

Regeneration and Economic Development Department

APPLICATION NO: 22/00202/FUL

APPLICANT: Mr Stephen Rogers

WARD AFFECTED: Halewood South

DEVELOPMENT: ERECTION OF SINGLE STOREY EXTENSION TO SIDE AND REAR;
DORMER EXTENSION (INCORPORATING JULIET BALCONY) TO REAR;
CONSTRUCTION OF PITCHED ROOF TO EXISTING REAR DORMER AND
FRONT PORCH

LOCATION OF SITE: 5 Mansell Drive, Halewood, Knowsley, L26 1TU

KNOWSLEY LOCAL PLAN ALLOCATION –

Primary Residential Development

RELEVANT POLICIES

National Planning Policy Framework

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

SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENTS

Householder Development SPD (2016)

TECHNICAL CONSULTATIONS:

Halewood Town Council - No Comments Received.

NEIGHBOUR NOTIFICATION:

This application has been publicised by letters sent to 11 neighbours.

There has been 1 letter of objection. The representations are summarised as follows:-

- a) The development would block outside and back of their property.
- b) It is too large and would not be in sync with the rest of the properties.
- c) The previous owners wanted to sell part of the land to new developers to build flats, this was also objected due to the impact this would have against our property and private.
- d) "The existing occupier of application site has caused some friction and stress towards existing members of the Drive.", including issues with parking.
- e) Issue with occupier extending white line in front of driveway, impacting on neighbour's visitors parking including carer for elderly mother, resulting in fines being issued to visitor.
- f) Driveway is blocked most of the time for themselves and for mother's carer.

The comments made at point c) – f) are not material planning considerations in the assessment of this planning application.

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

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.

ISSUES AND ASSESSMENT:

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

APP. NO: 18/00674/OUT
PROPOSAL: OUTLINE PLANNING APPLICATION FOR 1NO DWELLING - ALL
MATTERS RESERVED FOR FUTURE APPROVAL
DECISION: Granted
DECISION DATE: 21 December 2018

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

The application relates to a detached dormer bungalow with outrigger to the rear located on the eastern side of Mansell Drive an established residential area in Halewood. The site occupies a large plot over approximately 817 sq m, which is sited towards the end of a no-through road. A substantial area of hardstanding is to the side of the dwelling with vehicle access taken directly off Mansell Drive. Residential properties surround the site and the property backs onto the New Hutte Neighbourhood Centre and playing fields (formerly New Hutte Primary School).

PROPOSAL

The application proposes the erection of a single storey extension to the side and rear together with a new dormer extension with Juliet balcony to the rear and alterations to an existing rear dormer to provide a new pitched roof. In addition, the application proposes the erection of a porch to the front of the dwelling.

POLICY CONSIDERATIONS

The site is allocated as a Primarily Residential Area within the Local Plan Policies Map. Therefore, domestic extensions and alterations would be acceptable in principle within this location subject to compliance with all other relevant local planning policies and guidance.

The key policies for the determination of this application are Local Plan Policies CS2 and CS19 and Saved UDP policies H5 and H8. The Householder Development SPD is also a material consideration.

DESIGN, ACCESS AND CRIME PREVENTION

The host dwelling comprises a dormer bungalow with a large single storey flat roofed (with parapet) extension to the rear which projects 8.1 m from the main rear elevation of the dwelling, currently providing utility/WC, garage/store. Bedroom, bathroom and office accommodation is provided within the roof space with dormers at the front and rear. The host property is rendered/finished white with a tiled pitched roof.

The proposed extension would subsume the area currently occupied by the existing rear extension. The proposed front porch would have dimensions of 1.7 m by 3.4 m with a hipped roof attaining a maximum height of 4 m.

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

The extension would project 8.98 m from the rear and extend 8 m out from the side of the dwelling. Accommodation would comprise utility room, shower room and lounge with a large garage. The extension at the side would have a duo-pitched roof that would hip into the rear part of the extension. The extension at the side would be set back 11 m from the front elevation of the host dwelling.

