

APPLICATION NO: 22/00029/FUL **CASE OFFICER:** Maxine Wishart

WARD: Halewood North **PARISH:** Halewood Town Council

LOCATION: 5 Blacksmith Place, Halewood, L25 9LS

PROPOSAL: ERECTION OF A SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION
TOGETHER WITH THE ERECTION OF TWO STOREY SIDE
EXTENSION WITH FRONT CANOPY

Knowsley Local Plan Allocation –

Primarily Residential Area

Site Description

The application relates to 5 Blacksmith Place, a 2-bedroom, two-storey end terraced property within a terrace of three dwellings located on a small cul-de-sac comprising of 12 houses. Blacksmith Place is off Sherbourne Avenues in an established residential area of Halewood.

The property was built circa 2000 and comprises a red brick building with a small section of green render to the front elevation. It has a tiled roof and white uPVC windows. A tiled canopy is provided over the entrance door and a WC to the front of the dwelling.

The dwelling has is accessed off the head of the cul-de-sac with parking to the side. The plot is enclosed by railings and double access gates adjacent to the footpath.

Proposal

The application seeks consent for the erection of a single storey extension to the rear together with a two-storey extension to the side. It is also proposed to incorporate a canopy to the front elevation. The extension would comprise a garage, utility room and extended family area at ground floor with the first-floor extension providing a walk-in wardrobe with en-suite.

The ground floor extension would wrap around the side and the rear. At the side, a garage is proposed fronting the street with a utility room to the rear. The side element would connect with the rear extension providing additional open-plan family area.

The side element at ground floor would project 3 m out from the existing gable and extend a total of 11.32 m deep. The extension would project 3.9 metres to the rear of the existing rear elevation of the host dwelling (338 mm off the boundary).

The first-floor element would be 3m wide, set back 1 m from the front elevation at first floor and would not extend beyond the existing rear elevation. The depth of the first floor would be 6.44 metres.

The rear extension would extend the width of the existing dwelling and 3 m beyond the existing gable resulting in it being 8.8 m wide. It would have a flat roof with a height of 3.06 m. A roof lantern would sit atop the flat roof resulting in the extension

attaining a maximum height of 3.64 m. Four-section bi-folding doors together with a two-section sliding door would be inserted in the rear elevation. No windows are proposed within the side elevations.

Turning to the two-storey extension to the side this would have a pitched roof attaining a maximum ridge height of 7.12 m which would sit approximately 290 mm below the ridge of the host dwelling. A mono-pitched canopy would be incorporated spanning the front elevation and across the extension at the side, sloping up to the first floor. A garage door would be inserted to the front elevation together with a window at first floor level within the front elevation along with a first-floor window to the rear.

Materials would match that of the existing dwelling.

Consultations

Halewood Town Council - No Comments Received.

Highway Authority - Raise objection on highway safety grounds due to lack of in-curtilage parking.

Representations

This application has been publicised by letters sent to 9 neighbours.

The application has been amended since originally being submitted and discussion has taken place with the applicant's appointed agent resulting in a number of schemes being brought forward. The development currently under consideration was amended by a later iteration, however, the applicant has requested that this earlier iteration be taken forward to determination. Neighbours were consulted on this scheme. Therefore, the LPA has acted fairly and reasonably taking in to account the duty to fully consider representations from interested parties and considers that nobody has been deprived of the opportunity to make any representations that they may have wanted to make on the application due to the nature of the change involving the reversal back to an earlier scheme.

No representations have been received.

Planning History

APP. NO:	99/00775/FUL
PROPOSAL:	DEMOLITION OF MAISONETTE BLOCKS AND ERECTION OF 33 NO. TWO-STOREY DWELLINGS
DECISION:	Granted
DECISION DATE:	29 February 2000

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.

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

SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENTS

Householder Development SPD (2016)

Ensuring a Choice of Travel SPD (2010)

The site is identified as land allocated as a Primarily Residential Area on the Local Plan Policies Map. As such domestic extension to an existing dwelling is considered acceptable in principle, subject to compliance with relevant Local Plan policies and guidance.

The above policies and guidance require that new development demonstrates a high standard of design, which does not adversely affect the character of the property or street scene; maintains a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants; avoiding overlooking and overshadowing, as well as an unacceptable overbearing impact; and that adequate parking and garden space would remain for use by residents of the extended property.

Article 35 Statement

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, despite protracted discussions and submission of various iterations, 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(s) for the refusal, approval has not been possible.

