

<u>APPLICATION NO:</u>	25/00097/FUL	<u>CASE OFFICER:</u>	Reece Black
<u>WARD:</u>	Roby	<u>PARISH:</u>	
<u>LOCATION:</u>	24 Fernbank Avenue, Roby, Knowsley		
<u>PROPOSAL:</u>	ERECTION OF TWO-STOREY SIDE EXTENSION, SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION AND SINGLE STOREY FRONT PORCH EXTENSION		

Site Description

The application site is located at 24 Fernbank Avenue, Roby and is situated within a Primarily Residential Area in the Local Plan Policies Map. The application property is a two-storey, semi-detached dwellinghouse and is, predominately, brick facing (excluding sections of render on the front elevation) on its front, side and rear elevations together with white UPVC and grey, interlocking roof tiles.

The property previously benefited from a ground floor side projection in the form of a garage and a kitchen side and rear extension, which has recently been demolished. The front garden area comprises a combination of hardstanding and grass enclosed by a low, brick-built boundary wall.

The application site is located on a corner plot and is orientated to face the entrance of a cul-de-sac; the front elevation of the property is south-facing and is set-back from the public highway by 5.6m. The western part of the plot boundary to the side pulls to a north-eastern direction at a diagonal/oblique angle. The street scene is largely made up of semi-detached properties.

Proposal

The proposal is for the erection of a two-storey side extension, single storey rear extension and single storey front porch extension.

The proposed two-storey side extension would project out by 3.8m and would have a depth of 8.9m (ground floor) and 7.2m (first-floor). The first-floor front elevation would be set-back by 0.5m from the immediately adjoining front wall. This would be served by a dual-pitched roof, in which the eaves would measure 5m and the ridgeline would measure 7.7m in height; the ridgeline of the side extension would be set 0.5m lower in height in contrast to the roof of the original dwelling.

The proposed single storey rear extension would have a projection of 3m with a width of 9.3m. The rear extension would be served by a mono-pitched roof, which would measure 2.6m at the eaves and 3.5m at the tallest point.

The proposed front extension would have a projection of 0.5m with a width of 6.4m. This would be served by a mono-pitched canopy roof, which would measure 2.2m at the eaves and 3.5m at its tallest point.

Fenestration would be installed to the front, side rear elevations with 4 no. rooflights to the rear extension. The proposal would see the installation of an ACO drainage

channel to the front of the dwelling.

Consultations

None required.

Representations

This application has been publicised by letters sent to 9 neighbours.

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

The letter of support in summary outlines that there will be an expectation of noise but during construction but do not object or have any problems with the proposal.

Planning History

No relevant 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.

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

DESIGN AND RESIDENTIAL AMENITY

Two-storey side extension:

The Householder Development SPD (7.2) outlines that two storey side extensions (and provision of first floors over existing single storey side extensions) should be designed to avoid having an overbearing effect or causing unacceptable loss of light or privacy for neighbours. It further outlines that they should also avoid creating a terracing effect, either by themselves or in conjunction with similar extensions which may exist or potentially be proposed for adjacent properties in the future.

In line with the guidance of the SPD, where certain site contexts mean that the proposal would not result in the creation of a potential or actual terracing effect (i.e. corner plot such as the application site), then leniency can be applied to the set-back and set-in of the two-storey side extension in relation to the original dwelling. Notwithstanding this, the submitted plans show that the first-floor front elevation would be set-back from the immediately adjoining front wall by 0.45m, therefore the two-storey side extension still presents as a subordinate extension and would not result in the creation of a potential or actual terracing effect. The ridgeline of the two-storey side extension is set at a lower level than the existing dwelling to present itself as a subordinate addition.

The SPD also outlines that windows in side elevations that serve main habitable rooms and overlook an adjacent dwelling are rarely acceptable. The proposed development would contain a window to the ground floor side elevation, which would serve a utility room. This window would therefore serve a non-habitable room, would be screened by the existing timber boundary treatment to prevent any overlooking with sufficient interface distance of 15m retained between the front elevations of the dwellings No's 75 and 77 Fernbank Avenue (discussed further within the report) and the proposed side extension to prevent any unacceptable overlooking. No residential amenity or loss of privacy concerns are raised due to the proposed two-storey side extension.

6.4 of the SPD stipulates that the overall scale of the development should not look out of place in the street scene or other immediate environment. Extensions should normally be subordinate to the original dwelling. The width of the proposed side extension is marginally over 50% of the width of the original dwelling, however, because of its subordination and marginally larger width it does not result in any significant harm to the design in relation to the dwelling or street scene.

Single storey rear extension

The Householder Development SPD advises (7.4) that 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 proposed development would not exceed this as it spans a depth of 3m and therefore complies with this guidance. No windows are installed to the side elevations and therefore no residential amenity or privacy concerns are raised.

Single storey front porch extension

The Householder Development SPD states (7.5) that for the consideration of front extensions and porches style, design, materials and scale should respect the character of the surrounding residential area. Account should be taken of the building line, although, for example, small porches and canopies of a satisfactory design in materials projecting in front of the building line will normally be permitted. It also outlines 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. A large detached house, set a substantial distance from the highway, would normally be capable of accommodating a much larger front extension or porch than, for example, a terraced dwelling with minimal set-back from the highway.

The front projection would be of a minor scale (0.5m) and would display a satisfactory design and style that would integrate with the rest of the dwelling through matching materials. Given the small projection of the front extension and the suitable set-back of 5.5m from the public highway maintained, the proposal would be acceptable. No significant harm to the building line would be caused because of the proposal and it would not adversely impact the character of the area or harm the residential amenities of any nearby properties.

