

<u>APPLICATION NO:</u>	23/02774/FUL	<u>CASE OFFICER:</u>	Maxine Wishart
<u>WARD:</u>	Halewood South	<u>PARISH:</u>	Halewood Town Council
<u>LOCATION:</u>	89 Higher Road, Halewood, Knowsley		
<u>PROPOSAL:</u>	ERECTION OF PART SINGLE AND PART TWO STOREY SIDE AND REAR EXTENSION (DEMOLITION OF SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION AND SINGLE STOREY GARAGE TO SIDE)		

KNOWSLEY LOCAL PLAN ALLOCATION –

Primarily Residential Area

Site Description

The application relates to a two-storey semi-detached dwelling with associated land located on the northern side of Higher Road, close to the junction with Broom Way, Halewood.

The property is located on a site which benefits from private amenity space to the rear, hardstanding to the frontage and an attached garage with vehicular access from Higher Road. The site sits behind a low-level wall and planting along the front boundary.

Proposal

Planning permission is sought for the erection of a part single storey and part two-storey extension to the rear and side of the dwelling. It would consist of part single storey and two-storey to the rear comprising open plan ground floor lounge, dining and kitchen extension with bedroom above. The two-storey extension would wrap-around the side of the dwelling and together with internal alterations would also include a utility room, toilet and a new garage/store to ground floor with walk-in wardrobe, en-suite and re-located family bathroom above. The first floor would be set back 1 m at the front with a lean-to mono-pitch roof slopping up to the first floor.

The extension would subsume an existing ground floor kitchen outrigger and attached garage.

Consultations

Halewood Town Council - No Comments Received.

Representations

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

Planning History

APP. NO: K/APP/12798 (Alt Ref:74/12875/HIST)
PROPOSAL: ERECTION OF SINGLE STOREY LOUNGE EXTENSION TO REAR OF DWELLING
DECISION: Granted
DECISION DATE: 19 October 1990

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that accord with an up-to-date development plan without delay; or where the development plan is absent, silent or out of date planning permission should be granted unless the application of policies in the NPPF that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a clear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.

NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY FRAMEWORK

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

- H5 - Development within Primarily Residential Areas
- H8 - Extensions and Alterations to Residential Properties

KNOWSLEY LOCAL PLAN: CORE STRATEGY

- CS2 - Development Principles
- CS7 - Transport Networks
- CS19 - Design Quality and Accessibility in New Development

SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENTS

- Householder Development SPD (2016)
- Ensuring a Choice of Travel SPD (2010)

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

Layout and Design

Amenity Space

The property benefits from a private garden to the rear. The extension would leave adequate room about the dwelling to avoid a cramped appearance within the plot and to maintain adequate private amenity space.

Parking Provision

The development would see the existing three bedroom extended to provide a fourth bedroom. The Householder SPD requires that dwellings of 4 bedrooms are typically required to provide 3 no. parking spaces within the property curtilage.

The host dwelling has an existing attached garage to the side. The dimensions of the existing garage (internal approx. 4.58 x 2.5m) do not meet the required standards set out in the Council's Householder Development SPD for a garage to count as contributing to the car parking provision and to allow it to be satisfactorily used as such, the SPD requires minimum internal dimensions of 5.5m x 2.75m. The replacement garage/store proposes even smaller dimensions (approx. 3.55 x 2.3m).

The site frontage is made up of hardstanding with a driveway length of approx. 9.15 m fronting the existing garage. Hard standing fronting the host dwelling behind the wall that can adequately provide parking for an additional 2 no. parking spaces.

The existing level of provision for car parking would be retained within the curtilage of the dwelling and could accommodate 3 no. parking spaces.

Waste Storage (Bins)

The Householder SPD states that 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.

The proposal would retain some access to the rear of the site albeit that this would be reduced to 790 mm towards the rear, due to the angled boundary with the neighbouring property (No.91). Given the average size of a wheeled bin measures 580mm wide, this would prove to be tight, nevertheless, the proposal would also involve a garage/ store to the front which, whilst not suitable for the parking of a vehicle, could provide storage space. The development does not therefore pose any concern regarding waste storage on the site.

Design

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 and should avoid the creation of a terracing effect.

