

<u>APPLICATION NO:</u>	24/00194/FUL	<u>CASE OFFICER:</u>	Reece Black
<u>WARD:</u>	Prescot North	<u>PARISH:</u>	Knowsley Parish Council
<u>LOCATION:</u>	35 Middlehey Avenue, Knowsley, Knowsley		
<u>PROPOSAL:</u>	ERECTION OF A TWO STOREY SIDE AND REAR EXTENSION TOGETHER WITH PART SINGLE PART TWO STOREY FRONT EXTENSION AND SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION		

Site Description

The application site is located at 35 Middlehey Avenue, Knowsley and is situated within an area which is allocated as a Primarily Residential Area in the Development Plan. The application property is a detached dwellinghouse and is brick facing on its front, side and rear elevations. The property features white UPVC openings and interlocking rooftiles.

The property benefits from a modest front porch extension. The front elevation is West / North-Western facing and is sited approximately 10.2m from the public highway. The property previously benefitted from a detached garage structure which was sited adjacent the side and rear elevation of the dwelling, this has since been demolished to make way for the proposed development. The property also features two Velux rooflights to the front roof slope, suggesting that a loft conversion may have been undertaken. The front garden area comprises hardstanding by block paving together with a grassed section and displays an open-plan design.

The site features other residential dwellings to all directions.

Proposal

The application seeks permission for the erection of a two-storey side and rear extension together with part single and part two-storey front extension and single storey rear extension.

The proposed two-storey side extension (ground floor) would have a projection of 2.35m from the North facing gable wall and would have a depth of 13.5m (this includes the projection of the single storey rear extension). This would be served by a dual-pitched roof, which would measure 4.97m at the eaves and 7.21m at the ridgeline. The first-floor of the two-storey side extension would also have a projection of 2.35m but with a depth of 9.9m. This section would be served by a mono-pitched roof, which would measure 2.33m at the eaves and 3.84m at its tallest point.

The front projection of the proposal would be 2.2m at its furthest on the ground floor, but most of the front projection would be 1.6m. This would introduce a projecting gable roof with a large glass panel on the first-floor front elevation. The ground floor would be served by a canopy roof (excluding the central projecting gable). This would adjoin to the ground floor projection of the two-storey side extension. The projecting gable roof would measure 4.96m at the eaves and 6m at the ridgeline.

The proposed rear extension would have a projection of 5m. This would be served by a flat roof, which would measure 2.12m to the roof and would also feature a large roof lantern, which would measure 2.49m from the external ground level. This section of the proposal would see the excavation of approximately 0.60m of earth excavated to facilitate the proposed development.

The overall form of the proposal would be to a 'wrap-around' which would extend round the front, side and rear of the dwelling.

The first-floor of the two-storey side extension would also feature Velux rooflights to the front and rear roof slope (one on each side) and the rear elevation would feature a Juliette balcony.

The submission has seen amendments in the design which has seen the excavation to the rear to build the rear extension to reduce the height.

Discussions with the applicant involved the potential to remove the proposed single storey rear extension from this submission and to submit this under a separate Prior Approval – Larger Home Extension. This was not a feasible option due to practical constraints and technical elements of the guidance. This would remain part of this submission and its assessment.

Consultations

Knowsley Parish Council - No Comments Received.

Representations

This application has been publicised by letters sent to 6 neighbours. No representations have been received.

Planning History

APP. NO: 74/03756/HIST
PROPOSAL: FRONT STORM PORCH
DECISION: GRANTED
DECISION DATE: 20 December 1978

APP. NO: 74/03985/HIST
PROPOSAL: LOUNGE AND KITCHEN EXTENSION
DECISION: GRANTED
DECISION DATE: 4 April 1979

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.

The site is identified as a site allocated for housing development in the adopted Unitary Development Plan. As such, a domestic extension to the existing residential property is considered acceptable in principle, subject to compliance with local planning policy and guidance.

Regarding the adopted Development Plan policies, the proposed application has regard to policies CS2 and CS19 of the adopted Local Plan Core Strategy (2016) and saved policies H5 and H8 of the Unitary Development Plan (2006), together with the Householder Development SPD (2016).

