

<u>APPLICATION NO:</u>	25/00162/FUL	<u>CASE OFFICER:</u>	Reece Black
<u>WARD:</u>	St Gabriels	<u>PARISH:</u>	Tarbock Parish Council
<u>LOCATION:</u>	12 Biglands Drive, Huyton, Knowsley		
<u>PROPOSAL:</u>	ERECTION OF FIRST FLOOR SIDE AND REAR EXTENSIONS		

Site Description

The application site is located at 12 Biglands Drive, Huyton and is located within a Primary Residential Area. The application property is a detached, two-storey dwellinghouse. The property is a standalone dwelling, situated within a discrete location set-back from the street scene by a sufficient distance (of over 25m). The plot is an irregular shape.

The application property benefits from both an existing single storey side and single storey rear extension. There are 2 no. detached outbuildings located within the plot, one adjacent the north-west facing side elevation of the dwelling and the other located just beyond the front elevation of the dwelling (to the south/south-west of the property).

The front garden area is surfaced by a tarmac driveway which covers a large expanse of the front elevation of the property to the highway of Biglands Drive. To the east and south of the property are residential properties and to the north and west of the site is a dense line of tree coverage, with other residential properties situated to the west separated by the highway of Huyton Brook and further to the north lies Tarbock Road (A5080).

Proposal

The proposal is for the erection of first-floor side and rear extensions.

The proposed first-floor side extension would have a width of 1.9m and a depth of 7.2m. The proposed first-floor rear extension would have a depth of 4.1m and a width of 5.9m. Both projections would be served by a hipped roof, which would attain a height of 5.2m at the eaves and 7.3m at the ridgeline. The proposal would see alterations to the existing roofscape of the property from a pyramid roof to a hipped roof; the proposed projections would not display any lowered ridgelines.

Consultations

Tarbock Parish Council – No comments received.

Representations

This application has been publicised by letters sent to 11 neighbours. It has also been advertised by site notice. No representations have been received.

Planning History

No relevant recorded planning history.

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.

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

DQ3 - Gateway Sites and Corridors

SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENTS (SPDs)

Householder Development SPD (2016)

New Residential Development SPD (2018)

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

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*

Saved Policy DQ3 in the Replacement Unitary Development Plan states *that new development proposals which are within or adjacent to, or visible from, any of the following road and rail routes within Knowsley should seek to enhance the visual appearance of the route.* The A5080 (Tarbock Road/Cronton Road) is listed as one of the road routes.

DESIGN AND RESIDENTIAL AMENITY

First-floor side extension

The Householder Development SPD outlines that *two storey side extensions (and provision of first floors over existing single storey side extensions) should be designed to avoid having an overbearing effect or causing unacceptable loss of light or privacy for neighbours. They should also 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 SPD advises that set-ins or set-backs should be incorporated into the design of two-storey side extensions to prevent any potential or actual terracing effect from occurring, however, the SPD also allows for leniency to this policy guidance if, *because of staggered or irregular arrangement of the dwelling in the street or corner location, the construction of the extension would not create an actual or potential terracing effect.* Therefore, given the standalone nature of the application property, the proposed development would not result in any actual or potential terracing effect and therefore no set-ins or set-backs are required.

The SPD also outlines that the roof the extension should normally be at a lower level than the original. The proposal would involve alterations to the roof from the original pyramid roof to a hipped roof; however, the proposed projections would not be served by roofs set at a lower level than the original and would directly extend the ridgeline of the main roof of the dwelling. This conventionally, would be something that the Local Planning Authority would vehemently oppose, however, due to the site context factors of the application property, such as its location as a standalone property and in a discrete location with sufficient set-back from the street scene, this deviation from policy would not be considered to result in any significantly harmful appearance or severely harm the street scene (including views from Tarbock Road,

which due to the dense tree coverage along the boundary, would not have any detrimental impact by its appearance). The rooflines would be considered acceptable and would result in a coherent hipped roof appearance across the overall dwelling. Due to the absence of lowered ridgelines of the proposed projections, it would result in the application property having an enlarged appearance in contrast to its existing form and massing, however, it is considered that there is adequate space within the plot to ensure that the proposal would not present as unduly dominant or incongruous by its design; the scale would remain akin to other properties in the wider locality.