The SPD advises that a minimum 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 extension should be set back at least 1m from the immediately adjoining part of the main front wall of the original dwelling.

The proposed extension would be set off the boundary by between 1.32 m at the front and 0.79 m to the rear. The first floor would be set back 1 m from the immediately adjoining part of the existing front elevation resulting in a lean-to mono-pitched roof fronting the proposed garage/store at the front. The two-storey extension would extend the full depth of the gable and a further 5.06 m beyond the rear with a width of approx. 5.31m across the rear elevation to meet the single storey element which would be approx. 3.3 m wide.

The Householder SPD states that when considering the roof of an extension the main dwelling and similar nearby dwellings should be a guide. The proposed roof of the two-storey element would comprise a hipped roof to the front. The ridge at the front would be set 290mm below the ridge of the host dwelling. The roof would then be constructed with a valley toward the rear of the extension to create a duo-pitched roof (with vaulted ceiling) with a ridge line running front to back of the rear part of the two-storey extension, thus presenting a pediment gable at the rear elevation. The roof layout is considered to be acceptable and would not appear incongruous in this situation.

The single storey element would have a flat roof attaining a maximum height of 3.30m. It would incorporate 2 no. proprietary skylights resulting in an overall maximum height of 3.47m high. This part of the development would not be highly visible from outside of the site and the design considered to be an acceptable design solution.

The ground floor would see new roller garage door powder coated dark grey within the ground floor front elevation together with an obscure window at first floor above serving a bathroom. There would be aluminium framed system sliding patio doors, powder coated dark grey, to the rear at ground floor and a window serving a new bedroom above. It is proposed to insert 4 no. window openings within the new gable elevation. Three at ground floor to serve a WC; utility room and kitchen and an obscure glazed ensuite window at first floor.

The application has been amended at Officer's request which has seen a change from a large full height window within the rear first floor of the extension to a smaller window as it was considered that the larger window would not relate to the existing house or reflect the character of the host dwelling as set out in guidance within the Householder SPD. It was also considered that that the large window would have resulted in perceived overlooking of neighbours.

The host dwelling is in the main rendered and paint finished in a cream colour to the front and site with a brickwork facing to the rear with red/brown tiled roof and white uPVC windows. The proposed extension would be finished in K Rend (off-white) with a slate grey roof to the 2-storey element with replacement roof covering to match on the host dwelling. GRP roof covering is proposed for the flat roofed element. Dark grey windows are proposed throughout including replacement on the host dwelling. Rainwater goods would be black.

Streetscene

The immediate residential area is made up of a mix of dwelling styles, largely bay

fronted with a mix of rendered finished dwellings and brick faces dwellings and tiled roof. Generally, the appearance would harmonise with original property and the neighbourhood as such, the development is considered acceptable.

The scale of the development is considered to be acceptable having regard to the site layout and the juxtaposition with other neighbouring properties. The design would ensure that the development would not appear incongruous within the site setting or the streetscene.

As such, for the reasons set out above, it is considered that the proposed development would be of an acceptable design and scale and it would not harm the character and appearance of the host property or the street scene in this instance.

Residential Amenity

Saved Policies H5 and H8 of the UDP amongst other matters, seek to ensure that new development does not unacceptably impact on the amenity of neighbouring occupiers of adjacent dwellings. Policies CS2 and CS19 of the Local Plan seek to ensure that development promotes good quality design, respects its setting and avoids unacceptable impacts on existing residents. Further advice is set out in the Householder Development SPD.

87 Higher Road

No. 87 is the attached dwelling and the rear single storey element would be located adjacent to the common boundary with that dwelling, set 150 mm off the common boundary. This part of the extension would project 5.06 m beyond the main rear of the host dwelling.

The Householder SPD states that single storey rear extensions located on or immediately adjacent to the party boundary with a neighbouring dwelling will normally be acceptable if it does not project more than 4 m from the rear of the existing dwelling. A single storey extension beyond 4m (or in a situation where the application property has a rear elevation which 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.

In this case No. 87 has an existing extension along the boundary which projects 4.63m from the rear. The single storey extension would extend a further 0.45m beyond the neighbour's extension and as such would not breach 45 degrees from the mid-point of the nearest window within the neighbour's extension.

