

21/00033/PREAPP 1 Dee Close Kirby L33 4DE

Proposal: Erection of two storey side extension and a single storey rear extension
Planning ref: 21/00033/PREAPP

Response to 21/00033/PREAPP

Introduction

The applicant would like to thank Knowsley Local Planning Authority for provided the pre-application advice in a timely manner and for providing specific and detailed reasoning on potentially acceptable and unacceptable design elements.

The applicant would like to follow the approach advised by the Knowsley LPA in the conclusion of the pre-app and engage in further discussions as new information is available, that was not provided previously.

The applicant would like to apologise to Knowsley LPA for not providing this earlier, which was due to a combination of the inability to conduct thorough site visits during the Covid-19 restrictions and the pressures of the unprecedented high demand.

This new information is on potentially related cases, that the Local Planning Authority may wish to consider as part of their assessment of this proposal. The applicant would greatly appreciate the opportunity for this response to be considered, in the hope of coming to an agreed form of development. To achieve this, the key issue is the design impacts of the two-storey side extension on the street-scene.

Design impacts of the two-storey side extension on the street-scene

Knowsley Householder Development SPD June 2016 relevant abridged section states:

7.6 Extensions on Corner Plots

'The following general guidelines apply:

- 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.*
- In the case of two storey extensions, established building lines on both street frontages should normally be respected. The presence of existing substantial hedging or fencing / walls, or substantial highway verges would be taken into account in assessing whether a relaxation to the above guidelines can be made.'*

'Note: reduced distances may be accepted if:

- Open corner plots are not a feature of the area;'*

This response agrees that sufficient distance to the side boundary and respecting of established building lines are key aspects of the SPD that relate to this proposal and would

like to respectfully request present new information that shows open corner plots are not a prominent feature of the area and that due to the regular linear form of the street layout, can accommodate moderate two storey side extensions with limited visual amenity impact on the street-scene, as shown by nearby related developments.

The proposed 3.5m second floor extension was deemed to have a negative impact on the street-scene. Following a site visit by Planning Officer Rachel Maddison, which was made at the request of the applicant and discussions with Rachel's Manager, e-mail correspondence 06.08.2021 confirmed that a 2.5m extension would be acceptable. The applicant is very grateful for this site visit and consideration, and understands the guideline set out in SPD section 7.6 is relevant.

The building line at Severn Road and Dee Close is split and perhaps this is the reason why a 2.5m extension was advised as acceptably within the guidelines, following the site visit.



Figure 1: Split Building Lines in Severn and Dee Close

This Planning Statement hopes to show that a marginal increase of 0.5-1.0m to 3-3.5m would cause limited visual amenity harm to the street-scene, due to the development space allowed by the split building lines and a consideration of the impacts that exist on No.1 Mulberry Close and No.1 Aspen Close, where similar developments have been built. These developments show that two storey side extensions on the corner plots of regular street layouts can have limited visual amenity impacts.

The two approved 3m side extensions at No.1 Aspen Close and No.1 Mulberry Close have a slightly less regular building line than Severn Road and Dee Close, but not to such a significant degree that they cannot be compared.



Figure 2: Potential building Line for 1 Mulberry Close and 1 Aspen Close

1 Mulberry Close Kirkby L33 4DY

05/00375/FUL Erection of part two storey/ part single storey side extension with single storey extension including porch to front of dwelling GRANTED 25.05.2005
No associated documents available on the electronic public access system

1 Aspen Close Kirkby L33 4DX

03/00570/FUL Erection of two storey extension to side of dwelling to form lounge and utility room with bedroom and en-suite above GRANTED 01.08.2003
No associated documents available on the electronic public access system

The photos below show these areas, with some descriptions for consideration offered in the captions.



Figure 1: No.1 Dee Close with relatively large space for side extension



Figure 2: No.1 Dee Close with inset from rear property, due to differential building lines



Figure 3: No.1 Dee Close, as viewed from Dee Close, showing room for expansion without unduly closing the corner space



Figure 4: No.1 Mulberry Close, showing limited visual amenity impact of two storey side extension on corner plot



Figure 5: No.1 Mulberry Close, showing limited perceptual impact of two-storey side extension on corner plot



Figure 6: No.1 Aspen Close, showing the visual amenity impact of a similar two-storey side extension on a corner plot



7: No.1 Aspen Close, showing the visual amenity impact of a similar two storey extension on the street-scene



8: No.1 Aspen Close, as viewed from Aspen Close, showing how the expansion has not unduly closed the corner space

Considering the above, the proposal for a 3 or 3.5m two storey side extension would not be unduly prominent as it is at the middle of a building line and is afforded a reasonable development space due to the split building line as it joins Weaver Avenue. The existing developments at No.1 Mulberry Close and No.1 Aspen Close show the limited visual amenity impacts to the street scene of similar developments, and although the building line is less regular than at Dee Close, it is not of such a significant difference that the visual amenity impacts cannot be compared.

If it helps to aid the assessment, full street-scene images can be provided, along with a more detailed building line analysis, as well as a marked-out area on the property, to show the scale of the proposed development.

The applicant hopes that this new information would be considered in the spirit of co-operation and discussion, as mentioned above and apologises again for not providing it sooner.