Corner plot

The Householder Development SPD asserts (7.6) that particular attention should be paid to the design of extensions on corner plots. This is because they can encroach over the building line on either highway frontage, and therefore be particularly prominent in the street scene and sometimes create undesirable pinch points at the

entrance to side roads. They can also interfere with highway visibility in some solutions. The (relevant) 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.

The front corner of the two-storey side extension closest to the highway would be set in from the plot boundary by 3m whilst the rear corner would be set in by 1m. It is acknowledged that 1m distance from the side boundary would result in the proposal being prominent in the street scene; the most visually noticeable impact would come from the rear corner of the two-storey side extension where the plot boundary curves at an oblique angle. This concern was identified and discussed during the determination of the application and amended plans were received, however, resulted in other issues by design which would have a worsened impact to the character of the area.

It is considered that although the proposal at its closest would be within 1m from the boundary, it would not warrant a refusal. This is because despite the level of harm identified and that the proposal would appear visually prominent in the street scene, the rear corner of the two-storey side would be the most harmful section, however greater distance would gradually be achieved as the plot widens to the front elevation. Therefore, given that only the rear corner would result in the enlarged and prominent section, as it pulls away from the plot boundary this impact would be ameliorated and subsequently, on the planning balance, the two-storey side extension and its siting on the corner plot would be acceptable.

The previous side extension was built permitted in 1989 and Google Maps Street Data evidences this as early as 2009. Although this has recently been demolished, the significant material change to the street scene would therefore be the introduction of the first-floor element. The previous side extension had already somewhat compromised the building line to the side of the dwelling and down Fernbank Avenue, whilst it is recognised that the introduction of the first-floor element would accentuate this, it is not considered that this would element of the proposal would warrant a refusal. The character of the area further to the north of Fernbank Avenue displays gable walls and development close to the highway (namely No.14 of Birch Grove) with a side elevation and an outbuilding abutting Fernbank Avenue. Whilst it is acknowledged that the proposal would result in a prominent addition to the street scene at the rear corner of the two-storey side extension, the harm identified by the design would not be considered detrimental to an extent to substantiate a refusal.

The guidance of the SPD furthers that two-storey side extensions should avoid blank gables and should respect interface distances with neighbouring dwellings (12m between gable and front elevation). As covered previously in the report, the gable wall would include 1 no. window on the ground floor which is acceptable. Sufficient interface distance would be retained (15m).

As outlined, the design of the proposed development would result in a partial encroached section to the building line within the street scene, however, the proposal

would be no less than 1m from the highway at its closet point and given it would move away from the boundary would still present an open feel overall. The lowered ridgeline would contribute to the subordination of the extension. As established, despite the contraventions with the policy guidance of 7.6 of the SPD and the harms identified, it is considered that, on the planning balance, the proposed development would not warrant a refusal and the conflict with 7.6 of the SPD is considered acceptable on this occasion for the reasons outlined above.

Materials

The existing dwelling is a combination of brick and render facing with white UPVC openings and tiled roofing. The submitted plans show that a combination of matching render and brickwork exteriors would be employed to harmonise with the existing brick and render sections of the existing dwelling. Roof tiles are annotated to match the existing main roof and sandstone lintel cills are indicated to ensure that the design features are emulated where appropriate. The openings are not confirmed, however, this would be covered by the standing planning condition for matching materials.

HIGHWAYS

The submitted plans show that the front garden would be a fully paved hardstanding driveway. This would measure 9.8m in width and 5.5m in depth with an access to the hardstanding measuring 5.8m in width. The proposed development would see the property contain 4 no. bedrooms and therefore 3 no. parking spaces would be required. The front garden area would be capable of accommodating the required level of parking and accord with 6.16 of the SPD.

6.17 of the Householder Development SPD advocates that at least 50% of the front garden area remains porous or provisions should be made to direct run-off water from the hard surface to permeable or porous area or surface within the curtilage of the dwelling.

The plans show that an ACO drainage soakaway would be installed to the front elevation of the property. The gradient of the site slopes marginally lower toward the property. Therefore, the proposed development would be acceptable and not result in any highway safety concerns.

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.

- 4) Prior to the occupation of the proposed development, the parking arrangement indicated within the submitted and approved drawing, 'Existing Floor Plans and Elevations and Site Plan' (No. DH 01), shall be implemented in full accordance with the approved plan. This shall include the partial removal of the front boundary wall, extension of the dropped kerb shall be extended to the width of a minimum of 5.7m, to allow full access to the hardstanding and the installation of the ACO drainage system.

The parking, together with the driveway retained shall remain for parking purposes at all times thereafter.

Reason: To ensure that adequate off-street parking is available in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (2025), Policies CS2, CS7 and CS19 of the Knowsley Local Plan: Core Strategy, adopted January 2016, saved Policies H5 and H8 of the Knowsley Replacement Unitary Development Plan, adopted June 2006, Ensuring a Choice of Travel SPD (2010) and Householder Development SPD (2016).

SCHEDULE 1

Date Received	Ref. No	Version	Drawing/Document Title
22.04.2025	DH 02	REV B	PROPOSED FLOOR PLANS AND ELEVATIONS AND LOCATION PLAN
06.02.2025	DH 01	-	EXISTING FLOOR PLANS AND ELEVATIONS AND SITE PLAN

Signed Case Officer¹:

Reece Black

**Signed Authorising
Officer²:**

Jo Sheridan

Date:

25/04/2025

Informatives

- 1 It is an offence to drive over a footway without dropped kerbs and it is also an offence to carry out any works within the public highway without the permission of the Highway Authority. Only the Highway Authority or a contractor approved by the Highway Authority can carry out works within the adopted highway. The applicant should contact the Council's Maintenance Contractor Tarmac on Knowsley.highways@tarmac.com should they be minded to extend their dropped kerb to improve access

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