

**APPLICATION NO:** 25/00258/FUL **CASE OFFICER:** Andrew Hunt

**WARD:** Halewood South **PARISH:** Halewood  
Town Council

**LOCATION:** 64 Rutland Avenue, Halewood, Knowsley, L26 0TP

**PROPOSAL:** ERECTION OF A SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION

---

### **Site Description**

The application site is semi detached house set within a rectangular plot at 64 Rutland Avenue. The site is close to the junction of Rutland Avenue and Cambridge Drive. There are houses to the north, west and south of the site. There are trees to the north part of the site, however, these are well away from the proposed extension.

### **Proposal**

The proposal is for the erection of a single storey rear extension. The extension would have a projection of 3 metres from the original rear wall of the dwelling, 7.8 metres wide and 2.5m high to the eaves and 3.7m high to the ridge. Windows are not proposed to either side elevation.

### **Consultations**

N/A

### **Representations**

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

### **Planning History**

74/10363/HIST – ERECTION OF KITCHEN AND DINING ROOM EXTENSION TO REAR OF DWELLING – approved - 20.08.1987

16/00491/CLD - DEMOLISH EXISTING ATTACHED GARAGE AND ERECTION OF SINGLE STOREY SIDE EXTENSION – approved - 23.08.2016

### **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out of date planning permission should be granted unless the application of policies in the NPPF that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a clear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**

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

#### **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**

##### Character of Area

In relation to the character of the area, the side extension would not be visible from the streetscene. The extension would be pitched like the existing main roof and would not be out of character for the property. Overall, there would be no harm to the character of the area.

##### Neighbour Amenity

In relation to neighbour amenity, there would be no harm to 66 as the rear extension would only project 3 metres. This is less than the 4 metres set out in the SPD, Therefore, the extension complies with the Householder SPD.

For the same reasons, the extension would also not affect the amenity of 62.

Overall, the proposal would not result in harm to amenity.

### **Permitted Development**

It should be noted that planning permission would not normally be required for a rear extension of 3 metres, it is only the presence of a side extension (which would create a wrap around extension) that means planning permission is required.

### **Conclusion**

The proposal would be acceptable in relation to street scene and neighbour amenity. The application complies with local planning policies and is recommended for approval.

### **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 following approved plans and documents :-

- a. Block/ Location Plan - (received 18/04/2025).
- b. Proposed Plans and Elevations – (received 18/04/2025).

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt.

- 3) **Materials**

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 Policy CS19 of the Knowsley Local Plan Core Strategy, adopted January 2016 and saved Policies H5 and H8 of the Knowsley Replacement Unitary Development Plan, adopted in June 2006.

**Signed Case Officer<sup>1</sup>:**

**Andrew Hunt**

**Signed Authorising  
Officer<sup>2</sup>:**

**Jo Sheridan**

**Date:**

**23/05/2025**

## **Informatives**

### 1. **Encroachment**

The granting of planning permission does not confer consent to encroach on any neighbours land and would be a civil matter between the affected parties. Consideration should be given to this in respect of any gutters potentially overhanging over shared boundaries.

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