

<u>APPLICATION NO:</u>	24/00345/FUL	<u>CASE OFFICER:</u>	Reece Black
<u>WARD:</u>	Roby	<u>PARISH:</u>	
<u>LOCATION:</u>	43 Rupert Road, Roby, Knowsley		
<u>PROPOSAL:</u>	ERECTION OF SINGLE STOREY SIDE AND REAR EXTENSION TOGETHER WITH THE REPLACEMENT OF FRONT BOUNDARY WALL.		

Site Description

The application property is located at 43 Rupert Road, Roby and is sited within an area which is designated as a Primarily Residential Area in the Development Plan. The application property is a semi-detached dwellinghouse, rendered to the front elevation and brick facing on its side and rear elevations. It also contains timber framed windows with interlocking concrete roof tiles.

The application property benefits from a single storey rear extension. To the bottom of the rear garden is one brick built outbuilding and one timber outbuilding. The rear garden spans a depth of approximately 22m. The front garden area is enclosed by timber fence and gravel hardstanding and dropped kerb access onto Rupert Road. Access to the side and rear of the property is accessed via an existing timber fence, which the bins are currently stored adjacent.

The front elevation of the property is north / north-eastern facing. The street scene largely comprises of a range of semi-detached to the south-western side of the highway and terraced dwellings opposite the application site. Most of the semi-detached dwellings benefit from characteristic rear outrigger projections.

Proposal

The application seeks permission for the erection of a single storey side and rear extension together with the replacement and erection of front boundary wall.

The proposed rear extension would have a depth of 4m and would have a width of 7.75m, the side extension would have a width of 1.65m and a depth of 12.85m. The proposed development would form a 'wrap-around' layout to the original dwelling. This would be served by a mono-pitched canopy roof to the front and side and a dual-pitched roof to the rear elevation, which would measure 3m at the eaves and 4.11m at the ridge line.

The rear roof would feature a parapet coping at the edge, the roof slopes would contain four roof lights. The rear elevation would feature patio doors and a window, the side elevation would contain an access door and small window to the top of the elevation and the front elevation would comprise new fenestration arrangement and a new window. All the windows to the front and side elevations would be obscurely glazed as included within the submitted plans.

The proposed development would see the demolition of the existing rear outrigger.

The proposed replacement front boundary treatment (wall) would see the erection of a mid-height (0.93m) masonry wall with bullnose brick coping.

The proposal has seen amendments which include the footprint of the rear extension changing from chamfered to square in shape and the height of the proposed front boundary wall has been reduced from its original height of 1.64m.

Consultations

None Required.

Representations

This application has been publicised by letters sent to 10 neighbours. 1 letter of representation was received from 41 Rupert Road.

The occupants of No.41 requested that an extension of time to allow further consideration to review the plans, due to personal circumstances (regarding health concerns).

Following amendments to the scheme, original notified neighbours were re-consulted for 10-days on the revised plans received. The occupants of No.41 called and discussed some points of clarification and concerns with the Case Officer, however, no further comments in writing have been received.

Planning History

APP. NO: 00/00260/FUL

PROPOSAL: ERECTION OF SINGLE STOREY SIDE AND REAR EXTENSION TO ENLARGE KITCHEN, DINING ROOM AND UTILITY ROOM

DECISION: PERMITTED DEVELOPMENT

DECISION DATE: 11 July 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.

The site is identified as a site allocated for housing development in the adopted Unitary Development Plan. As such, a domestic extension to 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 identifying matters of concern within the application (as originally submitted) and negotiating with the applicant, acceptable amendments to the proposal to address those concerns. As a result, the Local Planning Authority has been able to grant planning permission for an acceptable proposal, 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

The Householder Development SPD states that single storey side extensions should be designed so that they preserve the street scene, protect light and privacy of neighbours and ensure that they provide sufficient parking spaces.

The Householder Development SPD states that rear extensions should be designed to avoid causing overshadowing, loss of outlook or loss of privacy to the neighbours, or appear unduly dominant to neighbours.

Design

The existing dwelling is brick facing with white and brown timber framed windows and tiled roofing. The proposed development would include materials that are in keeping with the existing dwelling. The proposal would see white UPVC windows installed to the existing dwelling and proposed development. The front elevation would remain rendered facing and the side and rear elevations would be brick facing. This would emulate the original design of the dwelling. The materials would therefore be in keeping and therefore feature an acceptable design. The proposal would be served by pitched roofs.

Although the rear roof would be a dual-pitched roof (unlike the hipped roof of the original dwelling) it would be considered that as the proposal would be sited to the rear of the dwelling, it would not be readily visible from the street scene or have any detrimental impact on the character of the area. Subsequently, this conflict with policy would be acceptable.

