

Regeneration and Economic Development Department

APPLICATION NO: 21/00883/FUL **APPLICANT:** Ms Cathy O'Shanghnessy

WARD AFFECTED: Halewood North

DEVELOPMENT: ERECTION OF A PART TWO-STOREY/PART SINGLE STOREY EXTENSION TO THE REAR (DEMOLITION OF EXISTING CONSERVATORY), PLUS REAR DORMER, TOGETHER WITH THE ADDITION OF A FIRST FLOOR EXTENSION OVER THE EXISTING GARAGE WITH ALTERATIONS TO THE EXISTING ROOF AND WINDOWS TO THE FRONT OF DWELLING, INCREASE IN SIZE OF BAY WINDOW TO THE FRONT ELEVATION .

LOCATION OF SITE: 23 Woodbridge Avenue, Halewood, L26 7XH

KNOWSLEY LOCAL PLAN ALLOCATION –

Primary Residential Development - Primary Residential Development

RELEVANT POLICIES

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

National Planning Policy Framework

TECHNICAL CONSULTATIONS:

Halewood Town Council - No Comments Received

NEIGHBOUR NOTIFICATION:

This application has been publicised by letters sent to 7 neighbours.

There have been 3 letters of objection (2 from the same occupier) and 1 letter of support. The representations are summarised as follows:-

Objections

- The proposal would block the light into 7 & 9 Blackberry Grove and their gardens. There is already poor light into the property.
- The view from the garden would be all brick building, the little view currently available would be removed.
- The garden and dwellings to No 7 & 9 would be overlooked due to the installation of 1st floor windows.
- It would reduce the property price.
- Would the loft conversion be classed as permitted development and would not be high enough to accommodate the required ceiling height as per the plans , a taller roof would be required.

Support

- The dwelling needs modernisation being 30 years old.
- Contemporary look is amazing and can only increase value of the houses in the street.
- The extension with extra space and open plan layout would help them manage family life much better.
- The loft would add more flexibility without adding much to the size of the building.

The reduction in property prices would not be material to the consideration of this application.

The loft conversion would not be classed as permitted development as this would result in an increase in the ridge height of the dwelling. The floor to ceiling height in the dormer is considered to be acceptable and would be in compliance with building regulations.

PLANNING HISTORY

None relevant

ARTICLE 35

The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by identifying matters of concern with the proposal and discussing those with the applicant. However, the issues are so fundamental to the proposal that it has not been possible to negotiate a satisfactory way forward and due to the harm which has been clearly identified within the reason for the refusal, approval has not been possible.

ISSUES AND ASSESSMENT:

PROPOSAL

This application relates to a detached dwelling situated at the end of Woodbridge Avenue, Halewood. The dwelling is two-storey and has a double garage located in front of it, the property is in a housing estate that includes a number of dwellings of similar character and the site is adjoined on all sides by residential properties.

It is proposed to erect a part two storey, part single storey extension to the rear of the dwelling (resulting in the demolition of an existing conservatory) ,the erection of a dormer extension to the rear of the dwelling, the erection of a first floor extension over the existing garage to the front with consequential alterations to the roof and windows of the existing dwelling and the increase in size of a ground floor bay window and installation of the first floor window to the front elevation.

POLICY CONSIDERATIONS

The site is allocated as a primarily residential area and therefore the principle of an extension to a dwelling would be acceptable subject to the detailed issues relating to design, appearance and impacts on amenity set out in the sections below.

DESIGN AND LAYOUT

The existing dwelling was built in the early 1990's. The surrounding area comprises dwellings of a similar age and are predominantly detached dwellings. The dwellings are predominantly brick built with some elements of render to the upper floors.

The proposed extensions would significantly alter the character & appearance of the existing dwelling.

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

- The proposals would not result in a disproportionate addition to the original dwelling
- The design and materials would reflect those used in the original dwelling
- The proposal would not adversely affect the amenity or privacy of occupiers of adjacent dwellings.

Policy CS19 in the Core Strategy Local Plan states that to enhance local distinctiveness, identity and accessibility of places, new development in Knowsley will be expected to:

- Respond to and integrate positive characteristics of immediate surroundings, including local materials, scale, mass, form

Policy CS19 also states that to maintain a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings, development proposals will be expected to:

- Avoid unacceptable impacts on existing residents, business occupiers and future occupiers

The Householder Development SPD provided guidance on the implementation of Policies H8 and CS19 in respect to front extensions paragraph 7.5 states the following guidelines shall apply “ style, design, materials and scale of front extensions and porches should respect the character of the surrounding residential area”.

The proposed front extensions and extension over the garage would not respect the character of the existing dwelling or surrounding residential area, they would appear as alien features which are a disproportionate addition to the dwelling and the design would fail to respect the design and appearance of the original dwelling resulting in an incongruous feature which causes harm to the appearance of the dwelling and its surroundings.

It is acknowledged that the dwelling is located in a cul-de-sac, however, the site would still be visible from the surrounding area and this would not make the development acceptable.

The rear extension is acceptable in terms of design, the proposed dormers whilst not a characteristic of the area are relatively small in size and would not be detrimental to the street scene or visual/ residential amenity.

