

<u>APPLICATION NO:</u>	23/02478/FUL	<u>CASE OFFICER:</u>	Reece Black
<u>WARD:</u>	Shevington	<u>PARISH:</u>	
<u>LOCATION:</u>	33 Beattock Close, Tower Hill, Kirkby		
<u>PROPOSAL:</u>	ERECTION OF FIRST FLOOR SIDE EXTENSION		

Site Description

The application site is located at 33 Beattock Close, Kirkby and is situated in an area allocated as a Primarily Residential Area in the Development Plan. The application property is a semi-detached dwelling and is red brick facing on its front, side and rear elevations. Along with black UPVC openings and flat, brown, interlocking roof tiles.

The property benefits from a single storey front and side extension, together with canopy roof, and a store adjacent the side of the extension. The dwelling is sited on a corner plot where Beattock Close intersects onto the highway of Melrose Road. The application property is South-East facing.

The application property holds a prominent position in the street scene, as it is located on the corner plot, with little screening and holds a notable presence in the residential area, particularly when observed from Beattock Close as the highway curves out as it connects to Melrose Road. The property is also encircled by other residential dwellings, notably other semi-detached dwellings, and a row of terraced houses to the rear of the site, the building line of the terraced row are set-back considerably from the highway of Beattock Close and this is accentuated by the curve of the highway as it connects to Melrose Road.

The front garden area of the site is enclosed by a concrete post and grey, timber fencing at an approximate height of 1m. This transitions to an approximate 1.8m high grey timber fencing as it screens the private rear amenity area.

Proposal

The application seeks permission for the erection of a first-floor side extension, to be sited on top of the existing single storey side extension, which would cumulatively form a two-storey side extension to the original dwelling.

The proposed first-floor extension would project out by 3m and would have a depth of 7.54m. The proposed first-floor extension would feature a dual pitched roof; the eaves for this roof would measure at a height of 5.3m and the highest point of the roof would measure at a height of 7.52m. This would be subordinate to the roofline of the existing dwelling.

The rear elevation of the proposed development would be erected with a separation distance of 0.98m from the cartilage of the dwelling and this would be the closest part of the development to the boundary line. The front elevation of the proposal would be sited 3.64m from the curtilage.

The front wall of the proposed development would be set-back by 0.55m. The front and rear elevations of the proposed development would feature windows.

Consultations

None Required.

Representations

This application has been publicised by letters sent to 9 neighbours. No representations have been received.

Planning History

APP. NO: 04/01349/FUL
PROPOSAL: ERECTION OF SINGLE STOREY EXTENSION TO FRONT AND SIDE OF DWELLING WITH CANOPY ROOF TO FRONT ELEVATION
DECISION: GRANTED
DECISION DATE: 24 February 2005

APP. NO: 22/00690/FUL
PROPOSAL: ERECTION OF FIRST FLOOR SIDE AND REAR EXTENSION AND REAR DORMER LOFT CONVERSION
DECISION: REFUSED
DECISION DATE: 15 March 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.

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.

**KNOWSLEY LOCAL PLAN: CORE STRATEGY
SAVED POLICIES - KNOWSLEY REPLACEMENT UNITARY DEVELOPMENT**

PLAN (ADOPTED JUNE 2006)

CS19 - Design Quality and Accessibility in New Development

CS2 - Development Principles

H5 - Development within Primarily Residential Areas

H8 - Extensions and Alterations to Residential Properties

Article 35 Statement

The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by identifying matters of concern with the proposal and discussing those with the applicant. However, the issues are so fundamental to the proposal that it has not been possible to negotiate a satisfactory way forward and due to the harm which has been clearly identified within the reason for the refusal, approval has not been possible.

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 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 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 states 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' in the entrance to side roads.

It also states that 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.

Design

The Householder Development SPD and Saved Policy H8 in the Replacement Unitary Development Plan state that the design and materials used would reflect those used on the original dwelling. The submitted plans show that these policy requirements accord with the Householder Development SPD and Saved Policy H8. The proposal would not be considered to result in the 'terracing effect', given the fact

that the site is located on a corner plot.

The Householder Development SPD states that the overall scale of the development should not look out of place in the street scene or other immediate environment. It also states that extensions should normally be subordinate to the original dwelling. It is considered that the overall scale of the proposed development is deemed too excessive by virtue of its form and mass, when observed in its site context and with the cumulative impact of the existing single storey side extension, in which it would be constructed upon. This would result in an extension that would dominate the street scene and would look out of place and would appear incongruous in the street scene.

The application site is situated with several dwelling houses on all sides of the property. In comparison to these, the proposed development would contrast significantly to the scale of the nearby dwelling houses and would appear overly large and domineering in the street scene. The existing property with the addition of the proposed development, would create an appearance of an unbalanced dwelling, especially when observed with the paired, semi-detached dwelling. The proposed development would not offer a sensitive contrast that respects the existing.

