

<u>APPLICATION NO:</u>	24/00390/FUL	<u>CASE OFFICER:</u>	Reece Black
<u>WARD:</u>	Northwood	<u>PARISH:</u>	
<u>LOCATION:</u>	43 Buxted Road, Southdene, Kirkby		
<u>PROPOSAL:</u>	CONVERSION OF EXISTING EXTERNAL FRONT CANOPY TO FORM HABITABLE ROOM. INSTALLATION OF EXTERNAL WALL INSULATION.		

Site Description

The application site is located at 43 Buxted Road, Southdene and is situated within a Primarily Residential Area in the Development Plan. The application property is an end-terraced property situated on a corner plot and is a combination of render and brick facing on its front, side and rear elevations together with navy UPVC openings and interlocking, roof tiles.

The application property benefits from a single storey ground floor extension, which projects to the rear of the dwelling. To the front and side of the dwelling is a canopy roof, in which the front adjoins a boundary wall by brick pillars and is enclosed further by (2.no) trellis fence panels and (3.no) full-height PVC obscured panels adjacent the party boundary shared with No.61 Lindby Road. The front canopy has served as a car port previously. The front canopy roof, adjoined brick boundary wall and trellis fence panels are erected to the edge of the cartilage of the boundary, adjacent the public highway.

The application site is situated on a corner plot, at the end of a uniform row of terrace dwellings which face Lindby Road with the gable triangle of the property fronting Buxted Road, the entrance to the property is also contained on this elevation.

The site overall holds a prominent view in the street scene, given the corner plot nature and presence of the existing front projection established close to the highway and as an entrance to Buxted Road. Directly to the north / north-east of the site are playing fields with residential properties to all other directions.

The character and appearance of the street scene comprises strict uniform building lines and rows of terrace lined housing, these range from appearing either brick or rendered facing and are all served by dual-pitched roofs.

Proposal

The application seeks permission for the conversion of existing external front canopy to form habitable room together with Installation of external wall insulation.

The proposed development would see the loss of the existing enclosed front private amenity area and would involve the infilling of existing canopy gapped openings between the brick pillars and installation of external wall insulation. The existing area covered by the canopy and boundary wall to be infilled would form the exterior of the proposal. Therefore, the

proposed works would be constructed to have a projection of 3.5m and a width of 5.49m. This would be served by the existing canopy roof (which would be retained) in which the eaves measure at a height of 2.37m and the highest point of the roof measures at 3.22m. Patio doors would be installed on the east / south-eastern facing side elevation.

The submitted plans annotate that the installation of external wall insulation would be across the entirety of the exterior of the property, both existing and proposed.

*During the determination period for the application, a complaint was received that works had commenced on site. This was queried with the agent who provided a response stating that no works related to the application under determination or requiring Planning Permission had commenced. Insulation was installed on the ground floor, which was previously rendered and consequently not considered to alter the appearance of the dwelling.

Although the installation of external wall insulation has been included within the application, it would not be the view that this would require Planning Permission. Given the site context, range of brick or rendered facing building rows and the corner plot location, it would not be considered that the external wall insulation and works would require Planning Permission. The application property is not a Listed Building or within a Conservation Area, and the Local Planning Authority hold no records of Permitted Development Rights being withdrawn via an Article 4 Direction.

It is considered that the installation of external wall insulation would be acceptable to complete without the requirement of obtaining Planning Permission and despite being included within the application would not form part of the assessment. The report and assessment would focus on the conversion of existing external front canopy to form habitable room.

Consultations

None required.

Representations

This application has been publicised by letters sent to 5 neighbours.

There have been 1 letter of objection, 0 letters of support and 0 letters of comment. The representations are summarised as follows:-

No.61 Lindby Road – the contents of this objection are largely focused highway safety, loss of light and visual amenity but makes more detailed reference to:

- Light to my front garden (and entrance to my property) would be reduced along with my visibility.
- The additional bedroom would increase the noise pollution from the property. This would be harmful to adjoining occupants and the public path.
- The current materials on the roof are currently a hazard as they have been replaced with plastic, which causes runoff to other gardens as the guttering does not link to the roof. The works were not completed by a professional roofer.
- The gas flue is currently situated under the canopy, concerns raised about the relocation should permission be granted.
- The scale of the development would look out of place on both Buxted Road and Lindby Road. The property would stand out, the application property is currently bricked and if permission would be granted it would look out of place from the other

properties in Lindby Road.

