

<u>APPLICATION NO:</u>	24/00299/FUL	<u>CASE OFFICER:</u>	Reece Black
<u>WARD:</u>	Roby	<u>PARISH:</u>	
<u>LOCATION:</u>	25 Headingley Close, Roby, Knowsley		
<u>PROPOSAL:</u>	ERECTION OF DETACHED OUTBUILDING FOR USE AS GARAGE, STUDY AND STORE ROOM (DEMOLITION OF EXISTING GARAGE)		

Site Description

The application site is located at 25 Headingley Close, Roby and is situated within an area allocated as a Primarily Residential Area in the Development Plan. The application property is a semi-detached dwellinghouse and is predominantly rendered facing on its front, side and rear elevations, together white UPVC openings and brown, interlocking roof tiles.

The application property is sited at the end of a cul-de-sac with access taken from a private driveway which serves the two furthest properties. The front elevation of the dwelling is east facing, the north side facing elevation of the property faces the highway of Twickenham Drive.

The property benefits from a two-storey side extension, a single storey front extension, a single storey rear extension and a detached garage to the front garden area. The front elevation of the garage is west facing and the north facing side elevation of this also faces Twickenham Drive; the rear elevation of the structure is adjacent the side curtilage (and boundary treatment) of No.27.

There is currently an approximate interface distance of 10.5m from the front elevation of the dwelling to the front elevation of the garage.

Proposal

The application seeks permission for the erection of a detached outbuilding to the front elevation of the dwelling.

This would see the demolition of the existing detached garage.

The proposed development would have a width of 6.10m and a depth of 7.08m. This would be served by a dual-pitched roof, which would measure 2.33m at the eaves and 3.76m at the ridge.

The existing outbuilding covers an area of circa 5.1m x 4.75m and occupies a footprint of circa 24sqm. The proposed would cover 6.07m x 7.08m and occupy a footprint of approximately 42sqm.

The front elevation would feature two garage doors and would be oriented to be south facing. The west facing side elevation would feature two doors.

Consultations

Highways – No objections received.

Representations

This application has been publicised by letters sent to 12 neighbours.

There have been 1 letters of objection, 1 letters of support and 0 letters of comment.

The representations are summarised as follows:-

23 Headingley Close – Support

The letter of support had raised no objections but did provide comments that they wished to have acknowledged.

- Please check the parameters on the boundary of the map provided with the application. The map is not accurate. This is not a true reflection of the actual boundary.
- My property has a 9-metre straight line from the wall of my house to the driveway. The map shows a curve from the wall to the driveway, this is incorrect as it removes a portion of my property.
- Please ensure you have the correct measurements according to the deeds and title register. If this is not rectified it will cause an issue with building regulations, party wall, future planning or emergency services entering both properties.

This representation was discussed with the occupants of No.23 to clarify their position on the proposal. They confirmed that they were not objecting to the proposed development, but wanted to highlight that the map submitted with the application was wrong and wanted this on record.

It was shared with them that matters pertaining to boundary disputes were not a relevant or material planning consideration and cannot be considered under planning legislation as these issues are covered under separate legislation and a favourable planning decision would not over-ride the obligations of the applicant to satisfy all aspects of other legislation and / or approvals that would be necessary before development commences; and should be addressed by the landowner independently of the planning process. This issue would be a private matter between the applicant and the occupants of No.23.

27 Headingley Close – Objection – Loss of light

- The existing garage currently takes light from the garden and any increase in size will increase the loss of light.

Planning History

APP. NO: 01/00226/FUL
PROPOSAL: DEMOLITION OF EXISTING GARAGE, ERECTION OF TWO STOREY SIDE EXTENSION TO FORM STUDY WITH 1 NO. BEDROOM ABOVE, ERECTION OF FRONT EXTENSION TO FORM ENLARGED EXISTING STUDY, TOGETHER WITH ERECTION OF DETACHED GARAGE TO FRONT GARDEN AREA
DECISION: GRANTED
DECISION DATE: 11 July 2001

APP. NO: 03/00614/FUL
PROPOSAL: ERECTION OF EXTENSION TO REAR OF DWELLING TO FORM KITCHEN.
DECISION: GRANTED
DECISION DATE: 10 September 2003

APP. NO: 74/09324/HIST
PROPOSAL: PROPOSED RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT
DECISION: GRANTED
DECISION DATE: 12 January 1987

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.

The site is identified as a site allocated for housing development in the adopted Unitary Development Plan. As such, a domestic outbuilding within the curtilage of the dwelling of the existing residential property is considered acceptable in principle, subject to compliance with local planning policy and guidance.

Regarding the adopted Development Plan policies, the proposed application has regard to policies CS2 and CS19 of the adopted Local Plan Core Strategy (2016) and saved policies H5 and H8 of the Unitary Development Plan (2006), together with the Householder Development SPD (2016).

These 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.

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

In addition, the Householder Development SPD (2016) is a material consideration for the purposes of this planning application and provides additional guidance in relation to householder development within Knowsley Borough.

Article 35 Statement

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.

