

<u>APPLICATION NO:</u>	24/00454/FUL	<u>CASE OFFICER:</u>	Reece Black
<u>WARD:</u>	Roby	<u>PARISH:</u>	
<u>LOCATION:</u>	39 Ewart Road, Roby, Knowsley		
<u>PROPOSAL:</u>	ERECTION OF A SINGLE STOREY REAR AND SIDE EXTENSION AND FRONT PORCH EXTENSION		

Site Description

The application site is located at 39 Ewart Road, Roby and is located within an area which is allocated as a Primarily Residential Area in the Development Plan. The application property is a semi-detached dwelling and is primarily brick facing on its front, side and rear elevations, (excluding a section of pebble-bashed render to front projecting bay elevation) along with white steel framed, glazed windows and grey, interlocking concrete roof tiles.

The application property benefits from an existing single storey rear extension and a side storage area which is screened from the street scene with storage space. The rear garden spans a depth of circa 28m when measured from the deepest elevation and rear curtilage of the boundary. There is a detached outbuilding to the rear of the garden and another adjacent the common boundary shared with No.41. The front garden area is largely grassed and contains hardstanding adjacent the grassed section which can accommodate one vehicle and is enclosed by a brick and timber wall with white metal gates. The front elevation of the property is western facing. Bins are currently stored within the existing side extension.

The street scene comprises of other semi-detached properties, which have been extended and altered in several ways. There are residential properties to all other directions from the site.

Proposal

The application seeks permission for the erection of a single storey front, side and rear extension.

The proposed front extension would be for a porch extension. This would project forward by 0.49m and would have a width of 5.49m (inclusive of the front elevation of the side extension). The front porch would be served by a dual-pitched roof, which would project from a mono-pitched roof for the rest of the front extension, in which the eaves would measure at a height of 2.6m and the tallest point would measure 3.2m. The front porch would largely be glazed, and the front elevation of the side extension would see the insertion of a window.

The proposed side and rear extension would form a 'wrap-around' layout. This would have a width of 2.79m and a depth of 13.13m. The rear extension would have a stepped / dog-legged arrangement in layout, with a projection of 4m closet to the common boundary shared with No.37 and 5.8m for the further projecting section. The side and rear extension would be served by a flat roof, which would measure at a height of 3.25m. The front section of the side extension would be served by the

mono-pitched roof, which would form a false canopy roof for the side extension also. The rear elevation would contain bi-fold doors and a full height window. The side and rear extension would feature 2 no. glazed lantern rooflights (which would be the tallest part of the proposal and attain a height of 3.55m with a flush skylight over shower room / toilet.

The application has been amended as the original submission would have had an unacceptable impact on the neighbouring residential amenities and living conditions of the adjoining property. The original proposal breached the 45-degree rule to a significant extent which would have had a detrimental impact on amenities, due to unacceptable overshadowing and appearing unduly dominant. However, following the amendments to the submitted plans, the proposed development would no longer be considered to have an unacceptable impact.

Moreover, amended site plans show that hardstanding within the front garden would be expanded allow refuse storage within the front garden area.

Consultations

None required.

Representations

This application has been publicised by letters sent to 7 neighbours.

There have been 0 letters of objection, 1 letter of support and 0 letters of comment.

The representation (support) is summarised as follows:-

- We have no objections as long as there is an independent party wall survey is in place, paid for by the applicant.

The above representation is acknowledged as a point of support. The contents of the representation are related to matters which are covered under the Party Wall Act (1996) legislation and are consequently, not a material planning consideration.

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 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 front extensions and porches can be particularly prominent in the street scene and should be particularly carefully designed to retain the character of the residential areas. It also states that style, design, materials and scale of front extensions and porches should respect the character of the surrounding residential area. Furthermore, account should be taken of the building line.

The Householder Development SPD outlines that single storey side extensions should be designed so that they preserve the street scene, protect light and privacy of neighbours and ensure that they provide sufficient parking spaces.

The Householder Development SPD advises 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 for two storey rear extensions of up to 3 metres will normally be acceptable.

Design

The existing dwelling is brick and render facing with white glazed, steel framed windows and tiled roofing. The Application Form submitted states that the proposed development would be (white) K-render; this would be to the front and rear elevations and the side facing elevation would be left brick facing. The windows throughout both the existing and proposed dwelling and extension would be PVCu framed opening sash windows (white), the porch would be construed with an aluminium frame (white) and the roof materials would be tiled to match.

6.10 of the Householder Development SPD states that normally the Council would require that materials for an extension should generally be the same or similar as on the main dwelling. Window styles should also generally match those on the main dwelling and echo the proportions of the original building. Any detailing on the original dwelling such as feature brickwork, or windowsills should be accurately reproduced where possible in the design of the extension.

It is considered that the proposed render facing of the application property would not result in any severe adverse harm by design. 6.13 of the SPD states that where architectural quality can be demonstrated, extensions may be acceptable where they are designed to offer a sensitive contrast to the original building through their siting, form, massing, fenestration, materials and design.

