

<u>APPLICATION NO:</u>	23/02820/FUL	<u>CASE OFFICER:</u>	Lee Osborne
<u>WARD:</u>	Prescot North	<u>PARISH:</u>	Knowsley Parish Council
<u>LOCATION:</u>	19 Ormskirk Road, Knowsley Village, Knowsley		
<u>PROPOSAL:</u>	ERECTION OF 1NO. BUNGALOW AND 1NO. HOUSE AND INCLUDING DEMOLITION OF EXISTING BUNGALOW (REVISED APPLICATION REDUCING NOS. OF BUNGALOWS FROM 2NO. BUNGALOWS TO 1NOS. BUNGALOW AND AMENDED SITE PLAN).		

Site Description

The application site is a corner plot on Ormskirk Road with Sugar Lane to the side. It is a large plot of approximately 1817sq.m (0.182ha) consisting of a detached bungalow and associated garden area. The plot had a significant belt of trees along the rear boundary, and also trees down part of the side boundary before the trees were felled last year prior to the submission of the planning application. There are some trees adjacent the front boundary of the property and there is hedging to the front boundary, and short part of the side boundary.

The adjacent property on Ormskirk Road to the north is a bungalow, as is the property adjacent to that. At the rear is a two-storey detached house, adjacent other detached houses. On the opposite side of Ormskirk Road to the site are fields which are within the green belt. On the opposite side of Sugar Lane to the site is a copse.

Proposal

The revised proposal is to demolish the bungalow and pool house and to erect a large, detached house and a detached bungalow.

The house would front Ormskirk Road with a width of approximately 19.5m at the front and 16.2m at the rear, and a depth of approximately 14.4m on the southern side and 11.3m on the northern side. The house would have a hipped roof with a height of approximately 7.7m to ridge and 6.2m to eaves. The house would be sited approximately 7.5m back from Ormskirk Road, and there would be approximately 8.4m – 9.2m from the gable to the boundary with Sugar Lane. From the northern gable to the party boundary with 21 Ormskirk Road there would be approximately 7.2m - 7.4m.

The house would be double fronted with a recessed entrance porch 4.5m wide. The house would project forward either side of the entrance 0.9m. Each side of the double frontage would have two windows to both ground and first floor and there would be two windows spaced at first floor above the entrance recess. The windows would be 2.1m high with a width of 1.2m. On each of the projecting frontages the windows would be approximately 2.2m apart, with 1.5m from the outermost windows and the gables, and 1.4m from the recess to the innermost windows. The windows above the recess would be 1m apart. There would be a single storey element to the rear with two lantern rooflights. The house would be rendered with render detailing

and a tiled roof. There would be driveway parking to the front of the house with sliding gate.

The house would be four bedroomed with two bedrooms having en-suites and walk-in wardrobes and the master bedroom having a separate bathroom and a room sized walk-in wardrobe/clothes room.

The bungalow would be sited 18.6m to the rear of the house and front Sugar Lane. The bungalow would be sited 8m back from Sugar Lane. There would be 0.6m – 0.8m between the bungalow and the party boundary with 157 Sugar Lane, and 1-1.2m from the bungalow and the party boundary with the proposed house. On the assumption that the pool house is demolished (not entirely clear from the site plan) the bungalow would have a rear garden of 18.6m long, with a width of 14m.

The bungalow would have a width of approximately 12.1m and a depth of 7.2m with a pitched roof. The bungalow would be approximately 4m to ridge and 2.5m to eaves. The bungalow would be rendered with brick detailing and tiled roof, which would have three rooflights within. There would be driveway parking to the front of the bungalow.

Consultations

Highway Authority - Objections: The proposed site plan again does not accurately depict the geometry of the highway in the vicinity of the development, e.g. the width of the carriageway of Sugar Lane is shown as less than exists in reality and the verge fronting along the development site on Sugar Lane is shown as larger than exists. The objections could be overcome with detailed drawings.

Highways also require a footway to be introduced along the Sugar Lane site frontage of 2m minimum width.

The site drawing should be updated to show the proposed driveway/parking arrangements for both properties. Double garages can only account for 1 no. parking space.

Solid boundary treatments on the plot frontages / sides or adjacent to vehicular accesses should be no more than 0.75 metres in height to ensure highway visibility is not compromised or intervisibility splays of 2 x 2 metres should be provided adjacent to both sides of vehicular accesses. 2.4m x 43m visibility splays from both proposed accesses is required.

