

APPLICATION NO:
23/02797/FUL

CASE OFFICER:

Reece Black

WARD:

Halewood North

PARISH:

Halewood Town
Council

LOCATION:

3 Yelverton Close, Halewood, Knowsley

PROPOSAL:

ERECTION OF A TWO STOREY SIDE EXTENSION TOGETHER
WITH THE CONSTRUCTION OF DROPPED KERB AND
HARDSTANDING AT FRONT FOR VEHICLE PARKING

Site Description

The application site is located at 3 Yelverton Close, Halewood and is situated in an area allocated as a Primarily Residential Area in the Development Plan. The application property is a modern, semi-detached dwelling, is brick facing on its front, side and rear elevations. The side elevation also features white plastic cladding on the first-floor exterior. The property contains flat-roof dormer extensions both on the front and rear elevations, which are faced with hung tiles. The application property also features white UPVC openings and interlocking roof tiles.

The application property is South-West facing. The property benefits from a detached garage to adjacent the rear curtilage of the dwelling as parking is accessed is the rear. The application site is situated on the inside of a corner plot of the cul-de-sac and the property is encircled by other residential dwellings. The front curtilage of the dwelling is enclosed by a low front boundary brick wall with hedging, and the rear private amenity area is screened by high timber fencing together with concrete posts.

Proposal

The application seeks permission for the erection of a two-storey side extension together with the construction of a dropped kerb and hardstanding to the front of the dwelling.

The proposed two-storey side extension would have a width of 3m and a depth of 7.6m on the ground floor and a depth of 7.1m on the first-floor. This would be served by a dual pitched roof, which would measure at a height of 2.32m and would 6.9m at the highest point.

The proposal would also feature flat-roof dormer extensions. These would extend the existing dormers found on the dwelling. The submitted plans show the dormer cheeks would be set in from the side elevation by 0.10m.

The front elevation of the proposed development would include the insertion of a front access door to the property. The proposed development would also feature fenestration on the front, side and rear elevations.

The proposed dropped kerb would be to facilitate access to the highway from the driveway. This would not require Planning Permission as Yelverton Close would not be a Classified Road.

The proposal has seen minor amendments to ensure that the proposal is more in

accord with the Householder Development SPD guidance. This includes a revision to make the two-storey side extension appear more subordinate to the original dwelling, and the insertion and amendments of the fenestration as well as changes to the proposed parking area and highway concerns which were raised by Highways.

Consultations

Halewood Town Council - No Comments Received.

Highway Authority – Objection withdrawn following amended plans received.

Suggested Condition that parking will be made available and in use before the first occupation of the proposed development.

Representations

This application has been publicised by letters sent to 9 neighbours. No representations have been received.

Planning History

No relevant 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 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 two storey side extensions should be designed to avoid having an overbearing effect or causing unacceptable loss of light or privacy for neighbours.

Design

The existing dwelling is brick faced, with white UPVC openings and tiled roofing, with the dormer extensions being tiled hanging tiles on the exterior. The proposed development would emulate the design and materials of the original dwelling and the

style of the dwelling and be in keeping. It would include materials that are found on the exterior of the dwelling.

The Householder Development SPD (6.5) states that when considering the rooflines of an extension, the main building and similar nearby dwellings (if any) should be a guide. The design of the roof and slope of the roof should echo that of the original dwelling, where appropriate. It also states that for the consideration of two-storey side extensions, the roof of the extension should normally be at a lower level than the original.

The proposed development has seen amendments so that it would be served by a pitched roof, which would be subordinate to the original dwelling and would feature a lower roofline and match the pitch of the existing roof. Therefore, the proposal would be in accord with this guidance.

The Householder Development SPD states that for extensions on corner plots, particular attention should be paid to the design of extensions on corner plots. This is because they can encroach over the building line on either highway frontage, and therefore be particularly prominent in the street scene and sometimes create undesirable pinch points at the entrance to side roads.

It also states that sufficient distance should be retained to the side boundary to preserve the character of the surrounding area. Extensions should not be sited so close to the boundary that they would adversely impact on the street scene. It is considered that, there would be sufficient distance left, the closest corner of the proposed development would be sited 3.93m from the curtilage of the boundary.

It is considered overall that the proposed development would leave a suitable amount of distance between the side boundary and the gable wall. It would not be considered that the proposal would cause any significant harm to the building lines or appear unduly dominant in the street scene or lead to the creation of a pinch point. In addition, the application site features an adequate level of screening via the high boundary treatment that would soften and reduce its impact on the street scene. The proposed development would not be deemed to cause adverse harm on the street scene.

The Householder Development SPD states that for roof alterations and dormer extensions, front dormers should be avoided unless they are characteristic of the building of locality. The application property and a prominent number of the building row of dwellings consist of uniform front and rear flat-roof dormer extensions. It is considered that the proposed development, which would see the erection (and extension of the existing) dormers, would be acceptable in design terms as they are characteristic of the dwelling and the locality.