- Visibility of the road will be restricted for motorists and pedestrians turning this corner, due to restricted visibility.
- The front garden of the property would have a cramped appearance compared to all other properties on Buxted Road.
- Concerns that any works carried out will affect and damage my property and the brick work.
- Will impact the ability to enjoy my front garden.
- Concerns that if permission is granted that the house would attract more crime in the area by means of house robberies. A bedroom on a ground floor directly on a footpath for pedestrians to view would attract criminals.

The contents of the objection are acknowledged. Not all of the points raised would form material planning considerations. These include comments such as noise pollution, an extension / alteration to an existing domestic property in a residential area would be acceptable in principle and no planning policies would specifically prohibit these on noise from the domestic property (unless a material change of use were to occur).

Impacts such as water runoff or damage to adjoining boundary treatment / property would be matters understood as private, civil matters left between neighbours to manage. Matters such as minor works (i.e. persons who complete the re-roofing etc) would also be understood as private matters and would not involve any action from the Local Planning Authority.

Although, the point of objection which pertains to crime and security is acknowledged, it would not be considered a sufficient reason to warrant a refusal of the application on those grounds.

Some of these points are material to the determination of the application. Issues which relate to design, scale, materials etc would be outlined in the design section of the report. Any impact on residential amenity, highways would be addressed in the relevant sections of the report.

Planning History

APP. NO: 74/12635/HIST

PROPOSAL: ERECTION OF SINGLE STOREY BEDROOM EXTENSION TO SIDE AND CANOPY TO FRONT ELEVATION

DECISION: GRANTED

DECISION DATE: 10 August 1990

APP. NO: 18/00126/UNBLD

PROPOSAL: Enforcement Enquiry

DECISION: CLOSED

DECISION DATE: 3 September 2018

APP. NO: 24/00035/UNAUTH

PROPOSAL: Enforcement Enquiry

DECISION: CLOSED

DECISION DATE: 30 April 2024

Under 74/12635/HIST a side canopy was included within that application, subsequently permitted and erected on site. The canopy roof extension fronting Lindby Road was not included within the application and was unauthorised development. The Enforcement

records note that in accordance with Google Earth, the extension was in place in 2009, and is therefore lawful as it has been in place for more than four years.

In 2018 an enforcement complaint was received which outlined that PVC panels and wooden trellis had been inserted into the existing canopy openings.

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

NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY FRAMEWORK (NPPF)

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 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.

Assessment

Core Strategy CS19 requires development to provide quality design and accessibility in new development and requires development proposals to respond to and integrate positively with the characteristics of the immediate surroundings, complement and enhance existing green infrastructure and features of local importance whilst seeking to maintain a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupiers to avoid unacceptable impacts on existing and future residents.

Saved Policy H5 in the Replacement Unitary Development Plan states that proposals for development within Primarily Residential Areas will be permitted provided that:

1. The Primarily Residential Areas are indicated on the Proposals Map
2. New development within the Primarily Residential Areas (or proposals for the change of use or redevelopment of existing buildings) which is for uses appropriate to a residential area will be permitted provided that the development (either by itself or in conjunction with other developments) would not:
 - a) Have an unacceptable impact on the amenity occupiers by reason of noise, disturbance, overlooking, visual intrusion, smells, fumes, on-street parking or other causes; or,
 - b) Adversely affect the character or street scene of the area.

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 NPPF (Paragraph 135) outlines that planning policies and decision should ensure that developments:

- (a) Will function well and add to the overall quality of the area, not just for the short term but over the lifetime of the development;
- (b) Are visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping;
- (c) Are sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting, while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation or change;

- (d) Establish or maintain a strong sense of place, using the arrangement of streets, spaces, building types and materials to create attractive, welcoming and distinctive places to live, work and visit.

The NPPF (paragraph 140) states that Local Planning Authorities should also seek to ensure that the quality of approved development is not materially diminished between permission and completion, as a result of changes being made to the permitted scheme (for example through changes to approved details such as materials used).

