a planning application conflicts with an up-to-date development plan, permission should not normally be granted. Local planning authorities may take decisions that depart from an up-to-date development plan, but only if material considerations in a particular case indicate that the plan should not be followed.

The development plan in Knowsley comprises the Saved Policies of the Replacement Unitary Development Plan, the Core Strategy Local Plan and the Joint Waste Local Plan. The following policies are relevant to the determination of this application.

CS2 - Development Principles

CS19 - Design Quality and Accessibility in New Development

H5 – Primarily Residential Areas

H8 - Extensions and Alterations to Residential Properties

In addition, the Householder Development SPD (2016) is a material consideration for the purposes of this planning application and provides additional guidance in relation to householder development within Knowsley Borough.

Policy CS2 sets out the local principles which underpin new development in Knowsley. Principle 4 in particular seeks to ensure new development understands and respects the character and distinctiveness of places whilst promoting good quality design, ensuring that development respects its setting taking into account relevant design requirements and best practice.

Policy CS19 sets out a range of design principles. In particular, it seeks to enhance local distinctiveness, identify and accessibility of places and requires development to respond to and integrate positively with its immediate surroundings, including local materials, scale, mass, form, layout, alignment and density whilst avoiding unacceptable impacts on existing residents and future occupiers.

Policy H5 identifies the land as a Primarily Residential Area. The principle of an extension to an existing dwelling is therefore acceptable subject to the detailed issues relating to design, appearance and impacts on amenity referred to in policies CS2, CS19 and H8.

Policy H8 requires development proposals to avoid 'disproportionate' additions to the original dwelling which would adversely affect the amenity or privacy of neighbouring occupiers of adjacent dwellings and that the design and materials of development would reflect those used in the original dwelling.

Article 35 Statement

The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by identifying matters of concern with the proposal and discussing those with the applicant. However, the issues are so fundamental to the proposal that it has not been possible to negotiate a satisfactory way forward and due to the harm, which has been clearly identified within the reason for the refusal, approval has not been possible.

Assessment

Design

The existing dwelling was built in the early 1990s and the surrounding area comprises dwellings of a similar age and are predominantly detached properties with mock Tudor detailing.

The development proposals as originally submitted would significantly alter the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and would implement features that are not typical of the character in the surrounding area such as the dormer windows above the garage together with the front dormer.

The Householder Development SPD is a material consideration for the purposes of this planning application. It states at paragraph 7.5 that front extensions can be particularly prominent in the street scene and should be carefully designed to retain the character of the residential area and that the style, design, materials and scale of front extensions should respect the character of the surrounding area and that front extensions should not dominate the existing dwelling.

The proposed front dormer extension and extension over the garage would not respect the character of the area and would introduce features which are considered to be alien in the context of the local vernacular and would be disproportionate additions to the dwelling which fails to have regard to the appearance of the original dwelling resulting in incongruous features which would harm the appearance of the host dwelling and its surrounding.

The Local Planning Authority accept that the dwelling is located in a cul-de-sac and is removed somewhat from the street scene. However, the property would still be visible in the surrounding area and this would not make the development acceptable.

The applicant submitted revised proposals for consideration which included a central gable in replacement of the existing (albeit plans were out of alignment). Although the replacement of the front dormer with a central gable feature would alter the appearance of the property this would simply shift the existing gable feature to a more centralised location. As such, it was considered an acceptable alternative. However, the alterations above the garage due to increase in mass and features out of keeping with the local vernacular are not considered acceptable in terms of design and residential amenity (further discussed below).

Whilst the loft conversion would not be in strict accordance with the SPD due to the increase in ridge height to create sufficient internal space, it is considered that this alteration to the roof in terms of ridge height is relatively small and would not be determinantal to the street scene or visual/residential amenity that would warrant refusal.

Residential Amenity

No. 25 Woodbridge Avenue

No 25. Is the neighbouring detached property located at the end of the cul-de-sac. The proposed rear extension is relevant to the development's effects to residential amenity in relation to this property.

No. 25 is set back 1.95m from the application property and has a conservatory located at the rear. The Householder Development SPD advises that single storey extensions located on or immediately adjacent to the party boundary will normally be acceptable if it does not project more than 4m from the rear elevation of the existing dwelling and that two storey extensions up to 3m will normally be acceptable.

