

<u>APPLICATION NO:</u>	23/00140/FUL	<u>CASE OFFICER:</u>	Andrew Hunt
<u>WARD:</u>	Roby	<u>PARISH:</u>	NA
<u>LOCATION:</u>	15 Springwell Avenue, Roby, Knowsley, L36 9AB		
<u>PROPOSAL:</u>	ERECTION OF A TWO STOREY SIDE AND REAR EXTENSION		

Site Description

The application site is a Detached house in a residential area. The site is situated on Springwell Avenue, Roby.

Proposal

The proposal is for the erection of a two storey side and rear extension. The extension would project around 3.9 metres at the rear and would be around 6.36 metres wide.

Consultations

N/A

Representations

This application has been publicised by letters sent to 10 neighbours. 2 objections have been received consisting of the following main points:

- The proposal will infringe on the privacy of our home.
- The proposed double extension would encroach 4 meters closer to our property with large windows facing directly into our property.
- This would considerably reduce privacy in our garden, dining room, kitchen and child's bedroom at the back of the house.
- We are also concerned about a potential loss of light into our garden and light pollution coming from the proposed extension with it being so close to our property.
- The application will cause loss of sunlight to our garden.

Planning History

None relevant.

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that accord with an up-to-date development plan without delay; or where the development plan is absent, silent or out of date planning permission should be granted unless the application of policies in the NPPF that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a clear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

Street Scene

The extension would not be readily visible from the street scene with only a small side part of the extension being visible from the front. This would be pitched like the existing roof and would be set back from the front of the dwelling. Therefore, the proposal is in accordance with the Householder Development SPD. Overall, there would be no harm to the street scene from the proposal.

Neighbour Amenity

In relation to 11, this property already extends further back than 15 and does not have windows on the side of the house. The extension would only extend marginally beyond 11. Therefore, there would not be harm to the amenity of 11.

In relation to 6 Olive Grove, there would be a distance of around 14 metres from the extension to the nearest habitable room window of no 6. This is an acceptable distance in relation to outlook and loss of light, as the extension would be over 6.5 metres away from the boundary. In terms of loss of light, due to the extension being to the west of 6, there would only be a loss of sunlight in the March to September period in the late afternoon (between around 5:20 and 7) and no loss of direct sunlight in winter as the sun does not reach far enough to the west. The loss would be in the later afternoon, be minor in scope and be in the summer months when there is the most sunlight. Therefore, there would not be significant loss of sunlight to number 6.

However, there are issues with privacy. The first floor side window of the extension would directly face no 6 and would be in sufficiently close proximity to affect the privacy of number 6. In particular, they would reduce privacy in the garden area of 6 and the main habitable room windows at the rear of 6. However, this privacy impact could be mitigated with a planning condition to require the side windows to be obscure glazed and non-opening. With this condition there would be no harm to the amenity of 6.

In relation to 7 and 9 Larch Road, the extension would be slightly closer to them than the existing dwelling, however, the extension would only be slightly closer than the existing dwelling of 11. There would still be a gap of over 20 metres between the original dwellings of 7 and 9 and the proposed extension. Overall, it is considered that there would not be significant loss of light or privacy 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 from 3 to 4. There are currently 2 parking spaces at the property, this would remain the same. This is slightly less than the 3 normally required, there is not sufficient space within the site to accommodate 3 spaces. Therefore, the relevant issue is whether there would be significant harm to highway safety. The shortfall would be minor (1 space) and the road is a minor road within a housing estate (rather than a busy main road). Therefore, it is considered that any harm from lack of parking would not be severe enough to warrant refusal and that the application complies with NPPF para 111.

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. Site Plans - 3 - Rev C - (received 24/04/2023).
 - b. Proposed Plans and Elevations 2 – Rev C - (received 13/03/2023).

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.

- 4) **Obscure Glazing**

The proposed First Floor Side window shall be:

- a. Obscure glazed, and
- b. non-opening unless the parts of the window which can be opened are more than 1.7 metres above the floor of the room in which the window is installed

Reason: In order to protect the privacy of number 6 Olive Grove.

Signed Case Officer¹:

Andrew Hunt

**Signed Authorising
Officer²:**

K Foster

Date:

25 April 2023

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

Appendix 1 – Site Photographs