Assessment

Saved Policy H8 in the Replacement UDP states that proposals for extension to dwellings will be permitted provided that (i) the proposals would not result in a disproportionate addition to the dwelling, (ii) the design and materials would reflect those used on the original dwelling, (iii) the proposals would not adversely affect the amenity or privacy of occupiers of adjacent dwellings, (iv) the proposal would not create potential hazards to highway users by obstructing visibility for pedestrians or drivers of motor vehicles, (v) adequate parking and garden space would remain for use by the residents of the extended property.

Policy CS7 in the Core Strategy states that new development will be required to be in compliance with adopted parking standards.

Layout / Design

The layout would result in the loss of all in-curtilage parking to the side which is discussed in more detail in the Highways section below.

The proposed layout would also see the loss of access to the rear of a dwelling. The Householder Development SPD requires that this will normally only be acceptable if a secure bin store or alternative arrangements can be provided to the front of the dwelling, which would not have a detrimental impact on the street scene. No detail of the bin storage supports the application, a scheme could be secured by way of a suitable condition if planning permission was to be granted.

Adequate amenity private amenity space would be retained to the rear of the dwelling.

In terms of the overall design of the two-storey extension, the first floor would be stepped back from the principal front elevation and the ridge height would be below the main ridge line of the main dwelling. The proposed roof would echo that of the existing house. Windows would be inserted into the front and rear elevations which would be of acceptable proportions.

The single storey rear extension would be finished with a flat roof and be of a contemporary style incorporating large bi-fold doors and sliding doors to the rear. Given the position within the rear garden area, there will be minimal views of this element.

The development includes a canopy spanning across the existing dwelling and the side extension. It has not been demonstrated how the canopy would be supported – whether it would be cantilevered or require a pillar. Nevertheless, the canopy would be sited immediately at the back of the pavement which would form an incongruous feature in the streetscene to the detriment of visual amenity which would not be acceptable.

Other external alterations to the dwelling would see the existing ground floor lounge window blocked up and alterations to the front entrance door and removal of a first-floor window to the front elevation. It is noted that this would result in there being only one source of light, from the rear elevation of the proposed extension, into what would be a large open plan living space measuring nearly 11m deep and the entrance door leading straight into the large open plan area. This would cause harm to the living environment and amenity of the occupiers. The works would also detract from the character and appearance of the dwelling due to the irregularly spaced openings and the ratio of solid to void on the upper floor and the proportions of the first-floor windows of the extension to front and rear do not follow that of the host

dwelling. Overall, the works would result in a loss of symmetry to the fenestration. However, it is acknowledged that these works could be carried out without the benefit of planning permission and are not necessarily symptom of the development the subject of this planning application under consideration.

The proposed materials and finishes are in keeping with the existing property and a condition should be attached to any planning permission if granted to ensure that the proposed materials and finishes match the existing features of the property to ensure the character of the property is maintained.

On balance, having regard to the above and by reason of the siting of the extension in close proximity to the highway, the development would have an unacceptable impact on the character and visual amenity of the streetscene contrary to Policies H5 and H8 of the Knowsley Replacement Unitary Development Plan, adopted June 2006, Policies CS2 and CS19 of the Knowsley Local Plan: Core Strategy, adopted January 2016 and the Householder Development Supplementary Planning Document (2016).

Residential Amenity

No. 4 Blacksmith Place

The proposed extension would be located along the common boundary with No. 4. That property is set approximately 1m further back than the host dwelling and there is a driveway width between the extension. The proposed extension is unlikely to have detrimental impacts on the occupiers of No. 4.

No. 6 Blacksmith Place

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.

The proposed rear extension, would be less than 4 m and would be set off the common boundary by 338 mm, but the attached property, is set forward of the host dwelling by approximately 1 m. The application does not show a 45-degree line from the neighbour's nearest window, nevertheless, the neighbouring property has a kitchen window close to the common boundary and the extension would extend beyond the guideline depth.

The development would have a detrimental impact on the neighbours of No. 6 from overshadowing and obstruction of outlook contrary to Policies CS2, CS19 of the Knowsley Local Plan Core Strategy adopted January 2016 and Saved Policy H8 of the Knowsley Replacement Unitary Development Plan, adopted June 2006

Highway Considerations

The property is currently a 2-bedroom house and currently provides 2 parking spaces within the curtilage which is in line with the Council's parking standards.

