

<u>APPLICATION NO:</u>	22/00629/FUL	<u>CASE OFFICER:</u>	Reece Black
<u>WARD:</u>	Halewood South	<u>PARISH:</u>	Halewood Town Council
<u>LOCATION:</u>	258 Higher Road, Halewood, Knowsley		
<u>PROPOSAL:</u>	ERECTION OF TWO STOREY SIDE EXTENSION AND SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION (DEMOLITION OF GARAGE AND CONSERVATORY)		

Site Description

The application site is located at 258 Higher Road, Halewood, and is located in an area that is allocated as a Primarily Residential Area in the development plan. The application property is a semi-detached dwelling and is rendered finish on its front, side and rear elevations. It features white UPVC windows and doors on its front elevation and a combination of white and grey UPVC windows on the rear elevation and has brown, flat, interlocking rooftiles.

The property benefits from an existing porch at the front, a garage attached to its side elevation and a conservatory located at the rear. In the rear garden are two detached outbuildings.

Proposal

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

The two-storey side extension would project 2.88m and would have a length of 7.32m (10.98m when combined with the single storey rear extension on the ground floor side elevation.) The front elevation will sit in line with the main, original front building line of the application site. The proposed development would be served by a hipped roof and would measure at a height of 5.24m at the eaves and the highest part of the roof measure at a height of 7.64m. The proposal would feature two windows on its front elevation, one on the ground and one on the first floor, with one window on the rear elevation on the first floor. It would also feature a door on the on the gable wall.

The single storey rear extension would project 3.66m and would have a width of 9.08m. This would be served by a mono-pitched roof and would measure at a height of 2.74m at the eaves and the highest part of the roof would measure at a height of 3.38m. The proposed development would also feature patio doors on its rear elevation and 3 skylights on the roof.

The proposed development would see the demolition of the existing garage and conservatory.

Consultations

Halewood Town Council - No Comments Received

Arboricultural Officer - Advised that the Tree Report should be updated and the site area re-surveyed.

Representations

This application has been publicised by letters sent to 5 neighbours. No representations have been received.

Planning History

APP. NO: 23/00074/FUL
PROPOSAL: ERECTION OF 2NO. OUTBUILDINGS TO REAR GARDEN AREA.
DECISION: GRANTED
DECISION DATE: 12 April 2023

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.

KNOWSLEY LOCAL PLAN: CORE STRATEGY SAVED POLICIES - KNOWSLEY REPLACEMENT UNITARY DEVELOPMENT PLAN (ADOPTED JUNE 2006)

CS2 - Development Principles
CS19 - Design Quality and Accessibility in New Development
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

Design

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.

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 existing dwelling is rendered finish with white UPVC openings on the front elevation, white and grey UPVC openings on the rear elevation and tiled roofing. The proposed development would also be rendered finish on its exterior to match and include materials which are keeping in with those found at the application property and would feature a hipped roof for the two-storey side extension and a mono-pitched roof on the rear extension. These are considered appropriate choices as the hipped roof is to be in-keeping with the roof of the existing dwelling and is also to match the hipped roofs of nearby dwellings. The pitched roof of the proposed rear extension is in accord with the Householder Development SPD and would be acceptable as a contrast to the overall design as this would serve a single storey rear extension, which would not be readily visible from the highway and would be sited in a private area. The extension has an acceptable design and is in keeping with the requirements of Policy H8 and the Householder Development SPD.

Amenity

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. It also states proposed developments should 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.

The Householder Development SPD also states that usually either a minimum space 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 of the extension should be set back at least 1m from the immediately adjoining part of the main front wall of the original dwelling. It states however, that this requirement may be relaxed if, because of a staggered or irregular arrangement of the dwellings in the street or corner location, the construction of the extension would not create an actual or potential terracing effect. The submitted plans evidence that the proposed two-storey side extension would be erected with approximately 1.25m between the side elevation and the shared party boundary. Therefore, it is considered that the proposed development would not cause any significant harm to any local amenities, and it would be in accord with the Householder Development SPD.

The Householder Development SPD states 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 breach more than 4m from the rear elevation of the existing dwelling. The proposed development would be in accord of this guidance. Therefore, it is considered that the proposed development would not cause any significant harm to any local amenities and would be in accord with the Householder Development SPD.

