

APPLICATION NO: 23/02696/FUL **CASE OFFICER:** Andrew Hunt

WARD: Halewood North **PARISH:** Halewood
Town Council

LOCATION: 14 Woodpecker Drive, Halewood, Knowsley, L26 7XU

PROPOSAL: ERECTION OF TWO STOREY REAR EXTENSION

Site Description

The application site is a Detached house in a residential area at Woodpecker Drive. The site is bounded by residential properties to the north, west, south and east. It is situated in the middle of a close (Woodpecker Drive) which is off Okell Drive.

Proposal

The proposal is for the erection of two storey rear extension. The extension would extend 4 metres at the rear of the existing dwelling. The extensions is narrower at first floor level than ground floor with a partially stepped profile. The proposed 1st floor rear window has been amended and now consists of a short but wide window at the top of the room. There is an additional 1st floor window on the side of the extension and windows on the side and rear at ground floor level.

Consultations

N/A

Representations

This application has been publicised by letters sent to 8 neighbours. 2 Objections have been submitted consisting of the following main points:

- The extension will cause loss of light to my property including the patio area and dining room.
- The building will jut out at least 2 metres and will form an unattractive blank wall.
- I was not told of the extension.
- The extension would cause loss of light and privacy and would be too close to our house.
- Construction vehicle will cause noise and pollution.

Planning History

N/A

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that accord with an up-to-date development plan without delay; or where the development plan is absent, silent or out of date planning permission should be granted unless the application of policies in the NPPF that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a clear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.

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)

H8 - Extensions and Alterations to Residential Properties

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

Character of Area

The extension would be pitched in accordance with the main dwelling and would not be a disproportionate addition. In relation to the wall being blank this is typical of an extension and not out of character. Therefore, there would be no harm to the character of the area.

Neighbour Amenity

16 Woodpecker Drive

In relation to 16 Woodpecker Drive, the extension would extend 4 metres at the rear, however, number 16 currently extends past 14 by around 1.8 metres. This means that the extension would project around 2.2 metres beyond the rear of no 16. This is in accordance with Para 7.4 of the Householder SPD which states that:

“Two storey extensions of up to 3 metres will normally be acceptable”.

Overall, whilst there would be some loss of light and outlook to the garden and dining room, the extension would not cause significant harm and complies with planning policy.

12 Woodpecker Drive

In relation to 12 Woodpecker Drive, the extension would take place on the opposite side away from 12 and would not impact on their amenity from loss of light or outlook. The side window would not affect privacy as it is set back from the boundary.

15 Bunting Court

In relation to the property at the rear (15 Bunting Court), the distance between the extension and 15 would be around 16.8m.

The standards for distances between dwelling is the following:

- 22 metres between the rear of dwellings with windows. (Privacy)
- 12 metres from a rear elevation to a gable. (Light and Outlook).

The 22 metre distance is to protect privacy whilst the 12 metre distance relates to protecting light and outlook.

Another relevant consideration is that a 3 metre long 2 storey rear extension could be erected without planning permission with a full window.

The extension has been amended to change the window to a tall and short window. This will restrict views from the extension and will preserve the privacy of properties opposite such as 15. The privacy impacts of the extension will therefore be more similar to a blank gable than a full window. As a result, it is considered that 16.8 metres is considered an acceptable distance between dwellings due to the nature of the rear 1st floor window which will not readily allow views of dwellings opposite. It would also be less harmful to the amenity of 15 than the permitted development fallback position which would allow unrestricted views.

In relation to loss of light and outlook, there would not be significant harm to the

amenity of 15 as the extension would be over 16 metres away. Overall, there will not be significant harm to 15 from the proposal.

In conclusion there would not be significant harm to residential amenity from the proposal.

Highway Safety

NPPF para 111 states that development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe.

The proposal would increase the number of bedrooms. However, there are currently at 3 parking spaces at the site (2 front spaces and a garage). This meets the 3 spaces required by the council guidelines for a 3 bedroom property. Therefore, sufficient parking is provided within the site and the application complies with NPPF para 111.

In terms of construction disruption due to parking, due to the scale of development, this would not be significantly harmful to highway safety.

Other Considerations

In terms of pollution during construction, this is true of all construction work and would not be reason to refuse the scheme. The impacts caused by construction works are for a temporary period only and should issues arise separate legislation exists to deal with any issues.

Whilst it is good practise to notify neighbours before submitting a planning application, the applicant is not required to carry out their own notification exercise.

Conclusion

The proposal would be acceptable in relation to Street scene, Neighbour amenity and highway safety. The application complies with local planning policies and is recommended for approval.

Recommendation

That planning permission be granted subject to the following conditions.

- 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 following approved plans and documents :-

- a. Proposed Plans and Elevations – Rev C - (received 8/012/2023).
- b. Location Plan - (received 04/10/2023).

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 Policy 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.

Signed Case Officer¹: **Andrew Hunt**

Signed Authorising Officer²: **K Foster**

Date: **11 December 2023**

Informatives

N/A

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