Moreover, the street scene does not display a strict uniformity in the exterior wall materials; many properties within the locality are rendered, with several properties displaying a part-brick, part-render design. Therefore, this would be acceptable. The window materials would be coherent across the dwelling and extension and would therefore be acceptable. Although the materials for the rear extension are yet to be

confirmed, it would be contained to the private rear garden and would not have any severe impact on the street scene. The other materials outlined are acceptable. The front elevation of the side extension would feature a window which is less in height than the other window on the front elevation (ground floor) and this was raised with the agent. This has not been amended, however, the difference in height is marginal in comparison and would appear significantly incongruous and subsequently would appear coherent otherwise, the width, glazing bars and materials would correspond to the other fenestration would therefore ensure it would still positively integrate and would therefore be acceptable.

The Householder Development SPD states that extensions should generally be served by pitched roofs. However, given that the sections of the proposal readily visible from and prominent in the street scene would be served by pitched roofs (and a false canopy roof to conceal the flat roofs of the side and rear extension) the flat roofs otherwise employed would not have a significant impact on the street scene or wider design and would subsequently be acceptable.

The front projections are deemed acceptable as they would be considered to retain the character of the area and feature an appropriate roof design. For the consideration of the front building line, the SPD states that small porches and canopies of satisfactory design in materials projecting in front of the building line will normally be permitted. Moreover, it states that the size and projection of front extensions and porches that may be permitted depends on the type of dwelling and degree of set-back from the highway. As the property is a semi-detached dwelling with a suitable set-back (circa 5.1m) a small front projection, which would not dominate the existing dwelling or disrupt the uniformity of a group of similarly designed dwellings, the front projections would be acceptable.

6.25 of the Householder Development SPD asserts that proposal 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 remove 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 amended plans have demonstrated that the expanded hardstanding would be sufficient to accommodate bins within the front garden area. This area would retain the existing one in-curtilage parking space and provide alternative arrangements for refuse storage. It is noted that several other properties store bins within the front garden area and therefore, this would not be detrimental to visual amenities.

Overall, the proposed development would have an acceptable design and broadly comply with the Householder Development SPD Saved Policy H8.

Residential Amenity

The Householder Development SPD asserts that a single storey rear extension located on or immediately adjacent to the party boundary with a neighbouring dwelling will normally only be acceptable if it does not project more than 4m from the rear elevation of the existing dwelling.

single storey extension beyond 4m (or in a situation where the application property 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.

37 Ewart Road

No.37 is the paired, semi-detached dwelling the main front and rear elevations largely sit parallel to the application site. Both properties contain the same general arrangement with the inner section of the properties being stepped back in contrast to the outer projections of the properties, this is characteristic of the original properties in the street scene. The room closest to the common boundary shared between the properties is a front room (habitable room).

Following the submission of the amended plans the proposal would not be considered to result in any unacceptable harm to residential amenities or privacy. Any projections beyond 4m from the original rear elevation of the property would be set-in from the common boundary by over 3m which would satisfy that there would be no unacceptable impact from overshadowing / undue dominance etc.

The letter of support received from No.37 has been addressed in the representations section.

Overall, the proposed development would be in accord with the Householder Development SPD and would not be considered to significantly harm the amenities or privacy of the occupants of no.37.

41 Ewart Road

No.41 is the adjacent, semi-detached dwelling located to the south of the application site. The two gable walls face each other, and the properties are semi-linked via the existing side extensions. No.41 benefits from a rear conservatory with a small window and door to the rear elevation of the side extension which is believed to serve a store / utility space and therefore a non-habitable room.

The proposed development would have a projection of circa 4.38m from the existing rear elevation of the property and although this was moderately be in excess of the 4m projection parameter, it would not be considered to result in any unacceptable harm to amenities as it would not have an impact to a habitable room. It is not known as to what room the next closest window serves but given the distance from the common boundary and depth of the extension, this would not be to an unacceptable extent.

The first-floor side elevation of No.41 contains two windows; one is obscurely glazed and assumed to serve a bathroom the other is transparent and understood to serve a bedroom. The proposed flush skylight would be at an oblique angle and not within a direct line of vision to be deemed to facilitate any overlooking between the properties.

Overall, the proposed development would be in accord with the Householder Development SPD and would not be considered to significantly harm the amenities or privacy of the occupants of no.41.

Highways

The application property currently has a driveway sited to the front garden area and can accommodate one vehicle. The driveway and hardstanding would be expanded

to accommodate one vehicle and refuse bins.

This would not remove and existing parking arrangements for the property and the proposal would not result in any increase to bedrooms and subsequently the existing parking provisions would not be affected.

Therefore, the proposed development is considered acceptable.

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.

SCHEDULE 1

Date Received	Ref. No	Version	Drawing/Document Title
15/12/2024	LH-39ER-SP	REV A	EXISTING AND PROPOSED SITE PLAN
17/12/2024	LH-39ER-002	REV B	PROPOSED ELEVATIONS AND FLOOR PLANS
26/08/2024	-	-	LOCATION PLAN
26/08/2024	-	-	APPLICATION FORM

Signed Case Officer¹: **Reece Black**

Signed Authorising Officer²: **K Foster**

Date: **18 December 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