

<u>APPLICATION NO:</u>	23/01838/FUL	<u>CASE OFFICER:</u>	Andrew Hunt
<u>WARD:</u>	Roby	<u>PARISH:</u>	NA
<u>LOCATION:</u>	4 Yew Tree Road, Huyton, Knowsley, L36 5UQ		
<u>PROPOSAL:</u>	ERECTION OF A FIRST FLOOR SIDE EXTENSION		

Site Description

The application site is a Semi - Detached house in a residential area. The site is situated on Yew Tree Road, Huyton. There is a woodland directly opposite the site.

Yew Tree Road is characterised by a relatively uniform pattern of semi-detached dwellings. The dwellings have a relatively consistent appearance with and similar character. Yew Tree Road is mostly a straight road with a slight curve. There is a public footpath which runs from opposite the house towards the corner of Yew Tree Road and Acacia Avenue.

Proposal

The proposal is for the erection of a first-floor side extension.

Consultations

N/A

Representations

This application has been publicised by letters sent to 4 neighbours. No objections have been received.

Planning History

A previous application for a single storey side and rear extension (following demolition of conservatory) was approved (11/00035/FUL – 19/10/2011).

A recent planning application was approved for a similar development of a first floor extension but with a 1 metre set back at first floor level. (23/00387/FUL – approved 12/06/2023). This was amended during the application (as agreed with the agent) to set back the extension by 1 metre to comply with the Householder SPD. However, after this was granted, the applicant stated their wish for a 1st floor extension that was not set back and expressed a desire to appeal the decision. In response to this it was stated that such an application was unlikely to be approved by the council but that the applicant could appeal any decision to the planning inspectorate. Therefore, the current application was submitted.

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that accord with an up-to-date development plan without delay; or where the development plan is absent, silent or out of date planning permission should be granted unless the application of policies in the NPPF that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a clear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

Street Scene

Policy

Part 1 a) of Core Strategy Policy CS19 states that development within Knowsley will be expected to Respond to and integrate positive characteristics of immediate surroundings, including local materials, scale, mass, form, layout, alignment and density of the existing built environment;

NPPF para 130 c) requires that planning decisions should ensure that developments are sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting.

Paras 6.14 and 6.15 of the Householder SPD states that an extension should leave adequate room around the dwelling and take into account regular spaces and avoid a terracing effect.

“6.14 The extension should leave adequate room around the dwelling to avoid a cramped appearance within the plot. It should also leave adequate garden areas for sitting out, the storing of refuse bins, etc.

6.15 Extensions should take account of any regular spacing between buildings or in the front line of buildings. In areas of semi-detached dwellings it is important to ensure that side extensions between dwellings do not result in a terracing effect”.

Para 7.2 of the Householder SPD states that two storey side extension should avoid creating a terracing effect either by themselves or in conjunction with other properties. It also states that either a minimum of 1 metre space should be retained to the boundary or the front wall should be set back at first floor level by 1 metre.

“7.2 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. A terracing effect is considered to be undesirable in areas of primarily detached or semi-detached dwellings as this leads, in the long term, to a significant reduction in the openness, local distinctiveness and spatial quality of these housing areas, as well as an alteration in the architectural style of the areas. In meeting these requirements, the following guidelines should be adhered to:

- Either a minimum space of 1m should be preserved between the extension and the party boundary to the side of the property, OR the front wall of the first floor of the extension should be set back at least 1m from the immediately adjoining part of the main front wall of the original dwelling.*
- The above requirement may be relaxed if, because of a staggered or irregular arrangement of the dwellings in the street or corner location, the construction of the extension would not create an actual or potential terracing effect. A relaxation may also be made if the existing character of the area is primarily terraced. The roof of the extension should normally be at a lower level than*

the original. Where the original dwelling has a hipped roof, the roof of the proposed extension should normally also be hipped. Conversely, where the original dwelling has a straight gable, then the extension should (provided the neighbours would not suffer significant loss of light as a result) also have a straight gable. Two storey extensions should not have flat roofs.

- *Extensions should preferably be set back at least one course of brick from the front elevation to avoid an unsightly bonding of old and new brickwork. In circumstances where the existing dwelling is rendered at first floor level, this treatment should be carried forward to the adjacent wall of the extension”.*

Background

Yew Tree Road is characterised by a relatively uniform pattern of semi-detached dwellings. The dwellings have a relatively consistent appearance with and similar character. Yew Tree Road is mostly a straight road with a slight curve. There is a public footpath which runs from opposite the house towards the corner of Yew Tree Road and Acacia Avenue.

Assessment

The extension would not be set back at first floor level contrary to para 7.2 of the Householder SPD. The extension is not on a corner plot and would not face a different direction to the neighbouring dwelling. Therefore, the exceptions where it can be departed from do not apply.

The extension would create an unattractive terracing effect, eroding the regular semi-detached character of the area, to the detriment of the street scene. The extension would be prominent within the street scene as it located in the middle of the street and would be readily visible from the road and pavement. It would be directly opposite a public footpath and would be prominent when viewed from the path opposite the dwelling to the end of the path at the intersection of Yew Tree Road and Acacia Avenue (Appendix 1). This would result in significant harm to the street scene.

Overall, the extension would appear as an incongruous, and unsympathetic addition to the street scene. It would create a terracing effect causing harm to the symmetry, harmony and consistency of the street scene, eroding its semi-detached character.

The proposal is therefore contrary to Core Strategy Policies CS2 and CS19, NPPF para 130 and the Householder SPD.

Other Considerations

6 Yew Tree Road

In relation to number 6 (next door) this extension is set back several metres at first floor level unlike the current proposal. The extension (01/00272/FUL) was approved 22 years ago (25/06/2001). The main concern of the terracing effect would be in relation to no 2 rather than no 6 next door as the extension would be closest to this

dwelling. If anything, the extension at no 6 sets a precedent for requesting at least a 1 metre setback to ensure consistency.

8 Yew Tree Road

In relation to 8 Yew Tree Road (which has a two-storey side extension without setback), there are records of a historic application for a two-storey extension (74/06688/HIST – approved 21.01.1982). However, as this was approved in 1982, the application was decided in a different planning policy context as the current Householder SPD was adopted in 2016. The council's planning policy records do not go back this far, and we are unable to determine what policies applied at the time against which the application was assessed.

Neighbour Amenity

In relation to 6, the extension would take place on the opposite side of the house so the amenity of 6 would not be affected.

In relation to 2. There are side windows on the side of 2 at ground and first floor level, however, these are not main habitable room windows. Therefore, 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 from 3 to 4. There is currently 1 parking space at the property, this would increase to 2 as shown on the plans. This is slightly less than the 3 normally required, however, the shortfall would be minor (1 space) and the road is a minor road (rather than a busy main road). The proposal would increase the ratio of parking spaces to bedrooms from 1/3 to 2/4 and therefore would represent a slight improvement over the existing parking provision. 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

Overall, the proposal is contrary to Core Strategy Policies CS2 and CS19, NPPF para 130 and the Householder SPD.

Recommendation

Refusal

That Planning Permission be refused for the following reasons:

- 1) The extension would create a terracing effect and harm the symmetry, harmony, and consistency of the street scene, eroding its semi-detached character. It would produce an incongruous design feature out of keeping with the existing dwellings 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 Policies H5 and H8 of the Knowsley Replacement Unitary Development Plan, adopted June 2006 and the Householder Development Supplementary Planning Document adopted June 2016.

Signed Case Officer¹:

Andrew Hunt

**Signed Authorising
Officer²:**

K Foster

Date:

29 August 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

Appendix 1 – Site Photographs