It is also proposed to create a pitched roof to a small flat roofed dormer and to construct a new dormer roof extension at the rear. The new dormer would extend an existing first floor office. There would be no set back from the eaves to the edge of the dormer as it would be flush with the outer face of the existing dwelling, it would have a duo-pitched roof, patio windows and Juliet balcony.

Saved Policy H8 of the UDP states that *'Proposals for extensions to dwellings, or for the erection or enlargement of domestic garages and outbuildings, 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...'* Likewise, the Householder SPD requires that the form and massing of an extension is critical in how it relates to the rest of the dwelling.

A neighbour has raised concern in regard to the extension being too large and would not match with the rest of the properties. In that respect, the Council's Householder SPD requires that single storey side extensions are designed so that they preserve the street scene. The overall scale of the development should not look out of place and should normally be subordinate to the original dwelling.

In this case, Officers consider that although the proposed extension is of significant size, adequate space would remain around the dwelling and given that there is an existing extension to the rear and the side element is set back some 17.5 m from the highway, the extension within this plot can be accommodated without having a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the host dwelling or on the streetscene and does not warrant a refusal in this instance.

Turning to the alterations to the existing dormer and the provision of a new dormer with Juliet balcony to the rear of the dwelling; the Householder SPD advises that dormers should not be so large as to dominate the roof slope resulting in a dwelling that appears unbalanced – they should be designed to ensure sensitive and appropriate approach conserves the character of the original building.

It is further advised that a dormer should normally be set back at least 1 m from the main elevation it relates to and 0.5 m from the roof edge on either side. In this instance the dormer is flush with the existing rear elevation and set in only 0.2 m from the roof edge on one side. Openings should generally be noticeably smaller than the storeys below. In this case, the dormer would read as an extension from the rear. It is proposed to have large patio doors within the dormer, however, the openings at the ground floor would also comprise in the main, large bi-fold and patio doors. The property backs onto a playing field and is not overlooked by other residential properties, there would be no views from the street. It is considered that the although the dormer would not be consistent with the guidance of the Householder SPD, it is considered that the impact would not be significant to justify refusing the development. The construction of the pitched roof to an existing dormer does not raise any issues.

Turning to the materials proposed, the application indicates that materials would match that of the host dwelling.

Adequate space and access would be retained on the site for the storage of waste and recycling bins.

There are no access or crime implications associated with this development.

Overall, provided materials appropriately match that of the host dwelling, it is considered that the design and scale of the proposal is acceptable, and it would not have a significant impact on the character or visual amenity of the dwelling or the surrounding area. As such the proposal would not conflict with relevant Core Strategy policies CS2, CS19 and Saved Policies H5 and H8 of the UDP.

HIGHWAYS

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

The host property currently accommodates 4 bedrooms, and the proposal would not involve any additional bedroom spaces. The level of parking required is unaffected by the development and ample hardstanding would be retained within the curtilage for parking to serve the property.

The development does not raise any highway concerns and the proposal therefore does not conflict with Policies CS2 and CS19 of the Core Strategy and saved Policies H5 of and H8 of the UDP.

RESIDENTIAL AMENITY

Private Amenity Space Provision

A garden depth of between approximately 9 m and 10 m with usable amenity space of about 195 sqm would be retained. Sufficient amenity space would be retained as a usable garden area without having detrimental impacts on the existing occupiers.

3 Mansell Drive

The extension would extend 8.9 m from the rear of the host dwelling, set in 3.9 m off the gable and a further 1 m off the common boundary with No. 3. The neighbouring property has an attached garage to the side which runs along the common boundary, resulting in the proposed extension being sited approximately 7 m from the main house on the neighbouring site.

No. 3 has 2 no. first floor windows and a ground floor window within the gable and the host dwelling currently sits across those windows. No. 3 also has a projecting bay to the rear, set approximately 500 mm off the gable. It has a door to the rear and small leaded windows to either side, one of which faces onto the common boundary with the application site. There is an existing fence and planting along the common boundary.