As outlined, the application site is situated on a corner plot with two elevations situated adjacent highways and therefore a view is required to affirm which elevation would be deemed the principal (front) elevation. Although the entrance to the property is on the gable wall, the property is an end-terraced dwelling in the building line of properties which front Lindby Road, it would be considered that the principal elevation of the property would correspond with the terrace row and like the rest of the properties in this row, are orientated facing to the north / north-east. Plans submitted previously for 74/12635/HIST had outlined the gable triangle of the property forms the front elevation. It is noted however, that particularly dwellinghouses (particularly on corner plots) can have two front elevations, which can further a difference of opinion. For the reasons provided above, the front elevation is understood as the elevation consistent with and fronting Lindby Road.

Principle of Development

At present, the proposed development comprises of a front canopy (mono-pitched) roof, with brick pillars which adjoin the front boundary treatment which covers the external garden. Notwithstanding the fact the proposal would be for infill sections to the existing canopy structure already erected (lawful and immune from any planning powers), it would be considered that the works included in this proposal require an application for full Planning Permission for the infill brickwork and would not benefit from Permitted Development.

Part 1 of Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) sets out Householder Permitted Development rights. Class A covers the enlargement, improvement or alterations to a house

Class A states that development is not permitted if:

- (e) the enlarged part of the dwellinghouse would extend beyond a wall which –
 - (i) Forms the principal elevation of the original dwellinghouse; or
 - (ii) Fronts a highway and forms a side elevation of the original dwellinghouse

The original dwellinghouse is understood as the building as it existed on 1 July 1948 where it was built before that date, and as it was built if built after that date. Despite the canopy structure being deemed lawful development, it is not part of the original dwellinghouse.

A view has been taken as to what would be considered the front elevation of the dwellinghouse. Therefore, the proposed works (to infill and convert this space) would not be covered by Permitted Development rights as the proposed works would enlarge a section of the dwellinghouse which would extend beyond the principal elevation of the original dwellinghouse.

This is an important material planning consideration to factor in, as to determine whether the proposed development could be implemented under Permitted Development or whether any fallback position could be established, and a view taken as to whether the proposed development would result in any significant materially greater impact. Despite the existing canopy structure being a lawful structure, the works for the infilling and conversion would not

be covered by Permitted Development.

For the determination of this planning application, as the proposal relates to an area which is to the front of the dwelling and as it would convert an existing external carport / storage area, erected on top of front boundary treatment and the area enclosed is surfaced by block-paved hardstanding to a habitable room (bedroom) it will subsequently be assessed as a single storey front extension in lien with the relevant policies.

The Householder Development SPD (front extensions and porches, 7.5) stipulates that front extensions and porches can be particularly prominent in the street scene and should be particularly carefully designed to retain the character of residential areas.

Design

The existing dwelling is a combination of brick facing on the first-floor elevations with rendered facing on the ground floor and associated brick boundary wall treatment and pillars; it also comprises navy UPVC with concrete roof tiles and cladding to the side of the roof.

The submitted plans note that both the existing and proposed external facing walls would be installed with external wall insulation. This would be across the entirety of the dwelling and would be rendered facing to appear in keeping and cohesive across the dwelling. The existing pitched roof would be retained.

Whilst it is acknowledged that the proposal would be an infill development which would not expand the depth or width of the area the existing canopy occupies, it would however, involve the erection of an expansive, blank wall with no openings and would result in the loss of the existing private, enclosed area, which at present still allows a level of visibility and views.

The proposal would be considered to contravene with paragraph 140. The front canopy roof extension is lawful development; however, it would not be the opinion that the proposed development under consideration would not result in the quality of the approved (through immunity from enforcement) being materially diminished. The material difference between what is existing to what is proposed would be considered to materially diminish further the development on visual amenity and design impacts. The images below demonstrate the incremental changes gradually implemented as a timeline of the impact this has to the quality of the developments design and the wider character of the area.

The NPPF makes clear that notwithstanding previously approved proposals, Local Planning Authorities are advised to resist materially diminishing the quality of these developments through changes. This would provide a policy consideration that notwithstanding what has been allowed on site by immunity from enforcement action, this would not provide a default position to allow further harmful development through substantial changes that may appear incremental changes.