Environmental Health - No objections but request CMP and construction hours condition, testing of soil imported to site to be tested and results submitted and agreed, and a contaminated land advisory.

Knowsley Parish Council - No Comments Received

United Utilities Water Ltd - No objections, informative given.

Merseyside Fire and Rescue Authority - No objections, informative given.

Representations

This application has been publicised by letters sent to 8 neighbours.

Two objections have been received to the scheme. The objections are summarised as follows: -

1. The height, bulk and appearance of the main house replacing the bungalow is vastly different, however in itself this wouldn't majorly differ from other houses on Ormskirk Road and the top of Sugar Lane.
2. The site plan indicates that the proposed footprint of the buildings would occupy the majority of the plot, with driveways occupying much of the rest. This would significantly reduce the runoff/soak away area for rain water in an area that flooding has been noted in the planning application form. The sewer system already overflows during heavy rain.
3. There is objection to the construction of the two bungalows. The provision of garden space of equivalent size to the proposed bungalow plots, behind the proposed bungalows would be far more suitable.
4. Traffic would also increase to serve these new properties, and the limited outdoor area could lead to an increase in street parking close to the junction to allow the use of the driveway as external space.
5. The size of the bungalows are out of character for the immediate area as they appear to be similar sized as neighbouring garages.
6. There is little outdoor space provided for the properties, and the natural light levels would be low for the properties due to surrounding woodland, existing properties, and the new double story property replacing the existing bungalow.
7. The height, bulk and appearance of two bungalows, is vastly different to the trees/hedging/fencing that was in place, prior to being cut down at the end of last year, with no building facing onto Sugar Lane from this plot. Two new properties are being squeezed onto less than a third of the existing plot, where perhaps even one would be too significant an impact.
8. Objections are for the bungalows not the main property.
9. The concept of building three dwellings on a piece of land where only one dwelling currently exists and giving them effective parking and garden space is flawed. This application represents an overdevelopment of the land.
10. There is an inevitability that this overdevelopment would generate parking on Sugar Lane. This is already a busy junction. This proposal will also make turning from both carriageways of Ormskirk Road into Sugar Lane even more dangerous than it currently is. It is a blind corner as you turn in and this proposal will dramatically increase the likelihood of meeting a car in the right-hand carriageway of Sugar Lane through overtaking parked vehicles.
11. This part of the road is also widely used by pedestrians and, for the same reasons as regards road traffic, this proposal would create serious safety issues for them.
12. The two bungalows themselves would be in complete contrast with the surrounding housing on Ormskirk Road, Sugar Lane, Tithebarn Road and Parklands.

13. The proposal would create a negative visual impact on the area as well as cause serious safety issues.

Following the submission of an amended scheme reducing the proposal to one bungalow and the main house replacing the existing bungalow neighbours were renotified. Two objections were received from the previous objectors. These objections are on the following summarised grounds: -

1. Object to the addition of a second residence on the plot but neutral on the main house despite the impact on the skyline from the green.
2. The boundary and design of the additional bungalow is an improvement on the previous application, with a suitable distance from the road and reduced height. Whilst the plan appears to indicate a new boundary line across the back of the existing plot, providing appropriate outdoor space, the "pool house" and pool is still shown on the plans, suggesting this rear land would not be part of the new bungalow plot. There are the same concerns as for the first scheme in that the front parking provision will be used as garden space forcing parking on the road close to a junction. The plans do not make it clear that the pool and pool building will be demolished to provide suitable garden space for the small bungalow.
3. Whilst plot utilisation has been shown elsewhere to be higher on the road, these have not been as an additional property, with associated people and vehicle burden on the local area.
4. The utilisation of the plot given to the additional bungalow appears high based on the plan (approximate from plans)
5. The plot of land suits the property as it stands, and for the new main property. The bulk of an additional property is significantly different to the previous/current trees, fence and hedge, and different in character to surrounding properties.
6. The reduction from 2 bungalows and a house to 1 bungalow and a house does not change the parameters in the original objection. The issues relating to road safety, pedestrian safety and being out of character with other dwellings on Sugar Lane still apply. There would still be an over development of land. Therefore, the objection still holds.

