

Regeneration and Economic Development Department

APPLICATION NO: 21/00874/FUL

APPLICANT: Mr Steve Lowe

WARD AFFECTED: Halewood North

DEVELOPMENT: ERECTION OF A REAR SINGLE STOREY EXTENSION

LOCATION OF SITE: 4 Turnstone Drive, Halewood, L26 7WR

KNOWSLEY LOCAL PLAN ALLOCATION –

Primary Residential Development - Primary Residential Development

RELEVANT POLICIES

National Planning Policy Framework

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

The Joint Merseyside and Halton Waste Local Plan 2013

WM9 - Sustainable Waste Management Design and Layout of New Development

TECHNICAL CONSULTATIONS:

Halewood Town Council - No Comments Received

NEIGHBOUR NOTIFICATION:

This application has been publicised by letters sent to 5 neighbours.

There has been 1 letter of objection. The representations are summarised as follows: -

- a) Ability to formulate 'objections' inhibited (Week beginning 13th December 21) as unable to access to the planning application. Due to 'essential maintenance' of the planning portal.
- b) Lived in adjacent house for twenty-six years.
- c) Overshadowing and loss of Outlook
 - Only centimetres from shared boundary extending 4 metres.
 - Kitchen window only 140 cm from extension
 - Kitchen/diner would be overshadowed
 - Would not comply with 45-degree rule
 - Dominating outlook would be of roof tiles and Velux window (height of eaves not indicated by the plan)
 - Garden would be overshadowed - extension would be half length of neighbour's garden
 - Impact on amenities enjoyed for 26 years
- d) Overbearing and Dominating
 - Extension would be situated oppressively centimetres from shared boundary

Document Reference	Document Issue Number	Document Issue Date
PS/DC/OP04/05	003	23/9/02

- Dominating effect due to scale
- Building would be practically the width of original house
- Footprint would be more than half the area of the original building
- At 4 m more than half the depth of the original house
- Would dramatically change character of property

e) Concern over disruption and damage during construction

f) Maintenance/Access Issues

- Increased maintenance requirements of the property
- Close proximity would be prevented without intrusion onto neighbour's property
- Consent would not be forthcoming for access onto neighbouring property to for construction

g) Both properties share drain/sewer which will need additional permission from United Utilities

h) Restrictive covenants relate to these properties

i) Proximity of building could adversely affect future development of neighbour's property.

In respect of the comment at point a) - essential maintenance to the Council's Public Access system was required and documents and plans unavailable to view on-line. Whilst the lack of access for some time is regrettable, however, Officers consider that the neighbours have not been deprived of the opportunity to make any representations on the application. Representation received is outlined above and will be appraised, against planning policy (where they are material in determining the application) within the assessment in this report.

In relation to the comment at point c) - not all dimensions are required to be annotated on plan as they are drawn to scale and dimensions can be measured.

The issues raised at points b), f), g) and h) are not material planning considerations in the assessment of this planning application.

ARTICLE 35

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.

ISSUES AND ASSESSMENT:

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

This application relates to a 3 bedroom two-storey semi-detached dwelling with existing conservatory to the rear. The property is located on the south eastern side of Turnstone Drive, located close to the junction with Okell Drive, Halewood.

The application site lies within a Primarily Residential area and is surrounded by a mix of similar semi-detached; detached and terraced dwellings constructed circa 1995.

PROPOSAL

The proposal would involve the removal of an existing conservatory to the rear to make way for a single storey extension extending across the whole rear elevation of the dwelling. The extension as proposed would project 4m beyond the existing principal rear elevation. It would have a width of 4.9 m. The extension would present a duo-pitched roof attaining a ridge height of 3.57m and a height of 2.37m at eaves level.

Document Reference	Document Issue Number	Document Issue Date
PS/DC/OP04/05	003	23/9/02

POLICY CONSIDERATIONS

The site is identified as a Primary Residential area on the Local Plan Policies Map and a domestic extension would therefore be acceptable in principle within this location subject to compliance with all other relevant planning policies and guidance.

The key policies for the determination of this application would be Knowsley Local Plan: Core Strategy Policies CS2 and CS19 and Knowsley Replacement Unitary Development Plan (UDP) Saved Policies H5 and H8. The Householder Development SPD is also a material consideration.