The Householder Development SPD states that particular attention needs to be given to design, to ensure a sensitive and appropriate approach which conserves the character of the original building and roofscape. It is considered that as the proposed development would be in keeping with the character of the locality where dormers are featured, that they would not appear incongruous or have an overbearing effect on the street scene or adjoining dwellings. The materials on the proposed dormer extensions would be to match the existing, which are hung tiles on the exterior. Subsequently, the design of the proposed dormers would be acceptable.

The proposal has seen revisions which include the lowering of the ridgeline, as well as the step-back of the first-floor front elevation. This was incorporated to ensure the

proposal was visually subordinate in relation to the existing dwelling.

Fenestration was also revised. The Householder Development SPD stipulates that two-storey side extensions should avoid blank gables and should respect interface distances with neighbouring dwellings (12m between gable and front elevation). Following amendments secured, the proposal has seen the insertion of a small window on the first-floor side elevation to ensure there is not a blank gable. There would remain an interface distance of approximately 17m from the front elevation of No. and the gable wall of the proposed development and subsequently would comply with the guidance. This is annotated as obscure glazing, at the applicant's request.

The rear elevation of the proposal was amended to mimic and emulate the existing window that serves the bathroom on the first-floor. This was requested to ensure that the fenestration was more in keeping with the existing. This is annotated as obscure glazing, at the applicant's request.

Overall, the design of the roof would be considered acceptable. The design of the proposed two-storey side extension would also be considered acceptable and accord with the Householder Development SPD.

Residential Amenity

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. It also states proposed developments should 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 Householder Development SPD also states 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.

However, the SPD also stipulates that the above requirement may be relaxed if, because of a staggered or irregular arrangement of the dwellings in the street or corner location, the construction of the extension would not create an actual or potential terracing effect. The agent had incorporated the above, despite this not being requested as the property is located on a corner plot and being set in from the boundary by a surplus of 1m and would be in accord with the guidance. However, it is still acceptable, and would also tie in with a similar extension in the locality.

Roof Alterations and Dormer Extensions

5 Yelverton Close

No.5 is the paired, semi-detached dwelling, the front and rear elevations of no.5 parallel to the application property. No.5 benefits from an adjoined single storey side garage.

The proposed development would not be considered to result in any impact to existing amenities. The proposal would not project beyond the rear or front elevations of the property and would therefore not be readily visible from no.5.

Overall, the proposed development would not be considered to have an adverse impact on the amenities or privacy on the occupants of no.5 and would be in accord with the Householder Development SPD.

4 Yelverton Close

No.4 is the adjacent, detached dwelling and is situated to the North/North-West of the application property. The front elevation of no.4 faces the existing gable wall of no.3 at an interface distance of approximately 20.9m at its closet.

The proposed development would not be deemed to have an adverse impact on the existing amenities of no.4. The proposal would leave an approximate 17.9m between the two properties, would be in accord with relevant interface distances of 12m (front elevation to gable) and the windows on the first-floor would be obscurely glazed, would not facilitate overlooking or unacceptable harm to privacy.

Overall, the proposed development would not be considered to have an adverse impact on the amenities or privacy on the occupants of no.4 and would be in accord with the Householder Development SPD.

No other residential properties are considered to suffer any adverse harm to existing residential amenities as a result of the proposed development.

Highways

Highways initially objected to the proposed development and requested that revised plans be submitted to take account of the reasons for objection.

This included requiring that for a double width drive there should be a minimum of 6m wide and a minimum of 5.5m long. Furthermore, to ensure visibility between drivers leaving the property and both approaching vehicles and pedestrians, the height of the front boundary hedge shall be kept to 1m maximum.

This was requested given the location of the application site and it being on a corner.

Amended plans were received which incorporated these required dimensions and annotated that the existing perimeter hedge to be capped at a maximum height of 1m. The plans also annotated that the driveway would be constructed from permeable tarmac.

The submitted plans were reviewed by Highways, who were satisfied with this and subsequently removed their objection. This was on the agreement that the proposed parking area would be secured by Condition. This was agreed that prior to the first occupation of the proposed development, the proposed parking will be made available and accessible and will remain as parking at all times.

Therefore, the proposed development would not be considered to have an unacceptable impact on highway safety and would be in accord with the Householder Development SPD.

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) The parking area shown on plan PROPOSED SITE LAYOUT PLANS Clifford/04 shall be implemented and made available for use prior to the first occupation of the extension. The area shall be made available for parking thereafter and remain at all times.

Reason: In order to comply with the Householder Development SPD and Saved Policy H8 in the Replacement Unitary Development Plan adopted June 2006.

SCHEDULE 1

Date Received	Ref. No	Version	Drawing/Document Title
23/11/2023	-	-	LOCATION PLAN
12/03/2024	CLIFFORD/02	REV A	PROPOSED LAYOUTS
12/03/2024	CLIFFORD/04	REV B	PROPOSED SITE LAYOUT PLANS

Signed Case Officer¹:

Reece Black

**Signed Authorising
Officer²:**

K Foster

Date:

14 March 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