The proposed first-floor side extension would be built directly on top of the existing ground floor side extension at the application property and would be erected adjacent the party boundary shared with No.5 Barker Close with a marginal overhang (of gutters and corner of rooftiles) into the rear garden of No.5 from the corner of the proposal. The proposed side extension would be erected with an interface distance of 11m at the closest; the New Residential Development SPD (Appendix 4: Interface Distances) stipulates that minimum interface distances for principal elevations to side elevations should retain at 12m.

Therefore, the proposed side extension would not comply with this guidance, which would raise concerns by harm to residential amenities, predominantly by way of undue dominance and an overbearing appearance to the rear garden and rear elevation of No.5, however, it is also considered that the shortfall in interface distance would be the closest point between the proposed extension and the rear elevation of No.5 and that given the diagonal orientation of the application property, the proposed extension would gradually increase the interface distance and gradually alleviate any impression of undue dominance and overbearing appearance.

There is an outbuilding contained within the rear garden of No.5 situated adjacent where the proposed development would overhang and adjacent the tree line which straddles the party boundary with the application property and No.7 Barker Close, there are already constraints to openness and the proposal would not significantly erode this. For these reasons and the sense of enclosed space that is already present to this area due to the existing gable wall of the application property, its existing side extension, the outbuilding within the garden of No.5 and the tree line all converging to the area where the interface distance falls short, it would not be considered sufficient to maintain that the proposal would unacceptably exacerbate by undue dominance or loss of outlook within the site context. Moreover, given the oblique arrangement of the application site which pulls away from the rear garden and rear elevation of No.5, it would ameliorate the impact from the proposal, which due to these reasons outlined, it would not be considered that any impacts caused from the proposal would be sufficient to warrant a refusal.

The side elevation of the proposed side extension would contain 1 no. window, which would serve a bathroom and not a habitable room, however, a condition will be included to ensure that this would be constructed with obscure-glazing to minimise any overlooking or perception of overlooking into the garden / rear elevation of No.5. This would further ensure the impacts of the proposal are mitigated and for the reasons set out in the report, would not result in any unacceptable harm to the amenities and privacy of the occupants of No.5. The proposed side extension is not considered to result in any significant impact to residential amenities for the occupants of the properties of No's 1 or 5 Barker Close.

No.10 Biglands Drive is a detached dwelling, situated to the south/south-west of the application property at an interface distance of 15.6m, with an oblique relationship

between the two properties. The New Residential Development SPD (Appendix 4: interface distances) stipulate that development should retain 22m interface distances between existing rear principal elevations and proposed principal elevations for two storey properties. The front elevation of the side extension would contain 1 no. window, although this elevation would not meet the interface distance set out in the Appendix 4, the application property is not orientated with a direct view concentrated to the rear elevation of No.10. Given the existing oblique relationship and arrangement of these properties, it is not considered that any direct overlooking or visual intrusion into the rear elevation of No.10 would occur. The proposal would not result in any significantly greater views into the rear garden of No.10 than the existing views from the application property and therefore no unacceptable impacts to residential amenity and privacy are raised.

First-floor rear extension:

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*. It also states *a two-storey rear extensions of up to 3m will normally be acceptable and extensions beyond 3m will only be acceptable if they do not breach the 45-degree rule*.