(Google Maps Street View, 2014)



(Google Maps Street View, 2022)



(Officer's site visit, 08/08/2024)

The street scene of both roads of Buxted and Lindby Road (as well as the wider locality) comprise of uniform building lines of terraced properties. The properties range from being brick or rendered faced but this is largely in rows of houses with a consistent external facing material, i.e. Lindby Road comprises brick faced properties whilst Buxted Road comprises rendered faced dwellings. The building lines of properties are all served by dual-pitched roofs. This strict uniformity establishes a strong sense of character.

As outlined, the proposal would be assessed in line with the relevant policy guidance for the consideration of front extensions and porches. 7.5 of the Householder Development SPD asserts that the following guidelines apply:

- Style, design, materials and scale of front extensions and porches should respect the character of the surrounding residential area.
- Account should be taken of the building line, although, for example, small porches and canopies of a satisfactory design in materials projecting in front of the building line will normally be permitted.
- The size and projection of front extensions and porches that may be permitted depends on the type of dwelling and degree of set-back from the highway. A large detached house, set a substantial distance from the highway, would normally be capable of accommodating a much larger front extension or porch than, for example, a terraced dwelling with minimal set-back from the highway.
- Front extensions should not dominate the existing dwelling or disrupt the uniformity of a group of similarly designed dwellings.
- Front extensions through their siting or fenestration should not generate the need to enclose or screen gardens with high boundary features in order to improve privacy.

The proposed development overall would be considered to feature a design and scale which would further fail to respect the character of the surrounding area. The proposal would not take account of the building line, as despite there being no change to the building line by means of projection, the solid, blank walling would increase visual impact of the existing structure on the street scene. There is a substantial difference between the level of impact boundary treatment erected to the edge of the curtilage to a height of circa 1.2m would cause in contrast to a full elevation (in this case 2.3m in height), which would create a more domineering and imposing structure and draw attention to this section failing to take account of the building line or display a suitable design, scale etc. This is furthered by the lack of gaps or allowing a level of views into this area to provide a degree of (semi)-openness, the proposal would appear harsh, unsympathetic and domineering.

Although the proposal would be an infill to the existing canopy, it is considered that the additional impact would result a greater level of harm than what is currently erected on site. The conversion of this canopy roof to form a habitable room would depart from the guidance point, that would support modest porches or canopies, with a satisfactory design and the proposed development would be considered a severe contrast to this policy guidance as it would be deemed to feature an unsatisfactory design, would have an adverse impact on the street scene and the existing built form and arrangement. This would be due to factors such as proximity to the highway, the amount of solid wall, the further detraction from the established character of the area.

Moreover, 6.4 of the Householder Development SPD states that the overall scale of the development should not look out of place in the street scene or other immediate environment. The proposed development would appear as an enlarged form of a front extension, which would appear incongruous in the street scene, the level of discordance enhanced by the infilling of the existing. It would not be considered that the proposal would

display a scale, form and massing, which would avoid appearing harmful in the locality or comparable to the scale of what would generally be perceived as a modest, sensitive front extension. The level of harm caused on the street scene by the existing development would be accentuated by the proposal, to fully infill and convert this space would continue to fail to take account of the existing building line or character of the residential area.

Even though the external brick walls which would infill the existing structure would be faced in render, which would tie in with the dwelling overall once the development had been completed, the materials used within the design of the proposal, itself, would not be considered to be satisfactory to permit the proposal and outweigh other levels of harm otherwise caused by form, massing, structure etc.

6.7 of the Householder Development SPD states that the ratio of solid to void on an elevation (i.e how much of an elevation is covered by windows or openings) is also a key consideration when designing an extension. For example, an extension that is blank walling would look out of place if it were directly alongside the large principal windows of a dwelling.

