

<u>APPLICATION NO:</u>	25/00014/FUL	<u>CASE OFFICER:</u>	Reece Black
<u>WARD:</u>	Page Moss	<u>PARISH:</u>	
<u>LOCATION:</u>	102 Rupert Road, Roby, Knowsley		
<u>PROPOSAL:</u>	ERECTION OF TWO STOREY SIDE EXTENSION, SINGLE STOREY SIDE / FRONT EXTENSION AND SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION		

Site Description

The application site is located at 102 Rupert Road, Roby and is situated within an area which is designated as a Primarily Residential Area in the Development Plan. The application property is a two-storey, semi-detached dwellinghouse and is predominately pebble-dash rendered on its front, side and rear elevations together with primarily white UPVC openings, with timber, brown frame employed for the existing porch and brown, interlocking roof tiles.

The application site sits in a uniform building line comprising of semi-detached dwellings (some of which have been previously altered and extended, predominately through modest porch extensions and rear extensions, some also benefitting from two-storey side extensions). The front elevation is south-western facing and is set-back from the public highway by circa 15.9m. The rear garden spans a depth of circa 24m.

The front garden area comprises block paving to provide hardstanding with a grassed section and is bounded by a low-brick boundary wall. The site features other residential properties to all directions.

Upon the time of the Officers' site visit (14.02.2025) the proposed development had begun above grounds works.

Proposal

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

Both storeys of the proposed two-storey side extension would project 2.58m. The ground floor would have a cumulative depth of 13.68m, when combined with the other ground floor development, and the first-floor would have a depth of 7.46m. This would be served by a dual-pitched roof, which would measure 5.11m at the eaves and 7.65m at the ridgeline.

The proposed single storey rear extension would have a depth of 4.25m and a width of 8.63m. This would be served by a dual-pitched roof, which would measure 2.52m at the eaves and 3.95m at the ridgeline. Windows and doors would be inserted to the rear elevation together with 4 no. rooflights.

The proposed side and front extension would project forward 0.9m with a width of 6.05m. This would be served by a mono-pitched roof, in which the ridgeline would

measure 3.35m.

Replacement fenestration would be installed to the property to the front and rear elevations.

Consultations

None Required.

Representations

This application has been publicised by letters sent to 7 neighbours. No representations have been received.

Merseyside Fire & Rescue Service – No objections, standard informative response.

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 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.

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

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.

The Householder Development SPD outlines that front extensions and porches can be particularly prominent in the street scene and should be particularly carefully designed to retain the character of residential areas.

Design

The existing dwelling is pebbledash rendered with white UPVC openings and tiled roofing. The agent has confirmed via email that the pebble-bash render would be removed, and both the original dwelling and the proposed development would be coherently k-rendered on the external facing walls and new windows would be white UPVC framed. This would remove the existing porch and the differing brick facing exteriors found on the existing front elevation and ensure all windows would be white UPVC framed and the external wall materials of the overall property, post completion, would be coherently k-render facing. The proposal would include materials which are to match the existing and emulate the design of the original dwelling (this would include the render and brickwork to match). The proposed development would be served by pitched roofs.

The Householder Development SPD outlines that for the consideration of two-storey side extensions either a minimum 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.

The submitted plans show that the front wall of the first-floor of the extension would be set back by circa 0.5m. Although this is a shortfall from what is prescribed in the SPD, it would be considered acceptable. This is because the front elevation of the original dwelling contains projecting bay window features which result in a stepped arrangement of the front elevation and are characteristic of the dwelling and other properties in the street scene. These projections account for the bulk of the front elevation and the first-floor front wall would be set back circa 1m from these projecting features and therefore would be acceptable. The roof ridgeline would further delineate the side extension is a subordinate addition to the original dwelling.

Moreover, there is a precedent set within the street scene. There are several properties (No.s 100, 104, 108 and 118 Rupert Road, with Planning Permissions granted between 1998-2013), granted before the adoption of the Householder Development SPD (2016) and therefore hold limited weight. Although, given that the application site is situated between two of these properties it would not appear to have an unacceptable impact on visual amenity, should a partial relaxation of the guidance be allowed on this occasion, when observed in context of the existing street scene. It would not be considered that the proposal would not result in any severe harm by design to the locality and for the reasons outlined above (and observed during the site visit) no potential or actual terracing effect would be created.