The Council's Householder SPD advises that a single storey extension at the rear of up to 4 m on or immediately adjacent to the party boundary will normally be acceptable. A single storey extension beyond 4 m (or in a situation where the application property has a rear elevation which is set further back than the rear elevation of the neighbouring dwelling) will normally only be permitted if it does not breach the 45-degree rule. Although the proposed extension considerably exceeds 4 m, it would be set substantially off the boundary. It is considered that an SPD compliant extension of 4 m deep immediately adjacent to the common boundary would have a much greater impact on the neighbouring property than the extension as proposed.

In regard to the new dormer, this would be sited adjacent to the boundary with No. 3. It is not considered that the proposed dormer would have any greater impacts on side windows in the neighbouring dwelling than currently exists. Given the juxtaposition of the dormer and the neighbouring dwelling, there would not be any issues relating to overshadowing, loss of privacy or overlooking from the Juliet balcony.

Taking the above into account the development would not have a detrimental impact on the residential amenity of that dwelling in terms of outlook; overshadowing; loss of light or loss of privacy.

9 Mansell Drive

A neighbour representation has been received in relation to overshadowing of the outside and back of this neighbouring property. In that regard, No. 9 is the adjacent property to the south of the application site. This property is set back approximately 9m from the front elevation of the host dwelling. The neighbouring property has a gable elevation with a first-floor window facing the application site and a conservatory to the rear set in approximately 2.6 m off the gable end.

The proposed extension would project approximately 3 m beyond the main rear elevation of No. 9, set between approximately 2.7 m and 4.2 m off the common boundary. In this case, the proposed extension does not extend more than 4 m in depth beyond the rear of the neighbouring property. As such, taking into account the juxtaposition of the two dwellings and the depth of projection, it is not considered that the development would give rise to unacceptable impacts from overshadowing or overbearing effects on the neighbouring dwelling.

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

No openings are proposed in the side elevation facing No.9 and the dormer with Juliet balcony would be sited at a position and distance that should not give rise to overlooking, as such, the development does not raise any concern in respect of loss of privacy.

The development would be within acceptable standards, and this is also having regard to the fact that outline planning permission was granted for a new dwelling to the side of 5 Mansell Drive between the host dwelling and No. 9 (Ref: 18/00674/OUT).

Conclusion in relation to Residential Amenity

Overall, it is considered that the proposed development would not have a significant detrimental impact on the amenity of the occupiers of surrounding properties. As such the proposal would not conflict with relevant Core Strategy policies CS2, CS19 and Saved Policies H5 and H8 of the UDP.

OTHER ISSUES

None.

CONCLUSION

It is considered that the proposed development would be of an acceptable scale and design in relation to the host dwelling and the plot in which it sits. It would not have significant impacts on the amenity of the neighbouring properties, nor would it unduly affect the character of the street scene and area in general.

As such the proposal would be in compliance with the relevant criteria of Policies CS2 and CS19 of the Local Plan: Core Strategy and Saved Policies H5 and H8 of the Knowsley UDP together with the Council's Householder Development Supplementary Planning Document.

RECOMMENDATION:

That planning permission be granted subject to the following conditions:

- 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 any description of materials in the application, the materials for the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those of the existing dwelling in type, size, colour and texture.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity and to comply with the National Planning Policy Framework (2021), Saved Policies H5 and H8 of the Knowsley Replacement Unitary Development Plan, adopted June 2006 and Policies CS2 and CS19 of the Knowsley Local Plan: Core Strategy, adopted January 2016.

SCHEDULE 1

Date Received	Ref. No	Version	Drawing/Document Title
11/04/2022	-	-	LOCATION PLAN

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

11/04/2022	05-22C	-	PROPOSED GROUND AND FIRST FLOOR PLANS
11/04/2022	05-22D	-	PROPOSED FRONT AND SIDE ELEVATIONS
11/04/2022	05-22E	-	PROPOSED REAR AND SIDE ELEVATIONS
11/04/2022	05-22F	-	EXISTING AND PROPOSED BLOCK / SITE PLANS

Informatives

None Required

Maxine Wishart

24 June 2022

Signed by

Mark Quinn

07.07.2022

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