

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 April 2024

by S. Hartley BA (Hons) Dist.TP(Manc) DMS MRTPI MRICS

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 May 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/V4305/D/24/3337681

5 Knowsley Park Lane, Prescott L34 3NA

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mrs Debra Weild against the decision of Knowsley Council.
 - The application ref 23/02778/FUL, dated 22 September 2023, was refused by notice dated 24 January 2024.
 - The development proposed is two storey pitched roof extension to the front and side and a single storey pitched roof extension to the rear.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issue is the effect of the development upon the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two storey, brick, detached dwelling set within a residential area and within a line of similarly detached, gabled dwellings with roofs running parallel with the road in front. There is generally a common building line and the houses have landscaped gardens to their frontages and bordering the footpath and road.
4. The host property, like several of the other adjoining dwellings, has an access drive leading to a single width garage. The proposal is to demolish the garage and the single storey attachment behind it and to construct a two-storey extension in its place. The proposal includes a single storey extension along the whole of the rear of the property and also a two-storey-high, double pitched front porch.
5. The local planning authority (LPA) raises no objections to either the proposed rear extension or the front porch. I have no reason to disagree.
6. The two-storey proposed side extension, while having a width slightly less than the single storey garage /store which it would replace, would nevertheless be very close to the common boundary with no.3 Knowsley Park Lane. While the submitted plans do not state the actual distance, my estimate is that it would

be very close to the boundary. In addition, the proposed extension would align with the front elevation of the host property and with no set-back from it at either first or second floor levels. The proposed roof to the extension would be at the same height as that of the host property with no set-down.

7. While the detached houses in the immediate area are generally close together, they nonetheless have a spacious appearance, created in part by the single storey side garages which permit views above them. The spaciousness adds distinctively and positively to the character and appearance of the area.
8. The LPA, in its Householder Development Supplementary Planning Document 2016 (SPD), aims to retain such spaciousness by avoiding a terracing effect by extensions. To this end, the SPD advocates that two storey side extensions should be a minimum of 1 metre from any joint boundary with its neighbouring property or should be set back at first floor level by one metre from the front elevation of the host property. The SPD also advocates that an extension should be set down below the ridge of the main dwelling.
9. In this instance, the appellant notes that the existing extension to No. 3 Knowsley Park Lane is approximately 1 metre away from the common boundary, and that should the appeal proposal be constructed, there would remain approximately 1.2 metres between it and the existing extension at no. 3 Knowsley Park Lane. This would not accord with the SPD. Moreover, the proposed development does not include any set-back of the extension at first floor level from the frontage of the host property.
10. On my site visit, I was able to see that the proposed side extension, by its size, height and position, would lead to an unacceptable terracing impact which the LPA is seeking to avoid. In this regard, the proposal would have an adverse impact upon the character and appearance of the area.
11. I conclude that, when the proposal is considered as a whole, it would not accord with the design, character, and appearance requirements of policies CS2 and SCS19 of the Knowsley Local Plan Core Strategy (2016), saved policies H5 and H8 of the Unitary Development Plan (2006) or the SPD.

Conclusion

12. For the above reasons, I conclude that the development should be dismissed.

S. Hartley

INSPECTOR