DESIGN, ACCESS AND CRIME PREVENTION

The proposed extension would comprise a single storey extension to the rear elevation to provide kitchen/diner accommodation. It would be constructed with a duo-pitched roof with the ridge line running through the depth of the extension. 'Velux' roof lights are proposed within the roof plane either side. The extension would include a large bi-fold window opening within the rear elevation with no openings to either side elevation.

The existing dwelling is constructed of red brick with render to the first floor on the front elevation. It is a gable ended property with a grey tiled roof and white uPVC windows, with a white uPVC extension to the rear.

When considering the roof of an extension regard should be had to the design of the host dwelling and the surrounding properties. The design of the roof and the slope of the roof should echo that of the original dwelling. The existing property is open gabled with a duo pitched roof and pike detailing to the front. The proposed extension would have a front gable, the ridge running the depth of the extension in contrast to that of the host dwelling. However, the extension would not be visible within the street scene and provided that the external materials match the host dwelling in terms of type, texture and colour it is considered that the design of the extension would be acceptable, and that the extension would satisfactorily harmonise with the existing built form.

Neighbour representation received, include that the extension would be practically the width of the house' with the footprint more than half the area of the original house, which would change the character of the dwelling. The existing house has a ground floor of approximately 30 sq m (internal) and the extension would increase that by approx. 17 sq m (internal) and replace an existing conservatory approx. 9 sq m (internal).

Saved Policy H8 of the UDP states that '*Proposals for extensions to dwellings, or for the erection or enlargement of domestic garages and outbuildings, 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...*' Likewise, the Householder SPD requires that the form and massing of an extension is critical in how it relates to the rest of the dwelling. In this case Officers consider that adequate space would remain around the dwelling and given that the extension is single storey and to the rear it would not result in a disproportionate addition or have a significant impact on the character and appearance of the host dwelling to warrant a refusal in this instance.

Turning to the materials proposed, the application identifies that the brickwork and roof tiles would match the main house, Velux windows would be either white or grey and new bi-fold doors would be metal or uPVC with colour to be either white, grey or black. These details are considered to be acceptable.

The application, however, indicates that rainwater goods would be uPVC with the colour to be either white, grey or black and fascias white 'unless client changes'. Rainwater goods and fascias on the existing dwelling comprise white uPVC fixtures and it is considered that these elements of the build should match that of the host dwelling, in which case, it is considered that if planning permission is granted this should be secured via a suitable planning condition.

Overall, provided materials appropriately match that of the host dwelling, it is considered that the design and scale of the proposal is acceptable, and it would not have a significant impact on the

Document Reference	Document Issue Number	Document Issue Date
PS/DC/OP04/05	003	23/9/02

character or visual amenity of the dwelling or the surrounding area. As such the proposal would not conflict with relevant Core Strategy policies CS2, CS19 and Saved Policies H5 and H8 of the UDP.

HIGHWAYS

The plans demonstrate that the extension would not impose on existing parking provision and would not increase the number of bedrooms. The development would not create a demand for additional parking provision on-plot. The proposal does not raise any concerns in relation to parking or highways safety.

RESIDENTIAL AMENITY

Private Amenity Space Provision

New developments should ensure that adequate private amenity space would remain for the occupants. The existing garden currently extends approximately 10 m beyond the principal rear elevation of the dwelling. A garden depth of approximately 6 m with usable amenity space of about 43 m² would be retained. Sufficient amenity space would be retained as a usable garden area without having detrimental impacts on the existing occupiers.

6 Turnstone Drive

The extension would project 4m from the rear elevation and would set off the boundary with No. 6 the adjoining property by approximately 150mm.

A neighbour representation has been received in relation to overshadowing and loss of outlook that would result; due to the depth and proximity to the common boundary and the impacts this would have, particularly to the kitchen/diner window and garden.

Further representation is made which contends that the development would dominate outlook, which would be of the roof tiles and Velux window; it would be overbearing and dominating given the proximity to the shared boundary; due to the scale; width and the depth. Additionally, the objection received refers to the development not complying with the 45-degree rule.

The Council's Householder SPD advises that a single storey extension at the rear of up to 4 m on or immediately adjacent to the party boundary will normally be acceptable. A single storey extension beyond 4 m (or in a situation where the application property has a rear elevation which is set further back than the rear elevation of the neighbouring dwelling) will normally only be permitted if it does not breach the 45-degree rule.