The submitted plans show that the proposed development would not contain any windows to the front elevation. This would contribute to a design which would not be appropriate, as the impact would be a bleak, bare wall, that would fail to integrate positively to the existing dwelling, wider locality and would detract from the character of the area, which displays a fairly consistent rhythm across the front elevation of the terraced row in terms of the fenestration. This impact would be enhanced given the proximity to the highway, the prominence of the property (corner plot) and the nature of the proposal being a front extension. 6.7 would therefore be paramount guidance to incorporate into a proposal such as this, the failure to include this furthers the level of harm from the proposed development and furthers the contravention with 7.5 as the proposal would detract from the character of the area. Moreover, the PVC plastic panels would be replaced with brick walling, which would further this impact and appear more overbearing (in contrast to the existing PVC plastic) particularly when viewed from the bottom of Lindby Road.

As outlined in 7.5, the guidance places stricter emphasis on front extensions properties such as terraced dwellings which are sited with little set-back from the highway. The guidance of 7.5 advocates that terrace dwellings with minimal set-back from the highway would not be as capable of accommodating a large front extension. For the consideration of this application, it is deemed that the proposal would increase the visual prominence, by furthering its unduly dominant impact. Given that the infill of the proposal would be directly adjacent the highway it would be considered to severely conflict with this guidance.

There are no known reasons as to why any relaxation of the guidance should be relaxed for the proposal. The impact would further the unduly disruption of the uniformity of the terrace row the property is part of, which would further conflict with the SPD's guidance for the consideration of front extensions.

The householder Development SPD (6.14) outlines 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 siting out, the storing of refuse bins, etc.

6.15 stipulates that extensions should take account of any regular spacing between buildings or in the front line of buildings.

The proposal would be deemed to breach this guidance. The infill and conversion of this space would erode the area within the front garden area and result in a cramped appearance within the plot, given it would directly abut the highway. The loss of any degree of openness or views would detrimentally enhance this impact, with nothing deemed to

ameliorate this. When observed in context with the existing rear extension (which disrupts the building line and arrangement of Buxted Road), the proposed development would leave very little room available within the curtilage of the dwelling and would not retain adequate room around the dwelling to prevent a cramped appearance within the plot. This furthers the harm to the character of the surrounding area, the proposal would become a discordant feature in the locality, to the detriment of the wider street scene.

Most of the points raised in the objection relevant to design elements have been addressed within the above. The point about the external facing materials, however, would not be considered to hold any weight. Given that the local area consists of properties which are faced with either brick facing or rendered facing, it would not be considered that the Local Planning Authority would take a view that it would significantly detract from the original dwelling, particularly should the overall dwelling appear more cohesive. Although a fully rendered dwelling may appear contrasting when observed in context of the Lindby Road facing terrace row, it would appear cohesive within the street scene of Buxted Road. Therefore, on this occasion for this property, this would not form a point of objection from the Local Planning Authority on design terms.

The proposed development would not appear to demonstrate quality design, or respond to and integrate positively with the characteristics of the immediate surroundings. It would be deemed to adversely affect the character of the area. Furthermore, the proposed development as a whole would contravene with paragraph 135, with particular conflict with (b), (c) and (d). It would be deemed that the proposed works would create a prominent and disruptive addition to the street scene that would further erode the established character of the residential area. Therefore, it would not be considered to comply with the Householder Development SPD guidance.

It has been considered that the proposal would be an infill to the existing structure established on site, which may appear an incremental or limited addition, particularly as the proposal would not be extended further in its depth. However, on the balance of ensuring high-quality development, it would not be the opinion that the extent of harm caused to the application property and street scene by the proposal would be outweighed by the scale / scope of the works being considered minor. It is deemed that the approval of this development would materially diminish the quality of the existing structure.

Overall, the proposed development would not be deemed to be an acceptable design and would conflict with CS19, Saved Policy H5 and H8, the NPPF (paragraphs 135 and 140) and the Householder Development SPD. The NPPF (paragraph 139) asserts that development that is not well designed should be refused, especially where it fails to reflect local design policies and government guidance on design, taking into account any local design guidance and supplementary planning documents which use visual tools such as design guides and codes.

Therefore, given the level of conflict with local design policies and the NPPF, it is deemed that the design would be harmful. Paragraph 139 should hold significant weight in the determination of this application.

Residential Amenity

6.19 of the Householder Development SPD stipulates that extensions must adequately protect your neighbours' right to enjoy their own home. Extensions must not overshadow or have an overbearing effect on neighbouring dwelling to an unacceptable degree.