The ridge height of the existing dwelling would be increased from 7.3m to 7.64m in height. This has been reduced from 8m on the original proposal. In terms of design this minor increase in ridge height would not be detrimental to the street scene to warrant a reason for refusal.

RESIDENTIAL AMENITY

The main issues would be the impact on the amenity on the occupiers of Nos 7 & 9 Blackberry Grove and 25 Woodbridge Avenue.

25 Woodbridge Avenue

It should be noted that the occupiers of this dwelling support the proposal. This property is set approximately 1.95m further back than the applicant's property and has a conservatory to the rear of the dwelling projecting 3.4m out from the rear elevation.

The proposed rear 2 storey extension would project 4m from the existing rear elevation (following the demolition of the conservatory). The householder SPD states that two storey rear extensions exceeding 3m are only acceptable if they do not breach the 45 degree rule from the nearest habitable room window in the neighbouring property. The proposed rear extension would not extend further than the existing conservatory at No 25. However the two storey rear extension would result in some loss of light / overshadowing to the side of the conservatory which is predominately glazed but this would not warrant a refusal of permission. In terms of the impact on the nearest habitable first floor window the proposed extension would not breach the 45 rule.

The rear extension would leave a rear garden depth of approximately 8.4m.

In conclusion the proposed two storey rear extension would not have any adverse impact on the occupiers of 25 Woodbridge Avenue.

7 & 9 Blackberry Grove

The proposed extensions would be sited approximately 1-1.5m from the rear garden boundaries of no's 7 & 9 Blackberry Grove.

The existing garage, dwelling and conservatory on the application site extend for 19.8m along the rear boundary of these two dwellings. However only 7.5m of this length comprises the two storey dwelling. The remaining 12.3m comprises single storey elements of the existing dwelling and conservatory extension.

The proposal comprises a two storey building with a cumulative length of 18.5m (the existing dwelling and proposed extensions) along the majority of the rear boundary of these 2 dwellings. The proposal includes a hall, toilet and two kitchen/dining windows to the ground floor and an ensuite, bathroom and small living room to the first floor. (the living room is proposed to have obscured glazing). The ground floor windows would be predominately obscured by the existing boundary fence and providing the first floor windows would obscurely glazed then there would be no loss of privacy to the occupiers of 7 and 9 Blackberry Grove.

The expanse of a two storey building close to the boundary of these dwellings would be extremely overbearing for the occupiers of Nos 7 & 9 and as such the massing of this building would be detrimental to the amenity of the occupiers of these dwellings it would also result in some overshadowing to the gardens of these dwellings.

As such the combination of the existing dwelling, two storey rear extension and first floor extension above the existing garage /dining room would be detrimental to the amenity of the occupiers of Nos 7 & 9 Blueberry Grove . As such the proposal would be contrary to saved UDP policy H8 , Local Plan policies CS2 and CS19 and the householder development SPD.

21 Woodbridge Avenue

The proposed rear extension would have no impact on the occupiers of No 21.

The first floor extension over the garage would be adjacent to a small part of the rear garden to No 21. This would result in some loss of light to a small area of the rear garden to No 21 however this would not be so significant to warrant a reason for refusal.

HIGHWAY SAFETY

The property benefits from a double garage and a drive way which can accommodate three vehicles.

The number of bedrooms in the property would remain at 4 following the extension. Therefore no additional car parking would be required for this proposal.

OTHER ISSUES

None

CONCLUSION & REASON FOR DECISION

The proposed extensions would be detrimental to the amenity of the occupiers of 7 and 9 Blackberry Grove due to the scale, height and massing of the extensions and their position close to the rear boundaries of Nos 7 and 9.

The design of the proposed dormer window and windows to the stairs to the front elevation would be an incongruous design feature out of character with the existing dwelling and would therefore be detrimental to visual amenity and the street scene.

As such the proposals would fail to comply with Local Plan policies CS2 and CS19 , saved UDP policy H8 and guidance contained within the Householder Development Supplementary Planning Document.

RECOMMENDATION:

That planning permission be refused subject for the following reasons :

1. The proposed extensions by reason of the scale, height and massing in close proximity to the common boundary with 7 & 9 Blackberry Grove would give rise to undue overshadowing, visual intrusion, and an unduly overbearing effect to the detriment of the amenity that the adjoining occupants could reasonably expect to enjoy. As such the proposal would be contrary to Policies CS2 and CS19 of the Knowsley Local Plan Core Strategy adopted January 2016 ,Saved Policy H8 of the Knowsley Replacement Unitary Development Plan, adopted June 2006 and the Householder Development Supplementary Guidance Note ,June 2016
2. The proposal would produce an incongruous design feature out of keeping with the existing dwelling and alien to the visual amenity and character of the street scene. As such the proposal would be contrary to Policies CS2, CS19 of the Knowsley Local Plan Core Strategy adopted January 2016, Saved Policy H8 of the Knowsley Replacement Unitary Development Plan, adopted June 2006 and the Householder Development Supplementary Guidance Note June 2016.

Mark Quinn
9 May 2022

Alan Kilroe
12 May 2022