Although identified on the proposed first floor layout as a 'walk in wardrobe', for the purposes of assessing the application, this space in officer's view could easily be used and considered to be a bedroom space and an additional bedroom being provided. Both 2 and 3-bedroom dwellings require 2 parking spaces to be provided on-plot.

Para 7.10 of the Household Development SPD states that: *“Garages will normally count as contributing to the car parking provision where their internal dimensions are sufficient to allow them to be satisfactorily used as such. Minimum internal dimensions of 5.5m x 2.75m.”* The proposed garage would have internal dimensions of 2.67 m wide by 7.13 m long.

The garage would not be of adequate dimensions to count towards providing a parking space. Furthermore, extensions incorporating a garage should be set at least 5.5m back from the pavement to allow a car to be pulled clear of the road whilst opening the garage door (para 6.18 Householder SPD). In some instances, a roller shutter door at 5 m set back would be acceptable. However, at only 1.63 m set back off the footpath to the front of the dwelling, the proposal would fall significantly below these standards.

The Council's Highways Engineers object to the proposal on highway safety grounds commenting that: *The extension will result in the loss of all available off-street parking...The road in question is narrow and there are very limited areas available to park a vehicle without other driveways being blocked. In addition, to this any vehicle parking in the cul-de-sac would likely make it difficult for waste collection operatives to service the road. Vehicles parking in the turning head would likely result in a waste service vehicle needing to manoeuvre within Sherborne Avenue to then reverse the full length of the cul-de-sac. British standards dictate that waste collection vehicles should not be required to reverse more than 12 m and then only in exceptional circumstances when it is a necessity.*

The Householder SPD states at para. 6.16 that...*Fewer spaces than set out in the parking standards will only be acceptable if the highway and environmental conditions in the locality allow, for example in areas with wider access roads and plots. Proposals that would result in an adverse impact on street parking conditions to the detriment of highway safety or the amenity of local residents would not be acceptable.*

The development would result in all off-street parking being lost and result in a proposal that is detrimental to highway safety contrary to H5 and H8 of the Knowsley Replacement Unitary Development Plan, adopted June 2006. Policies CS2, CS7 and CS19 of the Knowsley Local Plan: Core Strategy, adopted January 2016, the Householder Development Supplementary Planning Document (2016) and the Ensuring a Choice of Travel Supplementary Planning Document (2010).

Conclusion

The proposed development would have detrimental impacts on visual amenity, the residential amenity of adjoining neighbours and on highway safety.

The development conflicts with UDP and Local Plan policies, in particular: UDP Saved Policies H5 and H8 and Policies CS2 and CS19 of the Knowsley Local Plan: Core Strategy together with the Council's Householder Development and Ensuring a Choice of Travel SPDs.

Recommendation

That planning permission is refused for the following reasons:

1. The proposed development by reason of its siting and design in close proximity to the highway would form an incongruous and alien design feature within the streetscene which would fail to preserve or enhance the appearance of the area generally.

As such the proposal would be contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework, Saved Policies H5 and H8 of the Knowsley Replacement Unitary Development Plan, adopted June 2006, Policies CS2 and CS19 of the Knowsley Local Plan: Core Strategy, adopted January 2016 and the Householder Development Supplementary Planning Document (2016).

2. The proposed development would result in the loss of all in-curtilage car parking currently provided on the site with the result that vehicles would be forced to park on the surrounding highway to the detriment of highway safety; the convenience of other users of the highway as well as the safe manoeuvring of the Council's refuse/ recycling collection vehicles and the general amenity of the area due to the inconvenience of on street parking.

As such the development is contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework, Saved Policies H5 and H8 of the Knowsley Replacement Unitary Development Plan, adopted June 2006. Policies CS2, CS7 and CS19 of the Knowsley Local Plan: Core Strategy, adopted January 2016, the Householder Development Supplementary Planning Document (2016) and the Ensuring a Choice of Travel Supplementary Planning Document (2010).

3. The proposed extension to the rear would, by reason of its depth and juxtaposition with the neighbouring property, result in an imposing development which would be detrimental to the amenities of the occupiers of the adjoining dwelling, No. 6 Blacksmith Place, due to the loss of light and overbearing impact.

As such the proposal would be contrary to Policies CS2, CS19 of the Knowsley Local Plan Core Strategy adopted January 2016 and Saved Policy H8 of the Knowsley Replacement Unitary Development Plan, adopted June 2006.

Signed Case Officer: M Wishart

Signed Authorising Officer: Alan Kilroe

Date: 13 October 2022

Informatives

N/A

Appendix 1 – Site Photographs