7.5 of the Householder Development SPD asserts that extensions should not unacceptably obstruct the outlook of neighbouring dwellings or detract from their privacy.

61 Lindby Road

No.61 is the adjacent, mid-terraced property, the front and rear elevations of the property sit parallel to the original building elevations of No.43. No.61 features a small front garden enclosed by a brick wall with railings above. The existing plastic PVC panels are installed on top of the small brick boundary wall between these two properties. No 61 features a small window adjacent the front door, below a small porch canopy.

The main impacts on residential amenity would be that the proposal would be changed from the existing plastic PVC panels to entirely brick facing. The existing structure is built right adjacent the boundary treatment and to the highway. The proposal would increase the overbearing and domineering impact, to which this is recognised. It is also considered that the change in materials would contribute to harm to residential amenity, although obscured glazing is currently employed, it would still permit a level of light, where as the brick would result in further obstruction and loss of light significantly greater than the existing and would be considered to result in poor outlook within and from this space.

Notwithstanding these impacts, however, it must be considered whether the impact from what is currently erected to what is proposed would result in a materially significant change in the level of harm on residential amenity to a degree that would be deemed unacceptable. On the issue of residential amenity, it would be acknowledged that this would result in adverse harm to amenity, however, it would not be the opinion that the proposal would result in an unacceptable impact on amenity and privacy to a degree that would warrant a refusal. Furthermore, it is considered that the outlook from the ground floor window which would be predominately impact, is a small window which would not facilitate substantial views or light and therefore the proposal would not be considered to cause unacceptable adverse impacts.

The objection received asserts that the proposal would result in harm to residential amenities. The points relevant to residential amenities and the impacts have been considered. As stated above, it would not be considered that any impacts would be sufficient to warrant a refusal on the basis of impact to residential amenities.

Therefore, it is considered that notwithstanding the impacts outlined above, the proposed development would not be considered to result in an unacceptable impact on residential amenities or privacy.

Highways

Properties along Lindby Road do not contain any in-curtilage parking. The site of development has previously been used as a carport. It would not be considered however an unacceptable impact to highway safety should this space be removed. Therefore, although the proposal would see the loss of this area, this would not warrant a sufficient justification to refuse the application on highways grounds.

This view is reinforced by the NPPF (paragraph 115) which states that development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe.

A point of objection received was that visibility of the road would be restricted for motorists and pedestrians turning this corner from reduced visibility. It is considered that given the structure would already restrict some views, drivers would already be cautious and alert because of the existing level of obstruction. It is not the view that the proposed development would exacerbate the level of harm to an unacceptable level, given what is currently on site.

It is considered that the highways impact of the proposed development, although

acknowledged, would not be sufficient to warrant a refusal on highways grounds.

Other Considerations

Additional concerns due to the proposal are that it would lead to a precedent being set in which other forward projecting extensions in the locality, which would further disrupt the otherwise uniform building lines that exist in the local area.

Conclusion

In conclusion, the proposed development is considered to result in further harm by means of an enlarged and overly prominent development. This would be harmful application dwelling and visual amenity and character of the locality. The proposal does not accord with the local plan and its relevant policies or guidance contained within the Householder Development SPD. The proposed development significantly contravenes with national and local policies. The proposed development seemingly has not sufficiently complied with the relevant policies and guidance. Therefore, the issues caused by the design and conflict with policies should hold great weight and mean that the application be recommend for refusal.

Recommendation

That Planning Permission be refused for the following reason(s):-

- 1) The proposed development would feature a harmful and incongruous design which would be detrimental to the visual amenity and character of the local area. The overall design would appear enlarged, overly prominent and out of place in the street scene. The proposal is contrary to the NPPF, Saved Policies H5 & H8 of the Knowsley Replacement Unitary Development Plan, adopted June 2006, as well as Policies CS2 and CS19 of the Knowsley Local Plan Core Strategy, adopted January 2016 and the Householder Development SPD.

SCHEDULE 1

Date Received	Ref. No	Version	Drawing/Document Title
19.07.2024	-	-	LOCATION PLAN
19.07.2024	MS18303	-	PROPOSED GROUND FLOOR PLAN. PROPOSED ROOF PLAN.
19.07.2024	MS18304	-	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