

REGENERATION AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT

APPLICATION NO: 22/00101/FUL

APPLICANT: Mr Sean Creighton

WARD AFFECTED: Roby

DEVELOPMENT: ERECTION OF FIRST FLOOR FRONT EXTENSION ABOVE EXISTING
EXTENSION AND ERECTION OF SINGLE STOREY FRONT EXTENSION

LOCATION OF SITE: 3 Roby Mount Avenue, Roby, Knowsley, L36 4HP

KNOWSLEY LOCAL PLAN ALLOCATION –

Primary Residential Area

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

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.

PLANNING HISTORY

Numerous planning applications (8) have been approved at the site for extensions and alterations to the dwelling.

TECHNICAL CONSULTATIONS:

Network Rail – No Comments

NEIGHBOUR NOTIFICATION:

This application has been publicised by letters sent to 6 neighbours. 1 objection has been received consisting of the following main points:

- Concerned about my ability to access my property during construction due to parked vehicles.
- Applicant has undertaken unauthorised work on my land.

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

c:\users\kilroea\appdata\local\microsoft\windows\inetcache\content.outlook\6tverf1e\22-00101 ful 3 roby mount avenue roby
knowsley l36 4hp.doc

ISSUES AND ASSESSMENT:

SITE AND PROPOSAL

The application site relates to a large detached dwelling in a residential cul-de-sac, there are detached dwellings to the east and west and a railway line runs along the southern boundary of the site beyond which is a recent residential development. The application property has a large rear garden and has benefitted from a number of previous extensions.

This application proposes the erection of a first floor extension above the gym which is located to the front of the dwelling and the erection of a single storey front extension in front of the gym.

POLICY CONSIDERATIONS

Paragraph 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states that planning decisions should ensure that developments add to the overall quality of the area, are visually attractive as a result of good architecture and are sympathetic to local character. Paragraph 134 of the NPPF states that development that is not well designed should be refused.

Policy CS2 in the Core Strategy states that new development in Knowsley will be expected to promote good design quality and ensure that development respects its setting.

Policy CS19 in the Core Strategy states that new development in Knowsley will be expected to:

- 1(a) respond to and integrate positive characteristics of its immediate surroundings, including local materials, scale, mass, form, layout, alignment and density of the existing built environment.
- 2(a) avoid unacceptable impacts on existing residents, business occupiers and future occupiers

Saved Policy H8 in the Knowsley Replacement Unitary Development Plan states that extensions to dwellings, or for the erection or enlargement of domestic garages or outbuildings will be permitted provided that:

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

Para 7.5 of the Adopted Householder Developments Supplementary Planning Document states that the style, design, materials and scale of front extensions and porches should respect the character of the surrounding residential area and that front extensions should not dominate the existing dwelling or disrupt the uniformity of a group of similarly designed dwellings.

ASSESSMENT

3 Roby Mount Avenue is a large detached house set at the north western part of Roby Mount Avenue. The northern part of Roby Mount Avenue is characterised by mostly detached dwellings with semi detached dwellings to the south of the road. There is a clear absence of two storey front extensions within the surrounding area, as any front extensions tend to be modest additions such as porches or single storey extensions. There is no comparable front extension to that proposed.

The first floor extension would result in the two storey part of the dwelling extending significantly forward of the existing dwelling, creating a reverse L shape building. The extension would be a dominant and disproportionate addition to the existing dwelling. It would fundamentally change the character and appearance of the dwelling. The siting, scale and mass of the front extension would be

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

much larger than any comparable front extension in the street scene. The extension would therefore appear incongruous and out of place within the wider street scene. The extension would also create a windowless two storey blank gable facing towards Roby Road with no features to create variety or interest. This would result in an unattractive bare wall. The would be a discordant and unattractive feature in the wider street scene and would be significantly harmful to the character of the area.

Whilst the dwelling is located in a corner of Roby Road and would partly be obscured by trees, the extension is so disproportionately large and projects so far forward, that it would still be significantly harmful to the character of the area. Whilst the trees would partly screen the extension in summer, in winter the loss of leaves would mean the extension would be visible from the street scene. There is also no guarantee that the trees would not be removed in the future as they appear to be outside the boundary of the applicant's property.

Overall, the size, massing and location of the extension is contrary to Core Strategy Policies CS2 and CS19, Saved UDP Policy H8, NPPF para 130 and the Householder SPD.

RESIDENTIAL AMENITY

In relation to 1 Roby Mount Avenue, there would be no harm to amenity from loss of outlook or light due to the distance away from the boundary. There would be no loss of privacy as there are no side windows on 1.

In relation to 5 Roby Mount Avenue, there are side windows on number 5 that would be relatively close to the first floor extension, however, these are minor windows in rooms that have a main window at the front or rear of the house. Therefore, the extension would not cause significant loss of light or outlook. Overall, there would not be harm to the amenity of 5 from the proposal.

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

In relation to the parking of construction vehicles and of obstruction of properties, this would not be a planning matter, but would instead be a matter for the police/highways. In relation to damage to property or boundary disputes, these are also not material planning considerations but are covered by other legislation.

CONCLUSION

The size, massing, location and design of the extension would be significantly harmful to the street scene and character of the area. The development is therefore 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 size, massing, location and design of the extension would be significantly harmful to the street scene and character of the area. The development is therefore contrary to Core Strategy Policies CS2 and CS19, Saved UDP Policy H8, NPPF para 130 and the Householder SPD.

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

Andrew Hunt
22 April 2022

Alan Kilroe
27 April 2022

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

c:\users\kilroea\appdata\local\microsoft\windows\inetcache\content.outlook\6tverf1e\22-00101 ful 3 roby mount avenue roby
knowsley l36 4hp.doc