

<u>APPLICATION NO:</u>	23/02698/FUL	<u>CASE OFFICER:</u>	Lee Osborne
<u>WARD:</u>	Prescot North	<u>PARISH:</u>	Knowsley Parish Council
<u>LOCATION:</u>	31 Ormskirk Road, Knowsley Village, Knowsley		
<u>PROPOSAL:</u>	ERECTION OF A SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION WITH BALCONY ABOVE TOGETHER WITH THE ERECTION OF A SINGLE STOREY SIDE EXTENSION, ERECTION OF A FRONT PORCH EXTENSION AND ERECTION OF A TWO STOREY FRONT AND SIDE EXTENSION		

Site Description

The application relates to a large bungalow with a first floor in the roof space, and associated garden curtilage on Ormskirk Road. The western side of Ormskirk Road consists principally of large, detached dwellings on corresponding plots and of differing designs whilst beyond eastern edge of Ormskirk Road are fields, with this stretch of Ormskirk Road marking the boundary between Knowsley Village residential area and the Green Belt.

Proposal

The proposal seeks planning permission for the erection of a two storey extension on the front on the south eastern part of the house to match the similar on the north western part of the house. It is proposed to erect a two storey porch with void above between the proposed front two storey extension and the existing two storey projecting part of the front of the dwelling. It is also proposed to erect a single storey extension on the side of the house to the rear of the front two storey extension proposed.

A single store extension is proposed on the rear of the dwelling as existing extending the existing kitchen extension. Above this extension it is proposed to install a balcony which would extend as a walkway along the rear of a bedroom to the gable of the dwelling. The window of the bedroom would be replaced by French doors to access the walkway and ultimately the balcony.

The two storey extension to mirror the existing two storey front projection would be of the same design, and on the left hand side of the dwelling as looking from Ormskirk Road. It would take the form of a ground floor with steep roof comprising a living room extension to the ground floor with bedroom extension above within the roof space. The ground floor of the extension would be 7.3m wide with a depth of 2.5m extending at the south eastern end to 4.6m extending along the side of the existing dwelling. The extension would have two windows on the front at ground floor level and one window on the front at first floor level. The extension would have a pitched roof with a height to eaves of 2.2m and a ridge height of 6.8m, the same as the ridge height of the existing dwelling. The ridge of the extension would run at 90 degrees to the existing roof.

The porch extension would be sited between the proposed two storey extension and the existing two storey front projection. This extension would comprise an extension

to the entrance hall at ground floor with void above. There would be a front entrance door with glazing panels either side and a large window to the void on the front at first floor level. The roof would have a ridge in the same horizontal as the roof of the existing dwelling for a short stretch above the extension which would slope down beyond the sides of the extension to meet the roof slopes of the existing projection and the proposed front extension either side. The extension would have a width of 3.15m and a depth of 1m.

To the rear of the two storey extension, and the side of the existing dwelling, would be a single storey extension. An existing flat roof would be extended to form the roof of the extension, The extension would have a depth of 5.8m and a width of 2.3m widening to 2.8m. The extension would be for storage provision.

The single storey rear extension would have a depth of 5.1m, the same as the existing kitchen extension, and a width of 3.4m. The extension would be attached to the existing kitchen extension to enlarge the kitchen. The extension would have French doors on the rear elevation and glazed sliding doors on the side elevation. The balcony would be above the extension with the roof of the extension run across the rear of the dwelling to provide a walkway from the balcony to a bedroom and the gable of the dwelling, and a narrow covered area beneath. There would be a change on the rear of the bedroom to change the window to French doors to allow access to the walkway to lead to the balcony. The balcony and walkway/canopy roof would be a 'green' roof and the balcony and walkway would be enclosed by 1.2m high of obscure glazing.

Consultations

Knowsley Parish Council - No comments received.

Representations

This application has been publicised by letters sent to 3 neighbours.