The Householder Development SPD states (6.14) that the extension should leave adequate room around the dwelling to avoid a cramped appearance within the plot. It should also leave adequate garden areas for sitting out etc.

The submitted plans show that sufficient space would remain usable and would not result in a cramped appearance.

Access to the side and rear of the property would be reduced but not completely removed, therefore refuse bins could still be stored to the rear or side of the dwelling. Although, at present bins are stored within the front area of the curtilage. This is also common in the street scene, as observed during the site visit. Therefore, should bins be retained to the front of the dwelling, this would not be considered to result in any unacceptable impact on the character of the area.

The Householder Development SPD (7.11, gates, walls and fences) stipulates that highway visibility should be preserved and solid wall or fences above 0.6m adjacent to vehicular access should be avoided.

As the height of the wall has been markedly reduced from the previous height (1.64m) to the current height of 0.93m, and given that under Permitted Development, front boundary treatment adjacent a highway could be erected to a height of 1m, it would be considered acceptable at the indicated height. The design and materials used would be in keeping with the application dwelling and the wider area and would therefore be acceptable.

Overall, the proposed development would have an acceptable design and would be in keeping with the requirements of Saved Policy H8 and the Householder

Development SPD.

Residential Amenity

The Householder Development SPD states that extensions should not cause overshadowing, loss of outlook or loss of privacy to neighbours. It also states that a single storey rear extension located on or immediately adjacent to the party boundary with a neighbouring dwelling will normally be acceptable if it does not project more than 4m from the rear elevation of the existing dwelling.

Following the amendments to the scheme, the proposed development would have a depth of 4m. The original submission featured a chamfered section to take account for the neighbouring window (No.41) and incorporate the 45-degree rule, however, following discussions with the agent and clarification on the guidance of the SPD, this was changed to featuring a squared shape. This is because the 45-degree rule would not be used to assess a rear extension unless it were to project beyond 4m, this is in accordance with the guidance of the Householder Development SPD.

The revised proposal and its projection would therefore remain compliant with the policy guidance of the SPD and would be acceptable.

The roof pitch would be 17.5°, which would be a shallow pitch. As a reference point, the height of the eaves and roof (if discounting the parapet roof feature) would be in accordance with the parameters of what could be built under Permitted Development, therefore it is the opinion that this would not constitute any unacceptable impact on residential amenities.

41 Rupert Road

No.41 is the paired, semi-detached property. The original front and rear elevations of these properties sit parallel to each other. No.41 benefits from a rear outrigger extension (circa 3m in depth).

The proposed development would comply with the projection parameters and would not be deemed to result in any adverse impacts. The side elevation of the rear extension would be circa 0.33m off the party boundary shared with No.41.

There is also boundary treatment on the party boundary at a height of roughly 2m, which would soften the proposal.

Overall, the proposed development would accord with the Householder Development SPD and would not be considered to cause any unacceptable harm to the amenities or privacy of the occupants of No.41.

45 Rupert Road

No.45 is the adjacent, detached dwellinghouse. The original front and rear elevations of these properties sit parallel to each other. No.45 benefits from a small outrigger extension and a single storey side extension.

The proposed development would be within the guidance of the SPD. No.45 contains windows on the side elevation, which are believed to serve a kitchen. It is not considered that the proposal would result in any unacceptable impacts to residential amenity.

The proposed development would be built circa 0.8m off the party boundary shared with No.45. There is boundary treatment at a height of roughly 1.8m.

Overall, the proposed development would accord with the Householder Development SPD and would not be considered to cause any unacceptable harm to the amenities or privacy of the occupants of No.45.

Highways

As existing, parking is provided to the front garden area. The proposed development would not project beyond the front elevation of the dwelling and would not remove any existing in-curtilage parking provisions. Moreover, the proposal would not see the increase in the number of bedrooms so would not generate the requirement for any additional parking.

The proposed boundary treatment would not be considered to result in any significant highway safety issues.

Overall, the proposal would be acceptable and not have caused any adverse harm to highway safety of the locality.

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) Notwithstanding the outlined materials agreed for the roof of the extension hereby permitted, all other materials to be used on the external surfaces of the extension 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
05/07/2024	W-06_0.001	A	LOCATION AND BLOCK PLANS
23/08/2024	W-06_3.001	C	PROPOSED SITE PLAN
23/08/2024	W-06_3.002	B	PROPOSED FLOOR AND ROOF PLANS
23/08/2024	W-06_3.003	C	PROPOSED ELEVATIONS

Signed Case Officer¹: **Reece Black**

Signed Authorising Officer²: **K Foster**

Date: **13 September 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