Planning History

K/APP/11650 - ERECTION OF BATHROOM AND DRESSING ROOM BEDROOM EXTENSIONS AND GARAGE WORKSHOP. Granted: 24.07.1989.

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.

KNOWSLEY LOCAL PLAN: CORE STRATEGY

CS2 - Development Principles

CS7 - Transport Networks

CS19 - Design Quality and Accessibility in New Development

SAVED POLICIES - KNOWSLEY REPLACEMENT UNITARY DEVELOPMENT PLAN (ADOPTED JUNE 2006)

H5 - Development within Primarily Residential Areas

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. Unfortunately, it has not been possible to resolve those matters within the timescale allocated for the determination of this planning application. However, the Local Planning Authority has clearly set out, within its report, the steps necessary to remedy the harm identified within the reason(s) for refusal - which may lead to the submission of a more acceptable proposal in the future. The Local Planning Authority is willing to provide pre-application advice in respect of any future application for a revised development.

Assessment

The proposal is for new residential development on a plot of land currently housing a bungalow (to be demolished) within a residential area. The proposed development is therefore acceptable in principle.

Design and Visual Amenity Issues

Proposed House

The design of the proposed house is acceptable in its details. The house would generally fall within the building lines, front and rear, set by the adjacent bungalow. Due to the distance to the bungalow to the north and the house to the rear the proposal would not cause loss of outlook issues for neighbouring dwellings.

However the proposed house would be overly large and dominant, at maximum dimensions of 19.5m by 14.4m and hipped roof of ridge height of 7.7m, with central ridge 12m long. Considering that this is a corner plot with a copse on the opposite side of the road to the side of the plot, Sugar Lane, and two bungalows preceding the plot on Ormskirk Road north to south. It is recognised that there would be 8.4m – 9.2m from the proposed house to the boundary with Sugar Lane it is considered that

the house as proposed would be overly large and obtrusive in the street scene. Taking the adjacent bungalows on Ormskirk Road into account and the proposed bungalow to the west, the house would dwarf these dwellings and be overly obtrusive taking the context of the site and the bungalows adjacent. It appears to be clear that there is a shift down to bungalows as Ormskirk Road approaches Sugar Lane, with three bungalow plots leading to Sugar Lane, and then the copse beyond. Whilst it is considered that a two-storey house would be acceptable on the application site it is considered that a house of the size, mass and scale of that proposed is most certainly not acceptable. Such a house as that proposed would create an obtrusive, dominant and out of scale dwelling on this site and as such the proposal is not acceptable contextually.

Proposed Bungalow

The proposed bungalow and curtilage would be sited at the rear of the application and would front Sugar Lane with access / egress of the site from that road. Adjacent the site to the west is 157 Sugar Lane, a detached two storey house. The design of the bungalow is acceptable in principle. The proposed bungalow would have little impact on the neighbouring house or the proposed house in terms of outlook.

The bungalow in terms of height would be similar to a detached garage and would be anomalous within the street scene of Sugar Lane, which comprises the two storey dwellings, and copse opposite, including the adjacent detached house. The bungalow would be out of character and scale with the locality taking account the street scene of Sugar Lane together with the overly large house proposed to the east within the application site. As such the bungalow would introduce a discordant aspect into the street scene and area detrimental to the visual amenity of the area and the street scene.

The proposal therefore conflicts with Policies CS2 and CS19 of the Knowsley Local Plan Core Strategy adopted January 2016 and Saved Policy H5 of the Knowsley Replacement Unitary Development Plan adopted June 2006.

Highways Issues

The proposed house would have parking to the front garden area accessed from Ormskirk Road. There would be two sliding gate to give access, one adjacent the northern boundary of the site with 21 Ormskirk Road which could accommodate two cars and this resin bonded gravel driveway would extend across much of the front of the house, where another sliding gate access would be located with further car parking available here for in excess of three cars, or the gated accesses could be used as separate in – out access / egress for the cars. For new dwellings of four or more bedrooms the Council parking standards require a minimum of three parking spaces, and the proposed house more than meets this requirement.