Assessment

Saved Policy H8 in the Replacement Unitary Development Plan states that proposals for extensions to dwellings 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
- b) The design and materials used would reflect those used on the original dwelling
- c) The proposal would not adversely affect the amenity or privacy of occupiers of adjacent dwellings
- d) The proposal would not create potential hazards for highway users by obstructing visibility for pedestrians or drivers of motor vehicles; and
- e) Adequate parking and garden space would remain in use by the residents of the extended property

Design

The existing dwelling is predominantly rendered facing with white UPVC openings and tiled roofing. The submitted plans annotate that the proposed development would feature external facing materials that would match the existing dwelling and feature a cohesive design. The proposed development would have a pitched roof.

The proposed development would be erected to replace the existing detached garage. It is acknowledged that the proposal would be a notable size and an increase in scale, form and massing, however, would still be considered to be a subordinate addition and incidental to the original dwelling and overall would not appear as an unduly dominant structure in the street scene. The proposal overall, would have a footprint which would not exceed 50% of the footprint of the dwelling.

7.10 of the Householder Development SPD stipulates that garages, sheds and other detached buildings should normally be behind the building line or be well screened by hedging or similar landscape treatment.

The garage would be erected in front of the building line. However, given the site context and that it is situated to the head of the cul-de-sac, it would not be deemed to cause an adverse impact. It would be sited in an appropriate location and not immediately abutting the highway as it would be set-back by circa 1m at the closest points (which helps reduce any unacceptable visual impact).

The proposal, given where it would be sited, would not be considered to result in adverse harm on the street scene. Moreover, it was observed from the site visit that the other adjacent turn head features detached garage structures, which would ensure the proposal would not appear significantly incongruous in the street scene, would integrate positively and therefore be acceptable.

Overall, the proposed development would be considered to have an acceptable design and would be in accord with the Householder Development SPD and Saved Policy H8.

Residential Amenity

23 Headingly Close

No.23 is the paired, semi-detached dwellinghouse. The property's elevations are project slightly further to the front and rear elevations than the application site. No.23 benefits from a single storey rear extension, a two-storey side extension, a single storey front extension (with a canopy roof).

The side elevation of the proposal would be sited approximately 7.7m away from the front elevation of No.23. Although this is within close proximity, given the existing outbuilding it would not appear significantly incongruous or harmful. No issues of overlooking or loss of privacy are considered to be caused as a result of the proposal. It would not be considered to result in any unacceptable residential amenity aspects.

The contents of the representation have been addressed in that section and the issue raised, would not be a material planning consideration for the determination of this application.

Overall, the proposed development would be considered to comply with Saved Policy H8 and the Householder Development SPD and would not result in any unacceptable impact on the amenities or privacy of the occupants of No.23.

27 Headingly Close

No.27 is the semi-detached dwelling located opposite the application site. The front elevation of No.25 faces the rear garden of No.27 circa 15.5m, with the garage sited

in between.

The proposed development would be erected with a 1m distance from the closest corner of the proposal and the curtilage of the boundary of No.27.

The objection received from No.27 raised concerns that the proposal would contribute to the loss of light. Having considered the submitted plans, it is not thought that this would be the result. The existing outbuilding is constructed so that the ridgeline (and highest point) and gable triangle is orientated toward the rear garden of No.27. The proposed development in contrast, would be erected so that the eaves of the outbuilding are the closest point to the side curtilage of the boundary and the roof slope would pull away from the boundary (with the apex of this roof being circa 4m away). Consequently, it would not be considered that this would result in an unacceptable degree of overshadowing or loss of light.

Moreover, it is important to acknowledge the site context of No.27. The rear elevation of this property north facing and therefore there will be a large degree of light loss and obstructed due to this. It is not considered that the impact to any loss of light could be significantly attributed to the proposal.

Overall, the proposed development would be considered to comply with Saved Policy H8 and the Householder Development SPD and would not result in any unacceptable impact on the amenities or privacy of the occupants of No.27.

No other residential dwellings in the locality would be considered to suffer any significant adverse impacts as a result of the proposed development.

Highways

6.18 of the Householder Development SPD states that detached garages or extensions should not be built where they would obstruct views for motorists or pedestrians or otherwise compromise the safety of highway users. Detached garages or extensions incorporating a garage should be set at least 5.5m back from the pavement or service strip to allow a car to be pulled clear of the road whilst opening the garage door.

As established, the garage would be sited to the head of the cul-de-sac, where the existing is situated. This would ensure that no obstruction of views would occur. The proposal would not front a highway, pavement or service strip etc and would be sited over 10m to the head of the cul-de-sac and consequently, would not be deemed to cause any highway safety issues. The proposal would front the cul-de-sac and allow access and space to manoeuvre.

The proposal has also been reviewed by the Council's internal Highways Authority who have raised no objections to the scheme.

The proposed development would not be considered to raise any significant highway safety concerns and would be in accord with the Householder Development SPD.

Conclusion

The proposal would be acceptable in terms of design, residential amenity and highways. The proposal also complies with the relevant Core Strategy, Replacement UDP policies and guidance in the NPPF and is therefore recommended for approval subject to conditions.

Recommendation

That Planning Permission be granted subject to the following Condition(s):-

- 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.

- 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
12/06/2024	-	-	LOCATION PLAN
12/06/2024	01	-	PROPOSED ELEVATIONS, FLOOR PLAN AND SITE PLAN

Signed Case Officer¹: **Reece Black**

Signed Authorising Officer²: **K Foster**

Date: **19 August 2024**

Informatives

Not applicable.

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