

<u>APPLICATION NO:</u>	24/00388/FUL	<u>CASE OFFICER:</u>	Reece Black
<u>WARD:</u>	Cherryfield	<u>PARISH:</u>	
<u>LOCATION:</u>	7 Dunfold Close, Southdene, Kirkby		
<u>PROPOSAL:</u>	ERECTION OF TWO STOREY SIDE EXTENSION, SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION AND SINGLE STOREY FRONT EXTENSION TO FORM BAY WINDOW TOGETHER WITH CANOPY PITCHED ROOF.		

Site Description

The application site is located at 7 Dunfold Close, Southdene and is situated within an area which is allocated as a Primarily Residential Area in the Development Plan. The application property is a semi-detached dwellinghouse and is brick facing on its front, side and rear elevations. The property contains white UPVC openings and brown, interlocking roof tiles.

The property benefits from a single storey side extension which currently provides a garage, with a white garage door, along with a modest front porch with roof canopy. The rear garden is expansively covered by sealed surface. The front garden area comprises block paving which accommodates hardstanding for one in curtilage parking space, the remainder of the area is filled with gravel stones and enclosed by a mid-height brick boundary wall. There is access to the side and rear of the dwelling, accessed via a timber gate; bins are currently stored within the rear garden.

The application property is south-western facing, is situated in a (largely uniform) building line of other semi-detached properties, the properties opposite consist of a different architectural style of properties in keeping to their building line. The dwellings in the street scene have been altered and extended in a range of ways. As existing there is circa 5.5m from the front elevation to the public highway.

Proposal

The application seeks permission for the erection of a two-storey side extension, single storey rear extension and single storey front extension to form bay window together with a canopy pitched roof.

The proposed two-storey extension would see reconfiguration works to the building structure on the ground floor (existing single skin to be demolished and installation of cavity wall) which would be erected to the same width of the existing. Both storeys would therefore have a width of 3m, the ground floor would have a depth of 15.21m (combined with the rear extension) and the first-floor would have a depth of 7.8m. This would be served by a hipped roof, which would measure 5.2m at the eaves and 7.95m at the ridgeline.

The proposed rear extension would have a projection of 4m with a width of 9.15. This would be served by a mono-pitched roof, which would measure 2.33m at the eaves and 3.68m at the tallest point. This roof would feature 4 rooflights.

Windows would be installed on the front, side and rear elevations. The first-floor side elevation windows (2.no) would be obscurely glazed. The rear elevation would feature full height windows and patio doors. The garage door would be removed and replaced with a window and infill brickwork below.

The proposed front extension would be to form a mono-pitched canopy roof and front bay window and would have a projection of 0.8m. This would sit flush with the existing front porch. Other than the canopy roof, the only front extension would be a side wall

The proposed development would see a dual-pitched roof installed above the existing projecting bay window sections of the front elevation.

The proposal has seen amendments which include the set-back of the first-floor front elevation, review of the rear extension to reduce the depth to 4m – the extended roof canopy was removed from the proposal, floor plans being accurately annotated with rooms for clarification. Furthermore, a parking plan has been submitted to support the application to demonstrate two spaces can be achieved within the curtilage of the dwelling.

Consultations

None Required.

Representations

This application has been publicised by letters sent to 8 neighbours. No representations have been received.

Planning History

No recorded planning history.

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 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

f)

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.

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.

The Householder Development SPD states that two storey side extensions should be designed to avoid having an overbearing effect or causing unacceptable loss of light or privacy for neighbours.

The Householder Development SPD states 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 area.

Design

The existing dwelling is rendered and brick facing with white UPVC openings and tiled roofing. The proposed development would include materials which are to match the existing and emulate the design of the original dwelling, which would include the brickwork to match the design. The proposed development would be served by pitched (and hipped) roofs where appropriate (two-storey side extension).

The Householder Development SPD states that two-storey side extensions should not have flat roofs. The design of the roofs would be considered acceptable. The two-storey side extension would be served by a hipped roof which would emulate the design, pitch and materials of the original roof and would be subordinate (0.3m lower). This would therefore accord with Saved Policy H8 and the SPD.

The Householder Development SPD stipulates that two-storey side extensions should be designed to avoid creating a terracing effect, either by themselves or in conjunction with similar extensions which may exist or potentially be proposed for adjacent properties in the future.

The SPD furthers that usually either a minimum space of 1m should be preserved between the extension and the party boundary to the side of the property, OR the front wall of the first-floor of the extension should be set-back at least 1m from the immediately adjoining part of the main front wall of the original dwelling.

The proposed development was amended to incorporate this guidance and following this, the front wall of the first-floor would be set-back by an additional 0.5m to achieve the prescribed 1m set back. The proposal was also set in from the boundary by 1m. Therefore, it is deemed that the proposed development would not result in any potential or actual creation of the terracing effect and would comply with the Householder Development SPD.

The Householder Development SPD 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.

The application has been amended to reduce the depth and ensure that the

proposed rear extension would contain a depth of 4m (the previous canopy roof projection has been removed), subsequently, the proposal would be within the projection parameters outlined and therefore be acceptable.