The proposed bungalow would have two bedrooms. There is space to the front of the proposed bungalow for at least two cars which would meet the Council's parking requirements for two and three bedroomed dwellings. It is noted that the Highways Engineer has put in a holding objection due to concerns regarding the accuracy of some drawings and requires a footway to be introduced along this part of Sugar Lane and visibility splays / pedestrian splays, It is considered that the plot has sufficient size to achieve highways requests and that the proposal would not be overwhelmingly detrimental to highway safety, and the accurate drawings requested could be provided; as such this is not a reason to refuse the application. However, as the application is recommended for refusal the applicant has not been asked for such

additional / revised drawings as this would be an expense and the provision of such which would not affect the outcome.

The application complies with Policies CS2, CS7 and CS19 of the Core Strategy and Saved Policy H5 of the UDP.

Residential Amenity

The proposed development is for residential dwellings in a residential area and raise no residential amenity concerns including privacy, overlooking or overshadowing concerns. The proposals do raise concerns with the built environment character of the area and impact on the street scene as detailed above.

The application conflicts with Policies CS2 and CS19 of the Core Strategy and Saved Policy H5 of the UDP.

Trees and Wildlife Issues

The site previously had significant numbers of trees and shrubs, particularly along the rear boundary and partially down the side of the site boundary with Sugar Lane whilst there were also trees adjacent the front boundary. The trees were removed last year prior to the submission of the planning application. In addition to the loss of a number of trees including mature and semi mature trees, and the trees adjacent the side and front boundaries of the site which added amenity of some value to the area the trees could have provided habitat for bats and birds. A landscape scheme has been submitted which indicates 5 trees in the rear garden of the proposed house adjacent the side boundary with Sugar Lane and 2 trees in the southeast corner of the site, in the side garden to the side of the proposed house adjacent the junction of Sugar Lane with Ormskirk Road. This is less than the number of trees felled, but a landscape scheme notwithstanding that submitted could be required and some extra heavy standards or larger could be a requirement for such a scheme. In addition, the scheme could require the provision of bat boxes / bricks and bird boxes to provide habitat in the interest of biodiversity.

As such although the development has felled the trees and potentially lost habitat there could be some form of mitigation implemented to partially overcome that tree and shrub feeling which has occurred. Therefore, although the site works undertaken conflict with Policies CS2, CS8 and CS21 of the Core Strategy and Saved Policy DQ4 of the UDP, these works were undertaken prior to the submission of the planning application and mitigation could be implemented both with regards the trees and shrub loss and the potential habitat loss. As such it is considered that the application as submitted / revised, and the site works being carried out prior to submission there is a neutral impact with regards the policies.

Conclusion

Whilst the principle of development in the residential area is acceptable, and the overall design of the dwellings proposed is satisfactory there are significant concerns with the character of the area and the impacts on the visual amenity of the locality and the street scene due to the proposed house being overly large in the context of the plot and location and the siting and scale of the bungalow, all as discussed in more detail above. Parking could be achieved to Council standards and the proposals would not impact to any significant degree on the outlook from neighbouring dwellings or cause significant overshadowing, and privacy and overlooking issues are not raised. The application conflict with planning policies and

is therefore recommended for refusal.

Recommendation

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

- 1) The proposal bungalow would be out of character with this end of Sugar Lane and out of scale with the houses in Sugar Lane and the proposed house to the east within the application plot. As such the proposed bungalow would be discordant in the street scene which is characterised by houses, and a copse. The out of character and out of scale bungalow, sandwiched between existing houses and the proposed house would be incongruous within the street scene and locality. The bungalow would therefore be detrimental to the eastern end of Sugar Lane in terms of character, and the visual appearance of the street scene, to the detriment of the visual amenity of the locality and the proposed bungalow conflicts with Policies CS2 and CS19 of the Knowsley Local Plan Core Strategy adopted January 2016 and Saved Policy H5 of the Knowsley Replacement Unitary Development Plan adopted June 2006.
- 2) The proposed house would be overly large and dominant on a corner plot within this area of street scene, particularly considering the two neighbouring bungalows to the immediate north of the application site on Ormskirk Road and the proposed bungalow to the west within the application plot, and as such would be obtrusive and out of scale with the immediate locality. The application therefore conflicts with Policies CS2 and CS19 of the Knowsley Local Plan Core Strategy adopted January 2016 and Saved Policy H5 of the Knowsley Replacement Unitary Development Plan adopted June 2006.

Signed Case Officer¹: **Lee Osborne**

Signed Authorising Officer²: **K Foster**

Date: **6 August 2024**

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