In this case, the proposed extension does not extend beyond 4 m in depth and does not have a rear elevation which is set further back than the rear elevation of the neighbouring dwelling. In this instance therefore the 45-degree rule does not apply.

The nearest window of the adjoining property is known to belong to a kitchen/diner window (habitable room) which appears to also be served by a patio window. The edge of this kitchen window is sited approximately 0.72 m from the common boundary. There is an existing boundary fence of approximately 1.8 m high with trellis a top, the roof pitch of the extension would slope away from the common boundary with eaves reaching a height of 2.38 m. The maximum height of the extension would be 3.57 m to the ridge resulting in the highest part of the extension being some 2.69 m from the common boundary.

The proposed extension does not propose any openings in the side elevation facing this property and as such does not raise any concern in respect of loss of privacy.

Taking the above into account the extension would not have a significant detrimental impact on the residential amenity of that dwelling in terms of outlook; overshadowing; loss of light or loss of privacy. The development would be within acceptable standards.

The proposed development would be entirely within the boundary of the host dwelling and objection raised that the proximity of building could adversely affect future development of neighbour's property is not considered to be founded.

Document Reference	Document Issue Number	Document Issue Date
PS/DC/OP04/05	003	23/9/02

2 Turnstone Drive

Turning to the adjacent dwelling, No. 2 Turnstone Drive, this is a detached dwelling which has a single storey rear extension adjacent to the common boundary, forming part of a larger two-storey side extension to the side. The single storey element, as approved, extends 2.4 m beyond the main principal rear elevation of that dwelling. The proposed extension would therefore extend approximately 1.6 m beyond the neighbouring extension at a distance of approximately 2.2 m.

There are no windows within the neighbouring extension that face the application site and there is an existing garden fence along the common boundary. The roof of the proposed extension would slope away from the boundary with No. 2.

Taking the above into account the extension would not have a detrimental impact on the residential amenity of that dwelling in terms of outlook; overshadowing; loss of light or loss of privacy.

Carlyon Way

Other houses are located to the rear on Carlyon Way; the host dwelling shares a common boundary with no. 17 Carlyon Way. That dwelling is located between approximately 6 m and 9.5 m from the rear boundary. Given the interface distance, the fact that the extension would be single storey and the juxtaposition of the dwellings, it is not considered that the proposed extension would have any detrimental impacts on neighbours to the rear.

In relation to impacts on the amenity of existing residents during construction, it is inevitable that some disturbance will occur as part of the construction process. However, this should be for a temporary period only and separate legislation is in place to ensure this is controlled.

Conclusion in relation to Residential Amenity

Overall, it is considered that the proposed development would not have a significant detrimental impact on the amenity of the occupiers of surrounding properties. As such the proposal would not conflict with relevant Core Strategy policies CS2, CS19 and Saved Policies H5 and H8 of the UDP.

OTHER ISSUES

None.

CONCLUSION

It is considered that the proposed development would be of an acceptable scale and design in relation to the host dwelling. It would not have significant impacts on the amenity of the neighbouring properties, nor would it unduly affect the character of the street scene and area in general. As such the proposal would be in compliance with the relevant criteria of Policies CS2 and CS19 of the Local Plan: Core Strategy and Saved Policies H5 and H8 of the Knowsley UDP together with the Council's Householder Development Supplementary Planning Document.

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 approved plans and documents listed in Schedule 1.

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt.

Document Reference	Document Issue Number	Document Issue Date
PS/DC/OP04/05	003	23/9/02

- 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 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.

SCHEDULE 1

Date Received	Ref. No	Version	Drawing/Document Title
17/11/2021	004	-	Proposed Elevations
17/11/2021	007	-	Proposed Floor Plans
17/11/2021	014	-	Location Plan
17/11/2021	015	-	Site Plan

Informatives

None

Maxine Wishart

24 January 2022

Alan Kilroe
26 January 2022

Document Reference	Document Issue Number	Document Issue Date
PS/DC/OP04/05	003	23/9/02

c:\users\kilroe\appdata\local\microsoft\windows\inetcache\content.outlook\1f4xgbr\dlp -21-00874-ful - turnstone.rtf