There has been 1 letter of objection. The representations are summarised as follows:

1. Objection to the planning permission specifically relating to its balcony and any additional extensions that would be adjacent to the objector's property and overlook multiple aspects of the objector's residence.
2. Proposals will overlook objector's outside pool directly, whilst giving accessible view to all rooms on the left side of objector's residence (if facing the properties from the public road). These rooms are master bedroom, lounge, dining room, patio and kitchen, all of which are situated on the side of the mentioned extension, all of which have large windows. These are areas the objector's family regularly frequent. Objector's daughter's bedroom could also possibly be affected depending on the extent of proposal.
3. The objector bought their property mainly for the privacy element that the land granted the objector's family. The balcony would neighbour and directly overlook the garden and swimming pool leisure area of the objector's home that has always been a great asset and a crux of the objector's family's wellbeing. The objector's family have used the pool, patio, and garden as a leisure area regularly. The objector states that the very definition of a adjacent balcony to this area - i.e. being elevated- acts as an acute visible intrusion to the lifestyle the objector and family have pursued for 30 years.
4. An elevated balcony also poses the threat of a further invasion of privacy that grants direct viewing into not only upper levels of the objector's house, such as the

master bedroom, but also the lower level lounge, dining room and kitchen which are situated on the side of the proposed extension, and all of which have large windows.

5. The objector should not have to buy or keep closing blinds/curtains throughout the lefthand side of their property to preserve their privacy for a leisure area for the neighbour. Such a 'solution' would reduce the objector's family's access to sunlight to preserve their privacy. Thus the finished proposal will have direct impact on both the objector and her daughter's way of life and wellbeing, both physically and mentally.

6. The balcony also poses a larger noise problem. The balcony would be situated closer to the objector's boundary. The noise of neighbours engaging in their own leisure at an elevated level will impact the objector's family not only in their patio area, but also in the master bedroom, lounge, dining room and kitchen. These all have large windows and the lower level rooms all have doors that the objector regularly opens to access their garden. The objector notes that they did not purchase their property with an existing structure in such close proximity and would not have if this was the case at the time.

7. Concerns about the effects this extension with a balcony addition would potentially have on the value of the objector's property during and following the work. The privacy their property offers is one of its most attractive aspects.

It must be pointed out that the proposed extension to the side of the house would be to the side of the house adjacent to 29 Ormskirk Road i.e. the left hand side of the application dwelling and not the right hand side adjacent the objector's property. It should be noted that impact of a proposal on property value is not a material planning issue and as such cannot be taken into consideration.

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.

Consultations

Knowsley Parish Council – No comments received.

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
DQ4 - Trees and Development

Article 35 Statement

The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by assessing the proposal against all material considerations, including planning policies and any representations that may have been received and subsequently determining to grant planning permission in accordance with the presumption in favour of sustainable development, as set out within the National Planning Policy Framework.

Assessment

The application is for extensions and a balcony to a dwelling in a residential area and is therefore acceptable in principle.

Design and Visual Amenity Concerns

With regards the two storey living room and bedroom extension on the left hand side of the dwelling this is of the same design as the existing front projection of the dwelling on the right hand side of the dwelling. The two story entrance extension with void above would give a physical linkage between the proposed left hand extension and the existing right hand projection which has been designed to integrate between the two. The single storey side extension to the rear of the two storey left hand side extension would be acceptable in design and would not be readily visible from outside the site. The rear extension would be acceptable in design. The balcony above with additional linked walkway would be acceptable in appearance and the context of the building.

The proposed scheme is acceptable in design. The extensions would not be detrimental to the character of this large bungalow or the wider area. The two storey extension would be on the opposite side of the house to where the objector thinks with the two storey entrance extension being sited to the middle of the front elevation and set back from both the existing two storey projection and the proposed mirroring two storey extension. Whilst there are windows and a door opening on the side of 29 Ormskirk Road these are secondary windows or not windows to habitable rooms. As such it is considered that outlook from this neighbouring house would not be unduly compromised.