As discussed, caution should be displayed in the design to ensure that on a corner plot, the proposed development should not be built abutting the boundary line where it would become a prominent addition to the amenities of the area. In the context of where the site application is and due to the existing single storey side extension being sited abutting the boundary, it would not be within an appropriate design, as it would accentuate and adversely highlight how close the existing side extension is to the boundary line and the impact it would have on the openness of the space by appearing overbearing. This, in turn would negatively affect the openness of the surrounding highways of Beattock Close and Melrose Road.

The proposed development would look visually prominent in the street scene and contribute to the potential creation of a 'pinch point' in the street context at the junction. If the opposite dwelling of 1 Beattock Close, whose gable wall faces the application property, decided to extend through a two-storey side extension, it would create a significant 'pinch point' in conjunction with the proposed first-floor extension of the application. This would compromise the openness of the local area and highway of Beattock Close and would contravene with the guidance outlined in the Householder Development SPD.

The Householder Development SPD states that for extensions on corner plots that 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.

The application property benefits from a previously constructed and existing single storey front to side extension with a canopy roof to front elevation and a store at the side of the extension. This is constructed with sections abutting at the boundary line or being sited significantly close to the boundary line. Notwithstanding the previous application being granted, it would be considered that the proposed developments first floor side extension (and the result of a two-storey side extension as a result) would cause a harmful impact on the amenities of the street scene, through its cumulative impact, due to the form and mass of the proposal and appearing unsympathetic overall; along with the fact that it would be sited too close to the boundary and not in accordance with the Householder Development SPD when considered in the context of a corner plot.

The Householder Development SPD also states that in the case of two-storey extensions, the presence of existing substantial hedging or fencing / walls, or substantial highway verges would be considered in assessing whether a relaxation to these guidelines can be made. It is acknowledged that the existing fence, that encloses the private rear amenity area and where the proposed development would be sited, provides a level of screening. However, given that the application site is readily visible from the highway of Beattock Close and the application site is on a corner plot, which holds a prominent position in the street scene, it is considered this would not sufficiently offset the harm caused to the character of the street scene by the proposed development.

The Householder Development SPD states that overall, irrespective of the distance remaining to the side boundary, the extension should be appropriate in scale to the dwelling. The proposed development complies with guidance such as appearing subordinate to the original dwelling and a lower ridge line etc, It is considered that the proposed development would be an inappropriate addition in scale to the original dwelling, nearby dwellings, as well as the character of the surrounding area.

The Householder Development SPD also states that two-storey extensions should avoid blank gables, which the plans show a blank gable would be erected. This would cause significant harm to the amenities of the street scene and character of the area. The proposed development would not accord with the Householder Development SPD. strategy, Replacement UDP policies and guidance in the NPPF and is therefore recommended for refusal.

Overall, it is not considered that the proposed development would be in accord with the Householder Development SPD and would not feature an appropriate design. It would be considered to result in a harmful impact to the character of the area.

Residential Amenity

The proposed development would cause issues to the amenities of the street scene and character of the area, largely due to the scale and massing of the proposed development in the context of a corner plot. Although, there would be no specific issues of overlooking between neighbours or significant overshadowing, it is deemed that the proposed development overall would have a detrimental impact to the street scene and residential amenities of the local area.

The most prominent impact would be observed from the rear of the application site, to the North, by highway users and the terraced row of dwellings sited behind the property on Beattock Close, this would be considered a public vantage point and due to the setback of the row of terraced dwellings to the rear of the application site, the proposed development would be readily visible with little to no means of screening.

The scale of the proposed development and where it would be erected would reduce and harm the openness in the local area. Given that the Householder Development SPD advises against this, and that the openness of areas should not be lost, through the creation of 'pinch points'; this would be exacerbated by the form and mass of the proposed development, where the application site is located on a corner plot, holds a prominent site in the street scene and the lack of effective screening to offset any adverse impacts.

The Householder Development SPD states for extensions on corner plots, that reduced distances may be accepted if:

- Open corner plots are not a feature of the area.
- The site does not hold a prominent position in the street scene (for example, if it is at the end of a cul-de-sac); or
- The site is well screened and so the extension would not have a significant effect on the street scene.

It is observed that common features of the local area include corner plots, with some of the dwellings building close to the boundary lines. As well as a meandering and curved cul-de-sac type highway, meaning there are not strict building lines, that sit in uniform for the local area as a whole.