These policies and guidance require that new development demonstrates a high standard of design, which does not adversely affect the character of the property or street scene; maintains a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants; avoiding overlooking and overshadowing, as well as an unacceptable overbearing impact; and that adequate parking and garden space would remain for use by residents of the extended property.

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

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.

Article 35 Statement

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.

Assessment

Saved Policy H8 in the Replacement Unitary Development Plan states that proposals for extensions to dwellings will be permitted provided that:

- a) The proposals would not (due to their scale and massing) result in a disproportionate addition to the original dwelling
- b) The design and materials used would reflect those used on the original dwelling
- c) The proposal would not adversely affect the amenity or privacy of occupiers of adjacent dwellings
- d) The proposal would not create potential hazards for highway users by obstructing visibility for pedestrians or drivers of motor vehicles; and
- e) Adequate parking and garden space would remain in use by the residents of the extended property

The Householder Development SPD states that front extensions and porches can be particularly prominent in the street scene and should be particularly carefully designed to retain the character of the residential areas. It also states that style, design, materials and scale of front extensions and porches should respect the character of the surrounding residential area. Furthermore, account should be taken of the building line.

The Householder Development SPD states that rear extensions should be designed to avoid causing overshadowing, loss of outlook or loss of privacy to the neighbours, or appear unduly dominant to neighbours.

The Householder Development SPD states that two storey side extensions should be designed to avoid having an overbearing effect or causing unacceptable loss of light or privacy for neighbours.

Design

The existing dwelling is faced in red brick, with white UPVC openings and tiled roofing. The proposed development would see a full application of render to the external face of both the existing and proposed. The design and materials of the dwelling overall, would be cohesive and emulated to include materials which are found on the exterior of the dwelling. The proposed development would be served by pitched roofs.

The proposed two-storey side extension would be served by a dual pitched roof, although this would be to a slightly different pitch, the roof of the proposal would be subordinate to the roof of the original dwelling and would include matching materials. The introduction of the projecting gable is not a common feature in the locality, however, would not be an unacceptable element of design. Overall, the majority of roofs included within the proposal would be pitched roofs. The proposed rear extension would be served by a flat roof, this would however be acceptable, given that this would be a single storey and to the rear, which would not be readily visible from the street scene or cause any adverse harm in design terms.

The Householder Development SPD states that a single storey rear extension located on or immediately adjacent to the party boundary with a neighbouring dwelling will normally be acceptable if it does not project more than 4m from the rear elevation of the existing dwelling. A single storey extension beyond 4m (or in a situation where the application property has a rear elevation which is set further back than the rear elevation of the neighbouring dwelling) will normally only be permitted if

it does not breach the 45-degree rule.

It also outlines that the above guidelines may, in some circumstances, be relaxed for conservatories although it will often be necessary to provide or retain appropriate boundary fences/walls, etc. to prevent overlooking of neighbours.

The proposed rear extension would have a projection of 5m. This is 1m more than what the Householder Development SPD prescribes. However, this is considered acceptable given that the rear extension would be built at a lower level (0.60) in contrast to the external ground levels. This was following discussions about impacts on neighbouring residential amenities and a request to revise the projection of the proposal. This would be considered acceptable, however, given the depth and would reduce any visual impact or prominence of the proposal. Moreover, given that the proposed development would be constructed 1m away from the party boundary, this would further reduce the impact of the proposal. Given these considerations, it is considered that the proposed rear extension would have an acceptable design.

The proposed front extensions would be considered to retain the character of the residential area. It would represent a notable change; however, it would not be considered unacceptable or adverse in design or detract from the character of the area.

The Householder Development SPD states that the size and projection of front extensions and porches that may be permitted depends on the type of dwelling and degree of set-back from the highway. A large detached house, set a substantial distance from the highway, would normally be capable of accommodating a much larger front extension or porch than, for example, a terraced dwelling with minimal set-back from the highway. Given the site context, the proposed front extensions would be appropriate.