256 Higher Road

No.256 is the adjoining semi-detached property. The front and main rear building line sit in line with the application site. No 256 benefits from a single storey side extension and one small extension from the rear. The proposed two-storey side extension would be erected to the east side elevation of the application property and would not project beyond the front or rear building line and would subsequently not be readily visible to the occupants of no.256. The proposed rear extension would not surpass the 4m parameter outlined in the Householder Development SPD and would therefore be in accord with the guidance. It is considered that the proposed development would not cause any detrimental harm to the amenities or privacy of the occupants of no.256 and would be in accord with the Householder Development SPD.

260 Higher Road

No.260 is the adjacent dwelling house sited to the east of the application property. The property benefits from a small, attached side store that is sited at the front elevation and a single storey side and rear wraparound extension, which contains 3 skylights on the roof. The attached side store has a window on its gable wall. There is also one window on the gable wall of the first floor of no.260. It is assumed, that this would reflect the arrangement of the application property and would likely serve the first-floor landing. No representations have been received from the occupants of no.260 to object. There is also sufficient party boundary treatment through the presence of timber fencing between no.260 and the application property.

The proposed two-storey side extension is not considered to have an overbearing effect or cause an unacceptable loss of light or privacy. There may be a partial reduction in light as a result of the proposed development, but this would not be considered to be to an unacceptable degree. The side store of no.260 features small windows on its front elevation and is also not a habitable room. The single side and rear wraparound extension features a wide window on its rear elevation, along with 3 skylights on the roof. Therefore, the property would still receive light and any loss of light in this instance would not be to an unacceptable degree.

Furthermore, the proposed two-storey side extension would be in accordance with the Householder Development SPDs advocated distance between the shared party boundary and the side elevation of the proposed development. This further ensures there the proposal is not overbearing. There, are also no windows on the side elevation of the proposed side extension and therefore, it is considered there would be no issues regarding an interference of privacy.

The proposed rear extension would not surpass the 4m parameter outlined in the Householder Development SPD and would therefore be in accord with the guidance. It is considered that the proposed development would not cause any detrimental harm to the amenities or privacy of the occupants of no.260 and would be in accord with the Householder Development SPD.

Highways

The application site has existing parking provisions that are sufficient to accommodate up to three vehicles within the curtilage of the boundary. The number of bedrooms at the property would increase from 4 to 5 and although the property has the advocated level of parking provisions, the part removal of the front boundary brick wall should be carried out to facilitate access to the full space of the front driveway.

The proposed development would cause no impact to any existing off-street parking provisions at the application site. Therefore, it is not considered to have any impact on highway safety.

Trees

The application was supported by a Tree Survey. The Council's tree officer highlighted that not all trees on site have been surveyed as part of the assessment and requested that the site is re-surveyed to include all trees within the red line boundary and those situated within 10m of the proposed development and an Arboricultural Impact Assessment to accompany the survey. Since then, the conifer trees have been removed from the site.

A further Tree Survey and accompanying Arboricultural Impact Assessment is no longer necessary or therefore considered for the assessment of this application.

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) The existing front boundary brick wall to the front of the house and front driveway shall be partially or fully demolished and the dropped kerb extended to an extent to widen the access and parking of three cars to the front of the house, prior to the first occupation of the extension(s) permitted. The parking, together with the driveway retained shall remain for parking purposes at all times thereafter. For the avoidance of doubt, the removed boundary treatment shall not be reinstalled at any time.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety and to comply with Policies CS2 of the Knowsley Local Plan Core Strategy adopted January 2016 and Saved Policies of H5 and H8 of the Knowsley Replacement Unitary Development Plan adopted June 2006.

SCHEDULE 1

Date Received	Ref. No	Version	Drawing/Document Title
14/03/2023	GBA-HIG-PL-DR-DP-01	REV A	DEMOLITION PLAN
14/03/2023	GBA-HIG-PL-DR-EL-02	REV A	PROPOSED ELEVATIONS
14/03/2023	GBA-HIG-PL-DR-FP-03	REV A	PROPOSED GROUND FLOOR PLAN
14/03/2023	GBA-HIG-PL-DR-FP-04	REV A	PROPOSED FIRST FLOOR PLAN
14/03/2023	GBA-HIG-PL-DR-LP-01	REV A	LOCATION PLAN
14/03/2023	GBA-HIG-PL-DR-SP-01	REV A	PROPOSED SITE / BLOCK PLAN
03/03/2023	-	-	ARBORICULTURAL SURVEY

Signed Case Officer¹: Reece Black

**Signed Authorising
Officer²:** K Foster

Date: 2 May 2023

Appendix 1 – Site Photographs



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