It is acknowledged that this would generally allow relaxations of some of the guidance, however it is considered that this site holds a prominent position in the street scene and that the site is not well screened, therefore, the site does not lend itself to support the extension without having a significant effect on the street scene. On this basis, and other factors, it would not be appropriate to relax the guidance on the reduced distances for the development on corner plots.

The proposed development would not be sited in an appropriate area and the proposal would not benefit from any effective screening to offset any harmful impacts. Therefore, the proposed development would result in an adverse impact to the residential amenity of the street scene and character of the local area and would largely not comply with the Householder Development SPD.

No.33 Melrose Road

No 33 is the attached dwelling to the application site. The front and rear building lines of no.33 sit in line with the application property. The property benefits from a porch at the front elevation as well as a single storey side extension on its side elevation.

The proposed development would not project beyond the existing front and rear elevations of the property and would therefore not be readily visible from no.33. It is deemed this would not cause any harm to the privacy to the occupants of no.33. The proposal is also not considered to result in any overshadowing or obstruction of light. The proposed development would not cause a significant impact on the amenities and privacy to the occupants of the Householder Development SPD.

However, the proposed development would not be considered to foster a good relationship between the application site and no.33. The overall design of the application site, in contrast to no.33, would result in a stark, unbalanced, and unsymmetrical contrast between the two-semi detached properties.

It would have an overall negative impact on the two properties when viewed together and due to the openness of the area, would appear even more noticeable. Therefore, it would not appear to convey an appropriate overall design. Overall, it would be considered to cause harm to the residential amenities and would not be in accord with the Householder Development SPD.

The proposed development would also be considered to cause significant harm to the character of the area, particularly when observed from the North.

Highways

The application site utilises the front garden to provide off-street parking. By the dimensions outlined in the Householder Development SPD, which states that for parking to the front of the property it will require dimensions of 3m x 5m. This would provide a maximum of up to two spaces for the property. The proposal would not cause any change to existing parking provisions available to the occupants.

The proposed development would see the creation of a third bedroom at the property. The proposed development would be in accord with the Householder Development SPD as the maximum standards for 3 bedrooms would be 2 parking spaces.

This would be in accord with the Householder Development SPD, not result in any adverse impacts to the highway or contribute to on street parking and would therefore be acceptable on highway considerations.

Previous Planning Application

The application property has recently had an application for a similar proposal. An application was received requesting permission for the "ERECTION OF FIRST FLOOR SIDE AND REAR EXTENSION AND REAR DORMER LOFT CONVERSION" (23/00690/FUL). This was assessed and determined on 15/03/2023 and was ultimately refused.

This proposal featured a side projection of 3.95m from the gable wall and would have measured at a depth of 4.74m, before it would dog-leg in by 1.04m and then continue the side elevation by a further length of 3.5m, which would have a projection of 3.05m from the existing side elevation. This overall proposed side elevation would have measured at a total length of 8.24m. The proposed first-floor extension would feature a dual pitched roof; the eaves for this roof would measure at a height of 5.49m and the highest point of the roof would measure at a height of 7.57m.

The proposed development of the current application would have a roughly similar scale, form, and mass. It is the viewpoint of the Local Planning Authority that the current proposal would encounter the same issues of the proposed first-floor side and rear extension of 23/00690/FUL. The erection of a first-floor side extension, to create a two-storey side extension, was considered to cause adverse harm to the residential amenity and character of the local area. It is the view that the proposal in question would also cause this and there would not be a solution to provide an acceptable proposal that would permit a first-floor extension to the existing dwelling.

The proposal is considered to face similar issues to the recently determined application of 23/00690/FUL and therefore, this application would also be recommended for refusal due to the adverse impact it would cause to the character and residential amenities of the local area.

Recommendation

That Planning Permission be refused for the following reason(s):

1. The proposed development is detrimental to the visual amenity and character of the area. It will create a visually intrusive and overbearing feature in the street scene by reason of its location and massing. It would be detrimental to the visual amenities of the residential area and the adjoining property when observed as a pair of adjoined semi-detached dwellings and would, in consequence, be out of character with the area generally. The proposal is contrary to Saved Policies H5 & H8 of the Knowsley Replacement Unitary Development Plan, adopted June 2006, as well as Policies CS2 and CS19 of the Knowsley Local Plan Core Strategy, adopted January 2016 and the Householder Development SPD.

SCHEDULE 1

Date Received	Ref. No	Version	Drawing/Document Title
22/08/2023	01753	-	LOCATION PLAN
22/08/2023	01753-SK-01	-	EXISTING AND PROPOSED ELEVATION AND FLOOR PLANS
22/08/2023	01753-SK-02	-	EXISTING AND PROPOSED SITE PLANS

Signed Case Officer¹:

Reece Black

Signed Authorising Officer²:

Alan Kilroe

Date:

20/10/23

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