

REGENERATION AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT

APPLICATION NO: 22/00053/FUL

APPLICANT: Mr Leeroy Dewah

WARD AFFECTED: Swanside

DEVELOPMENT: ERECTION OF A TWO STOREY SIDE / REAR EXTENSION TOGETHER
WITH THE ERECTION OF A SINGLE STOREY FRONT EXTENSION

LOCATION OF SITE: 31 Merton Close, Roby, L36 4JD

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 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.

PLANNING HISTORY

N/A

TECHNICAL CONSULTATIONS:

N/A

NEIGHBOUR NOTIFICATION:

This application has been publicised by letters sent to 10 neighbours. Two Objections have been received on the original plans consisting of the following main points:

- The proposed site plan is incorrect as it shows 30 as set back from 31, whereas they are the same depth.
- Concerned about noise, dust during construction.
- The building is large for a small close.

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\s3nw9zki\22-00053 - ful 31 merton
close roby l36 4jd.doc

- We have re ordered our kitchen to allow more light, this will be affected by the two storey extension.
- We are concerned in relation to the visual amenity of the extension and overshadowing.
- Has a loss of light survey been conducted.
- The extension would affect the value of our property.
- We have no objection to a single storey extension.

In addition, one objection was received on the amended plans consisting of the following main points:

- I was advised that a minor alteration was made to the plans. Having viewed the latter, our objections remain the same and we would value a visit to our property for you to understand the serious concerns we have regarding the proposed building extension and repeat below the previous for our objection.

ISSUES AND ASSESSMENT:

PROPOSAL

The application is for the erection of a two storey side/rear extension together with the erection of a single storey front extension*.

**The project of the two storey extension at the rear has been reduced from 3.3 to 3 metres in length.*

POLICY CONSIDERATIONS

The application complies with Policies CS2 and CS19 of the Core Strategy and saved Policies H5 and H8 of the UDP; the application also complies with the Householder Development SPD.

DESIGN, ACCESS AND CRIME PREVENTION

The design of the proposal is acceptable. The two storey extension would have a pitched roof like the existing main dwelling. The two storey side extension would be set back around 0.65 metres from the nearest wall and 1.24 metres back from the main front wall of the property. This in conjunction with the adjacent angle of the neighbouring dwelling (32) means that there would not be a terracing effect. The application therefore complies with para 7.2 of the Householder Development SPD. The scale of the extensions are not unusual for a residential property. Overall, the design of the scheme is acceptable. The application raises no crime or anti-social behaviour issues.

RESIDENTIAL AMENITY

The proposal would not harm the amenity of neighbouring properties.

In relation to 30, the rear extension roof changes would be less than 4 metres long and would not impact on 30. The two storey side/rear extension would be on the opposite side of the house and away from the boundary. Overall, there would be no harm to the amenity of 30.

In relation to 32, the two storey extension would only project around 3 metres at the rear. This complies with Para 7.4 of the Householder SPD which states that two storey extensions of up to 3 metres will normally be acceptable. As the extension is not more than 3 metres long, it does not need to be considered against the 45 degree rule or require a lighting assessment.

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

The nearest part of 32 is a garage rather than a main habitable room. There would be some loss of light/outlook to the kitchen/dining room of 32 through the side window and double doors. However, these are considered secondary windows. The primary window of the room (at the rear) would not be significantly impacted by the proposal. This combined with the rooflight would ensure that there would be sufficient light and outlook for this room.

In addition, it appears that there was also originally a rear window which has been recently blocked up. As the owner has actively chosen to block up their own rear window, any loss of light arising from this is their responsibility, not a result of the proposed extension. Also, the two storey side/rear extension would be around 0.8 metres away rather than directly on the boundary. Therefore, any loss of light/outlook from the two storey extension would not be significant enough to justify refusal of the application, particularly when considering the reduction in length to 3 metres.

Overall, there would not be significant harm to the amenity of 32.

Overall, the proposal will not cause significant harm to the amenity of neighbouring properties.

OTHER MATTERS

In relation to construction work, noise and dust would not be valid planning reasons to refuse the scheme as all construction work will generate noise and dust to some extent. In relation to impact on property prices, this is not a material planning consideration that can be taken into account.

In relation to the site plan being inaccurate, the development has been assessed following a site visit and taking into account the comments made by neighbours. The discrepancy referred to appears to be a drafting error on the O/S base.

CONCLUSION

The proposal is acceptable in design and would not harm the amenity of neighbouring properties, The application complies with local planning policies and is recommended for approval.

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 Policy CS19 of the Knowsley Local Plan Core Strategy, adopted January 2016 and saved Policies H5

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

and H8 of the Knowsley Replacement Unitary Development Plan, adopted in June 2006.

SCHEDULE 1

Date Received	Ref. No	Version	Drawing/Document Title
01/02/2022	05	-	Location Plan
31/01/2022	02	-	Proposed Ground Floor Plan
28/03/2022	03	Rev A	Proposed First Floor Plan
28/03/2022	04	Rev A	Existing and Proposed front and rear elevations
28/03/2022	05	Rev A	Existing and Proposed Side Elevations

Informatives

N/A

Andrew Hunt
05 May 2022

Alan Kilroe
9 May 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\s3nw9zki\22-00053 - ful 31 merton
close roby l36 4jd.doc