These would be suitable in scale. The canopy roof on the ground floor would be acceptable and the most prominent change would be the projecting gable element of the proposal, however, 6.13 of the Householder Development SPD states that where architectural quality can be demonstrated, extensions may be acceptable where they are designed to offer a sensitive contrast to the original building through their siting, form, massing, fenestration, materials, and details. In such cases, simple and elegant design will be preferred, where the new development is clearly identifiable from, but an integral part of, the original building. The proposal would be considered to achieve this policy consideration through a contrasting element to the original building whilst positively integrating and cohesively combining the original dwelling within the proposed development.

It was suggested to the applicant to introduce some fenestration and openings which would be obscurely glazed to serve non-habitable rooms to help break up blank gable walling. No such openings were incorporated into the revised submission, however, it is not considered that this would result in any significant adverse harm on the design as most of the proposed side elevation would be facing the opposite gable wall and would not hold a prominent position in the street scene to cause adverse harm.

The first-floor rear elevation of the proposed development would also see the inclusion of a Juliette balcony. The design is slightly incongruous to the rest of the proposal, however, would not be an unacceptable feature.

Overall, it is considered that the proposed development would have an acceptable

design and would be in accord with the Householder Development SPD and Saved Policy H8.

Residential Amenity

The Householder Development SPD states that two-storey side extensions should be designed to avoid having an overbearing effect or causing unacceptable loss of light or privacy for neighbours. It also states proposed developments should avoid creating a terracing effect, either by themselves or in conjunction with similar extensions which may exist or potentially be proposed for adjacent properties in the future.

The Householder Development SPD also states that usually either a minimum space of 1m should be preserved between the extension and the party boundary to the side of the property, OR the front wall of the first floor of the extension should be set back at least 1m from the immediately adjoining part of the main front wall of the original dwelling.

The Householder Development SPD further stipulates that this requirement may be relaxed if, because of a staggered or irregular arrangement of the dwellings in the street or corner location, the construction of the extension would not create an actual or potential terracing effect.

The application property is a detached dwelling, which does sit in line with the front elevation of the adjacent dwelling. The front wall of the first floor of the extension would be set back by 2.1m from the immediately adjoining part of the main wall of the original dwelling, therefore would comply with this policy requirement and prevent any potential or actual terracing effect occurring and would be acceptable.

The proposed Juliette balcony would not be considered an unacceptable element or cause any significant adverse harm on residential amenities. It would not offer any excessively greater opportunity for overlooking and would predominately offer views from the rear elevation. It is considered that the rear elevations and gardens of the opposite properties are located with a sufficient interface distance to prevent any unacceptable overlooking or loss of privacy. Although the Juliette balcony is not a desirable element of the proposal, the Local Planning Authority would not seek to resist this given the site context.

33 Middlehey Avenue

No.33 is the detached dwellinghouse situated to the north/north-west from the application property. The front building lines of No.33 sit in line with the application site (which includes a matching front porch extension). No.33 benefits from a two-storey rear extension, a single storey rear extension and a detached garage to the side of the rear extensions. The two gable walls of the properties face each other at an approximate interface distance of 4.9m.

The gable wall of No.33 features 5 openings in total, the ground floor includes one access door (with a window) and a window (which is obscurely glazed), one obscurely glazed window serves the staircase in the middle of the gable wall. The first-floor includes two windows, one being obscurely glazed and the other is assumed to serve a bedroom.

The proposed development would leave 2.6m between the two gable walls of the properties. It is acknowledged that there would be a level of light lost and

overshadowing present, however, given the interface distance that would remain between the two gable walls, this would not be considered to an unacceptable degree. It is considered that No.33 would still receive an adequate amount of light.

The proposals other elements would otherwise not be considered to result in an unacceptable impact. The front and rear projections are not considered to have a detrimental effect.

Overall, the proposed development would largely be in accord with the Householder Development and would not be considered to cause any significant harm to the amenities or privacy of the occupants of no.33.