Turning to the two-storey element, the Householder SPD states that two storey extensions to the rear of up to 3 metres will normally be acceptable. Extensions beyond 3 metres will only be acceptable if they do not breach the 45-degree rule. In addition, where the properties are attached and the neighbouring dwelling has no extension adjacent to the boundary, any first-floor element of an extension beyond 3 metres should be set in from the party boundary by a minimum of 1m.

The two-storey element would project 5.06 m beyond the rear and 3.51m would be maintained between the two storey extension and the boundary with No. 87. As discussed above, the neighbour has an extension and in considerably more than 1 m would be maintained between the boundary and the extension. Furthermore, the submitted plans show that the development would not breach a 45-degree line taken from the mid-point of the neighbour's nearest first floor bedroom window.

Given the above, it is not considered that the proposed development would have a detrimental impact on the living conditions of this property.

91 Higher Road

The SPD provides specific design guidance in relation to two storey side extensions and states that, *"Side extensions should be designed to avoid causing direct overlooking or loss of light to main habitable rooms in neighbouring dwellings". In addition, it states 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 two-storey side and rear extension would be located adjacent to the common boundary with the neighbouring property No. 91 Higher Road. That property has a single storey attached garage and extension sited along the shared boundary.

The proposed two-storey extension would extend out from the existing side elevation of the host dwelling by between 2.61 m (front) and 1.98 m (rear). It would project approx. 5.06 m beyond the neighbour's main rear elevation and approx. 640mm beyond their ground floor extension.

The nearest first floor window to the rear of No. 91 is set on the far side of the elevation and the proposed extension would not breach a 45 degree line taken from the mid-point of that window. Given the existing neighbouring extension and the positioning of the nearest habitable room window at the rear, the extension would not result in unacceptable impacts on this neighbour at the rear.

No.91 does have several windows within the gable elevation facing the application site; these serve a first floor bathroom / WC and a landing. At ground floor level there are another 3 no. windows which appear to be within the garage and a bathroom. The ground floor windows are set at close proximity to the existing timber boundary fence. Whilst there would inevitably be some loss of light to these windows, given that these do not serve habitable rooms, it is not considered that the proposed development would result in significant impacts that would warrant the refusal of planning permission in this instance.

The application also proposes several windows within the side elevation of the extension facing the boundary with No. 91 comprising first floor obscure glazed en-suite together with ground floor obscure W.C, small utility room and secondary kitchen window. It is considered that in such close proximity to the fence line there would be limited light provided into the extension at ground floor level, nevertheless, they would not result in any unacceptable overlooking or loss of privacy to the host dwelling or the neighbouring property.

Other Properties

Higher Road is a wide major trunk road. Properties on the opposite site of the application site are located in excess of 30 m away. Houses to the rear are on Broom Way and 14.5 m would be retained between the rear of the extension and the common boundary with those properties.

Adequate interface between surrounding dwellings would therefore be maintained to ensure that the development would not have a detrimental impact on residential amenity.

Conclusion

The proposal would be acceptable in terms of design, residential amenity and Highways. The proposal also complies with the relevant Core Strategy and Replacement UDP policies together with guidance in the NPPF and is therefore recommended for approval subject to conditions.

Recommendation

That planning permission be granted subject to the following conditions:

- 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 the National Planning Policy Framework (2023), Saved Policies H5 and H8 of the Knowsley Replacement Unitary Development Plan, adopted in June 2006 and Policies CS2 and CS19 of the Knowsley Local Plan Core Strategy, adopted January 2016.

SCHEDULE 1

Date Received	Ref. No	Version	Drawing/Document Title
28/12/2023	89HR/02A	-	FLOOR PLANS AS PROPOSED
28/12/2023	89HR/04A	-	ELEVATIONS AS PROPOSED
28/12/2023	89HR/05A	-	SECTIONS AS EXISTING AND PROPOSED
07/11/2023	89HR/SP01	-	O.S. Map
07/11/2023	89HR/SP02	-	SITE PLAN (PROPOSED)

Signed Case Officer¹: **M Wishart**

Signed Authorising Officer²: **K Foster**

Date: **10 January 2024**

Informatives

None.

Contd...

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

Appendix 1 – Site Photographs