The rear extension would be approximately 7.5m to the party boundary with 33 Ormskirk Road, with the canopy and walkway above, with glazed walkway enclosure, extending to the gable of the bungalow approximately 3.2m to that party boundary. As such it is considered that the proposals would not impact adversely the outlook of 33 Ormskirk Road and that the proposals in general would not be detrimental to the visual amenities of the neighbouring properties or the locality.

The application complies with Policies CS2 and CS19 of the Core Strategy and Saved Policies H5 and H8 of the UDP.

Residential Amenity Concerns

The proposal is for extensions and a balcony to a dwelling in a residential area and raises no residential amenity concerns. The objections received centre around loss of privacy together with noise. However, among these objections is that the dwelling would come nearer to the objector's dwelling as a result of the two storey extension and would cause loss of privacy but part of the objection appears to be as a result of misinterpretation of the drawings and the objector thinking that the two storey extension would be on the right hand side of the dwelling, adjacent the party boundary with the objector's property, rather than the extension actually being on the opposite side of the dwelling. In any case the two storey extension would not have any windows on the side and as such does not raise overlooking or privacy concerns with regards that neighbouring house, 29 Ormskirk Road.

Overlooking of the side of 33 Ormskirk Road could occur from the end part of the walkway if people walked up to here, and lesser overlooking from the balcony at 10.5m approximately from the balcony to the actual house. However, such could be overcome by having a heightened obscure glass enclosure along these lengths of walkway and balcony of 1.8m. In addition, there is vegetation along the boundary that offers significant shielding, particularly during summer months. As such it is considered that the balcony and walkway suitably revised as noted here would not cause significant overlooking of 33 Ormskirk Road.

An element of the objection was that noise from use of the balcony, and during construction works, would cause disturbance to the detriment of the amenities of the neighbouring property. However it is considered that the distance of the balcony from the party boundary, and the actual neighbouring house, would not lead to excessive noise disturbance to a significant and adverse impact. All extensions and building works lead to noise during construction works. It is considered that such noise would be acceptable for the period of the construction and if there was excessive noise or works during unreasonable hours there are environmental health regulations that could be brought to bear.

Highways Considerations

The front garden area is hard surfaced with parking available for in excess of three cars, which is the maximum number of parking spaces required by Council policy. No other highways issues are raised.

Conclusion

The proposals are acceptable in design and would not be detrimental to the visual or residential amenities of the neighbouring properties to a significantly detrimental degree. There are no highways issues raised. The application complies with planning policies and is 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 approved drawings the obscure glass balustrade to the north western side of the balcony hereby permitted and the north western end of the walkway adjoining the gable of the dwelling shall be 1.8m high. Such screening shall be in place prior to the first use of the walkway and shall be so maintained at all times the balcony and walk way is on site.

Reason: In the interests of privacy 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 June 2006.

- 4) 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 south east (side) elevation of the extensions hereby permitted.

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

- 5) The front of the proposed two storey extension comprising extension to lounge on the ground floor and extension to bedroom one (as identified on Dwg No P2E28423A) shall be rendered on the front elevation to match the existing render to the front elevation of the existing dwelling. All brick and tiles to be used on the extensions hereby permitted shall match those of the existing dwelling.

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 Local Plan adopted June 2006.

SCHEDULE 1

Date Received	Ref. No	Version	Drawing/Document Title
06/10/2023	P2E28423A	-	PROPOSED SITE PLAN
02/11/2023	P2E28423A	-	PROPOSED FLOOR PLANS AND ELEVATIONS
02/11/2023	P2E28423A	-	LOCATION PLAN
30/11/2023	AIA.13732.01	-	ARBORICULTURAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT WITH ABRORICULTURAL METHOD STATEMENT

Signed Case Officer¹: **Lee Osborne**

**Signed Authorising
Officer²:** **K Foster**

Date: **6 February 2024**

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