37 Middlehey Avenue

No.37 is the detached dwellinghouse situated to the south-west from the application site. The front elevation of the dwelling is set closer to the highway by approximately 5.5m in contrast to the application site. The original rear elevation of the application property is set further back by approximately 2.3m to the existing rear elevation of No.33. No.37 benefits from a single storey rear extension (adjoined with a garage conversion) and adjacent a rear conservatory. The rear roof slope and loft space has also been converted into living space and a rear full width dormer.

The proposed two-storey extension would not hold a prominent view to No.37. The front extension would also not hold a readily visible position when observed from No.37. The most prominent change to the outlook and views would come from the proposed rear extension. This has been addressed in the earlier design extension that on the planning balance, it is accepted that the level of harm would not be severe; The proposed rear extension has been reduced in its height (in appearance when observed from No.37 due to the 0.6m excavation and lowering of its internal ground level.) This would mean that despite the depth, it would only project above the boundary treatment between the plots at an approximate height of 0.5m. This would not be considered to result in any significant adverse harm.

Given the arrangement of the dwellings and the set-back of the rear elevations, the 45-degree rule is breached easily. The original submission would have resulted in a level of harm which would have been adverse, the reduction of the height would reduce its overall impact through it appearing unduly dominant and its impact on residential and visual amenities. Additionally, both properties are built 2m away from the party boundary (this includes any extensions) and subsequently, the impact of the proposal would be mitigated further, given that the closest room of No.37 is a conservatory with high levels of glazing, it would not be considered that any significant overshadowing or loss of light would occur to an unacceptable degree.

Overall, the proposed development would largely be in accord with the Householder Development and would not be considered to cause any significant harm to the amenities or privacy of the occupants of no.37.

Highways

The proposed development would retain the existing hardstanding. This would ensure that 2 spaces remain in use within the curtilage of the dwelling. Given that the number of bedrooms would go to 3 (assuming that the loft conversion has been converted to a habitable room which provides a further bedroom, the number of bedrooms would be 4 at a worst-case scenario.) It would be acceptable that any third

space required could be provided by on-street parking to the front of the property.

The Householder Development states that for development which results in the number of bedrooms going to 4+ then 3 spaces should be provided. These are maximum standards however, and therefore 2 spaces retained within the curtilage, would be deemed acceptable. It was noted during the site visit that a level of on-street parking occurs in the locality without compromising highway safety.

Overall, the proposed development would be in accord with the Householder Development SPD and would not be considered to cause any adverse harm to highway safety.

Other Issues

The Householder Development SPD states that proposals should ensure that adequate provision is made / retained for refuse collection and recycling. Ideally a minimum distance of 1m should be retained between the side wall of any side extension and boundary to facilitate collection. This may not always be practicable, particularly in cases where houses have very narrow plots. Extensions which removed access to the rear of a dwelling will normally only be acceptable if a secure bin store or alternative arrangements can be provided to the front of the dwelling, which would not have a detrimental impact on the street scene.

The application site would retain the access to the other side of the dwelling (east facing) and could store bins to the rear of the property. The proposed development has included garage storage, which would be an alternative arrangement to accommodate bins and refuse collection which were previously stored to the other gable wall of the dwelling. Either or arrangement would satisfy the guidance of the Householder Development SPD.

Conclusion

The proposal would be acceptable in terms of design, residential amenity and highways. The proposal also complies with the relevant Core Strategy, Replacement UDP policies and guidance in the NPPF and is therefore recommended for approval subject to conditions.

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) 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 Saved Policy H8 of the Knowsley Replacement Unitary Development Plan, adopted in June 2006, Policy CS19 of the Knowsley Local Plan Core Strategy, adopted January 2016, and the National Planning Policy Framework.

SCHEDULE 1

Date Received	Ref. No	Version	Drawing/Document Title
17/04/2024	-	-	LOCATION PLAN. PROPSOED BLOCK PLAN & SITE PLAN.
01/07/2024	1051/24	REV A	PROPOSED PLANS & ELEVATIONS

Signed Case Officer¹: **Reece Black**

Signed Authorising Officer²: **K Foster**

Date: **4 July 2024**

Informatives

Not applicable.

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