The proposed rear projection would project 4.1m from the original rear elevation of the dwelling, which is in excess of the 3m policy guidance. Given the property does not contain any properties in a building line either side the proposed rear projection would not impact on any nearby properties. The side elevation of the proposed rear extension would be located over 12.5m from the closest property (the rear elevation of No.5 Barker Close). Therefore, the depth of the proposed rear extension would not raise any design concerns or result in any unacceptable impacts to residential amenities. Furthermore, windows are concentrated to the rear elevation and subsequently do not raise any concerns from overlooking and visual intrusion into neighbouring gardens and dwellings.

The Householder Development SPD asserts that two-storey rear extensions would not normally be allowed to come within 7 metres from the rear boundary. At its closest, the two-storey rear extension would be situated 5.6m away from the rear boundary of the plot, whilst the 1.4m shortfall is considered a sizeable conflict, it is not considered that this would result in any severe harm to the street scene and it is Officers' opinion that some leniency can be applied to this point for several reasons. As outlined, the plot is of an irregular shape and this is the closest the proposal would come to the rear boundary, due to the layout of the plot, this distance generously increases in other parts. Moreover, the section of the rear boundary situated 5.6m from the rear elevation of the property, is set back from Tarbock Road by over 16m, which is considered more than ample distance to ensure that the proposal would not result in any detrimental harm from its visual appearance; this is further mitigated by the dense tree line coverage. Therefore, although a section of the proposed rear projection would conflict with this specific policy point, it would not be considered to result in any significant harm by design. Moreover, given that the built form of the proposed development when completed would not project any closer to Tarbock Road and break that building line of other residential properties in the locality, it would not result in any unacceptable harm to views from Tarbock Road and would broadly comply with H5 and DQ3 of the Knowsley Replacement UDP.

Materials:

The submitted plans do not contain any information on exterior materials for the proposed development, however, a condition for matching materials would be included to ensure that the external walls, fenestration and roof tiles would match the existing dwelling. For the avoidance of doubt this condition will include the brick detailing to the elevations found on the existing dwelling to be emulated to the proposed development.

HIGHWAYS

The existing property contains 2 no. bedrooms. The proposal would introduce an additional bedroom and increase this to 3 no. bedrooms. The existing parking at the property comprises of a generous amount of hardstanding to the front of the property which can accommodate several vehicles. The Householder Development SPD requires that 2-3 bedroom properties should provide 2 no. parking spaces within the curtilage of the dwelling. The existing parking provisions at the property are adequate. The proposal does not raise any highway safety or inadequate parking concerns and would be acceptable.

OTHER ISSUES:

SITE CONSTRAINTS

The application site is identified as a low-risk area for previous coal mining activity as well as a constraint for the Environment Agency for a river buffer. Given that the proposed development would be for first-floor extensions built above existing ground floor extensions and no increase to the existing footprint of the dwelling, it would not be necessary to include standard informatives for the issue of low-risk area for previous coal mining or consult the Environment Agency.

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. For the avoidance of doubt this will include any brick detailing of the existing dwellinghouse being carried over and emulated to the external elevations of the proposed development, hereby permitted.

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.

- 4) No part of the development hereby permitted shall be used or occupied until the proposed window on the first-floor side elevation of the first-floor side extension as indicated on the approved plan (Dwg Ref: Proposed Plans, Dwg. No: 002) has been glazed with obscure glass to level 4/5. The window shall be retained as such with level 4/5 obscure glazing at all times thereafter.

Reason: In order to safeguard the residential amenities enjoyed by the occupants of adjoining residential property and to ensure the development complies with Policies CS2 and CS19 of the Knowsley Local Plan Core Strategy and Saved Policy H8 of the Knowsley Replacement Unitary Development Plan, adopted in June 2006, and the National Planning Policy Framework.

SCHEDULE 1

Date Received	Ref. No	Version	Drawing/Document Title
14/04/2025	002	-	PROPOSED PLANS AND ELEVATIONS
14/04/2025	003	-	LOCATION PLAN AND BLOCK PLAN

Signed Case Officer¹:

Reece Black

**Signed Authorising
Officer²:**

Jo Sheridan

Date:

04/07/2025

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