No. 25 is set back by 1.95M from the application property and has been previously extended in the form of a two-storey rear extension together with a conservatory located at the rear. The proposed rear extension would only extend 1m beyond the existing rear elevation of the application property at ground floor level and would not extend beyond the rear elevation of the no.25's rear conservatory. The first-floor aspect would be largely parallel with no.25 rear elevation and as such it is not considered that this property would be adversely affected by the proposed development.

No. 7 & 9 Blackberry Grove

The proposed development would be sited 1.1m – 2.3m from the common boundaries with no. 7 & 9. The applicant seeks to increase the height of the existing garage to provide habitable living space at first floor level above the garage. The existing footprint of the existing garage, dwelling and conservatory extend 19.8m in length. However, only 7.3m of the main dwelling house comprises the two-storey dwelling as currently in situ.

The proposal would result in non-obscured non opening windows at first floor level facing these properties. As such, there would be no loss of privacy in relation to the occupiers at no. 7 & 9 Blackberry Grove. Notwithstanding this, the proposed development would increase the height of the garage roof to 5.5m. The cumulative effect of the proposal would therefore result in an overall width of 19.5m at ground floor level and 18.4m at first floor level. The extent of the two-storey aspect of the building within 1.1m – 2.3m from the shared property boundary would have a significant overbearing effect on the residential amenity of the occupiers at no. 7 & 9.

During the course of the application, the applicant was advised to remove the first-floor extension above the garage and instead convert the existing garage space to provide habitable living accommodation. This would result in a significant reduction in built form cumulatively from 19.8m to 10.3m in total. This was considered acceptable on balance to reduce impact of residential amenity to neighbouring properties whilst still allowing the level of living accommodation the applicant wished to deliver on site. The applicant decided to only amend the front elevation of the proposal by removing the front dormer but still maintained the height of the garage. The Local Planning Authority advised that they would be unable to support such a development as it would result in having an overbearing affect to resident amenity.

As such, the combination of the existing dwelling house together with the proposed additions would result in having a detrimental affect to amenity of these occupiers. As such, the proposal is contrary to saved UDP Policy H8, Local Plan policies CS2 and CS19 and the Householder Development SPD.

Highways

The application proposals would not result in adverse effects to public highway safety.

Conclusion

The proposed development would result in a dominate and disproportionate additions to the application property and results in unacceptable impact to design and character of the local area together with unacceptable impact to residential amenity of neighbouring properties at no. 7 & no.9 Blackberry Grove. As such, the application is contrary to Core Strategy policies CS2, CS19 and saved Policy H8 of the Knowsley Unitary Development Plan and is recommended for refusal.

Recommendation

That planning permission is refused for the following reasons:

- 1) The proposed extensions by reason of the scale, height and massing in close proximity to the common boundary with 7 & 9 Blackberry Grove would give rise to undue overshadowing, visual intrusion, and an unduly overbearing effect to the detriment of the amenity that the adjoining occupants could reasonably expect to enjoy.

As such the proposal would be contrary to Policies CS2 and CS19 of the Knowsley Local Plan Core Strategy adopted January 2016 ,Saved Policy H8 of the Knowsley Replacement Unitary Development Plan, adopted June 2006 and the Householder Development Supplementary Guidance Note ,June 2016.

- 2) The proposal would produce an incongruous design feature out of keeping with the existing dwelling and alien to the visual amenity and character of the street scene.

As such the proposal would be contrary to Policies CS2, CS19 of the Knowsley Local Plan Core Strategy adopted January 2016, Saved Policy H8 of the Knowsley Replacement Unitary Development Plan, adopted June 2006 and the Householder Development Supplementary Guidance Note June 2016.

Signed Case Officer¹: **John Fleming**

Signed Authorising
Officer²: **Alan Kilroe**

¹ I confirm that I do not have a personal relationship with the applicant, agent or other interested parties; I also confirm that I do not have a financial interest in the site or the development proposed.

² I confirm that I do not have a personal relationship with the applicant, agent or other interested parties; I also confirm that I do not have a financial interest in the site or the development proposed.

Date:

14 February 2023

Appendix 1 – Site Photographs