The Householder Development SPD states that proposals should ensure that adequate provision is made / retained for refuse collection and recycling. Ideally a minimum distance of 1m should be retained between the side wall of any side extension and boundary to facilitate collection. This may not always be practicable, particularly in cases where houses have very narrow plots. Extensions which removed access to the rear of a dwelling will normally only be acceptable if a secure bin store or alternative arrangements can be provided to the front of the dwelling, which would not have a detrimental impact on the street scene. In such cases acceptable alternative arrangements for bin collection need to be indicated in the planning submission.

The proposed development would retain circa 1m between the party boundary, which is the same as the existing. Bins are currently stored to the rear garden, with access still retained. Therefore, bin storage would remain as existing, and the proposal would not result in this being changed or remove access to the side and rear of the dwelling.

The Householder Development SPD states that 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 proposed development would therefore be deemed to comply with the guidance of the SPD. The proposal would feature a small side wall projecting forward to sit in line with the existing porch and a front canopy roof. The front elevation would contain a bay window underneath the canopy roof. The forward projection would not significantly alter the massing of the dwelling and would still retain an acceptable distance from the highway to prevent it featuring an unduly dominant appearance.

Overall, the proposed development would accord with the Householder Development SPD and would be deemed to have an acceptable design.

Residential Amenity

5 Dunfold Close

No.5 is the paired, semi-detached dwelling, the original front and rear elevations sit parallel to each other. No.5 benefits from a single storey side extension (garage).

The proposed two-storey side extension would not be readily visible to the occupants of No.76 as it would not project beyond the existing rear elevation and therefore would not have any impact. The proposed single storey extension would be within the parameters of the SPD and would be acceptable. The front extension would be very minor and not cause any adverse impact to residential amenities.

Overall, the proposed development would accord with the Householder Development SPD and would not be deemed to cause any significant harm to the amenities or privacy of the occupants of No.5.

9 Dunfold Close

No.9 is the adjacent semi-detached dwelling, the two gable walls of these properties

face each other. The original front and rear elevations of these two properties are roughly parallel. No.9 benefits from a two-storey side extension.

The proposed development would not be considered to result in any unacceptable impact on residential amenities or privacy as it is policy compliant with the guidance of the SPD. The gable wall of No.9 does not contain any windows. The side elevation of the proposal contains 2 windows on the first floor, however, these are obscurely glazed and given the distance to the boundary and the proximity these would be in relation to the gable wall of No.9 it would not result in any harm to residential amenity or privacy.

The proposed single storey rear extension would not be deemed to cause any unacceptable impact on residential amenities as it would comply with the projection parameters contained in the SPD. The proposed works to the front elevation would be minor and not considered to result in any severe impact.

Overall, the proposed development would accord with the Householder Development SPD and would not be deemed to cause any significant harm to the amenities or privacy of the occupants of No.9.

Highways

The proposed development would see the number of bedrooms increase to 4 bedrooms. In addition, the existing ground floor garage would be changed to a habitable room, it has been stated that this would not be a bedroom, however, the internal dimensions meet the threshold to be considered a parking space within the curtilage of the dwelling and subsequently, would be deemed the loss of a parking space within the curtilage of the dwelling.

The Householder Development SPD states that dwellings which have 4+ bedrooms would require 3 parking spaces.

Therefore, it has been agreed that a second accessible parking space would be provided to the front garden area, with the removal of a section of the existing front boundary wall. The driveway access would be extended to 7.94m in width. The depth would still allow the minimum 5.5m required.

This would therefore provide a replacement parking space within the curtilage of the dwelling.

Given that a replacement (in-curtilage) parking space has been provided and that the parking standards are maximum standards, this would be considered acceptable and would not result in an unacceptable highway safety impact. It would be considered that any additional parking requirements could be accommodated on the street scene, in which it is evidenced that on-street parking is a feature of the close.

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

Overall, the proposed development would be acceptable and would not cause any significant harm on highway safety.

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.

- 4) No part of the development hereby granted shall be occupied until the submitted and approved drawing, proposed parking arrangement (No.1070/24) has been implemented in full accordance with the detail indicated on the plan. For the avoidance of doubt the agreed parking arrangement shall remain for parking purposes at all times thereafter and the demolished sections of the boundary wall shall not be reinstated.

Reason: To ensure that adequate off-street parking is available in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (2023), Policies CS2, CS7 and CS19 of the Knowsley Local Plan: Core Strategy, adopted January 2016, saved Policies H5 and H8 of the Knowsley Replacement Unitary Development Plan, adopted June 2006, Ensuring a Choice of Travel SPD (2010) and Householder Development SPD (2016).

SCHEDULE 1

Date Received	Ref. No	Version	Drawing/Document Title
19/07/2024			LOCATION PLAN
09/09/2024	1062/24	REV C	EXISTING AND PROPOSED PLANS AND ELEVATIONS
09/09/2024	1070/24		PROPOSED PARKING ARRANGEMENT

Signed Case Officer¹: **Reece Black**

**Signed Authorising
Officer²:** **K Foster**

Date: **8 October 2024**

Informatives

- 1) It is an offence to carry out any works within the public highway without the permission of the Highway Authority. This permission requires the construction, improvement or alteration of an access to the public highway. Under Section 184 of the Highways Act 1980, the Highway Authority must specify the works to be carried out. Only the Highway Authority or a contractor approved by the Highway Authority can carry out these works. Prior to the commencement of any works, the applicant is advised to contact the Council's Maintenance Contractor Tarmac on 0800 023 2334 or Knowsley.highways@tarmac.com

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