The Householder Development SPD states that proposals 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 removed 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.

Given the degree of set-back from the public highway, it would not be considered to present a severely harmful impact to the street scene. During the Officers' site visit it was observed that other properties store refuse bins to the front garden adjacent the front elevation. This would be considered acceptable.

The front extension(s) would be deemed acceptable as they would account for the building line and incorporate matching materials and a satisfactory design. The Householder Development SPD permits modest front extensions. Given that the property would be sufficiently set-back from the street scene and is semi-detached, it would further ensure that the proposal would be acceptable.

Overall, it is considered that the proposed development would have an acceptable design and would broadly accord with the Householder Development SPD and Saved Policy H8.

Residential Amenity

The SPD (6.19) stipulates that extensions must adequately protect your neighbours' right to enjoy their own home. Extensions must not overshadow or have an overbearing effect on neighbouring dwelling to an unacceptable degree.

The proposed rear extension would have a depth of 4.25m, which is 0.25m more than the guidance of the SPD, however, this would be considered acceptable. The projection would be a modest excess. Additionally, both neighbouring properties have rear extensions adjacent the party boundaries and therefore the rear projection would not project more than 4m beyond the rear elevations of the rear extensions and consequently be acceptable.

100 Rupert Road

No.100 is the paired, semi-detached property. The original front and rear elevations of the properties sit parallel to one another. The property benefits from a two-storey side extension, single storey rear extensions and a single storey front porch extension.

There is a rear extension of circa 4m adjacent the boundary shared with the application site.

The proposed rear extension would sit roughly in line with this extension. No severe amenity or privacy concerns would be raised.

The two-storey side extension would not be readily visible to the occupants of No.100 and the front extensions would not have any overbearing impact.

104 Rupert Road

No.104 is the adjacent, semi-detached dwelling. The original front and rear elevations are roughly parallel to one another. The property benefits from a two-storey side extension, single storey rear extensions and a single storey front extension.

There is a rear extension of circa 1m adjacent the boundary shared with the application site.

The proposed rear extension would project approximately 3.25m beyond the rear elevation of this and this would be in accord with the SPDs projection parameters. Therefore, no severe amenity or privacy concerns would be raised.

The side elevation of No.104 does not contain any windows and the first-floor element would not project beyond the existing front and rear elevations.

Overall, the proposed development would accord with the Householder Development SPD and would not be deemed to cause any significant harm to the amenities or privacy of the occupants of No.100 or No.104.

No other dwellings in the locality are considered to suffer significant harm to their amenities or privacy as a result of the proposed development.

Highways

The proposed development would see the no. of bedrooms at the property change from 3no. to 4 no. The Householder Development SPD stipulates in most cases the existing level of provision for car parking should be retained within the curtilage of the dwelling. Where the extension would result in the need for additional or replacement parking, the number of spaces should be in line with the Council's parking standards. Table A in the SPD outlines that for 4+ bedrooms, 3.no parking spaces would be required.

The SPD outlines that car parking to the front of a dwelling should measure 3m x 5m. The existing parking provisions at the property comprise a triple length driveway. Although the proposed development would see a marginal loss of the hardstanding due to the front projection, the submitted plans show that 15m of drive would remain in use and consequently, retain the appropriate level of in-curtilage parking required.

Overall, the proposed development would accord with the Householder Development SPD and would not be deemed to cause any unacceptable impact on highway safety.

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.

SCHEDULE 1

Date Received	Ref. No	Version	Drawing/Document Title
03/02/2025	P02	REV B	PROPOSED FLOOR PLANS AND ELEVATIONS AND PROPOSED SITE PLAN
03/02/2025	P03	REV B	LOCATION PLAN AND EXISTING AND PROPOSED SITE PLAN
28/02/2025	-	-	CORRESPONDENCE WITH AGENT ON MATERIALS

Signed Case Officer¹: **Reece Black**

Signed Authorising Officer²: **Jo Sheridan**

Date: **05/03/2025**

Informatives

- 1 Merseyside Fire Authority

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