

|                               |                                                                                                   |                             |             |
|-------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------|
| <b><u>APPLICATION NO:</u></b> | 22/00546/FUL                                                                                      | <b><u>CASE OFFICER:</u></b> | Andrew Hunt |
| <b><u>WARD:</u></b>           | Roby                                                                                              | <b><u>PARISH:</u></b>       |             |
| <b><u>LOCATION:</u></b>       | 33 Oak Road, Huyton, Knowsley, L36 5XY                                                            |                             |             |
| <b><u>PROPOSAL:</u></b>       | ERECTION OF SINGLE STOREY FRONT, SIDE AND REAR<br>EXTENSION INCLUDING THE ADDITION OF FRONT PORCH |                             |             |

---

### **Site Description**

The application site is a Semi - Detached house in a residential area which has a small single storey extension at the rear and an outbuilding which runs along the boundary with number 35 Oak Road.

### **Proposal**

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

### **Consultations**

N/A

### **Representations**

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

### **Planning History**

None relevant.

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that accord with an up-to-date development plan without delay; or where the development plan is absent, silent or out of date planning permission should be granted unless the application of policies in the NPPF that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a clear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

#### **Street Scene**

The proposed changes to the front are minor with a modest projection of around 1.2 metres. The proposed changes match the character of the existing house. Overall, there would be no harm to the street scene.

#### **Neighbour Amenity**

In relation to 31, there would be no harm to amenity as the extension would only extend around 3 metres at the rear. This is less than the 4 metres allowed in the Householder SPD.

In relation to 35, there is a main habitable room window on the side of 35, which serves the kitchen. This appears to be the only main habitable window for this room. The extension would therefore result in loss of light and outlook to the kitchen of 35. However, a relevant consideration is that a solely single storey side extension would be permitted development and could be built without planning permission. This a relevant material consideration as it means a similar impact on 35 could happen without requiring planning permission. The light and outlook for this room is also already partly obscured by the presence of the boundary fence and the gable of the application property and it is not considered that moving the ground floor gable wall closer to the windows would have a significantly more harmful effect on outlook.

The rear element would not cause unacceptable harm to the amenity of 35's occupants as it would only extend 3 metres.

Overall, due to the permitted development fallback position, the current outlook from the property and presence of the existing fence and other approvals nearby, it is considered that there would not be significant harm to the amenity of 35. Therefore,

refusal of the application would not be justified.

### Highway Safety

NPPF Para 111 states that development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe.

The application would reduce the number of parking spaces to 1. This is below the 2 parking spaces recommended for a 3 bed property. However, Oak Road is a relatively quiet residential road with limited through traffic. It is also only built up on one side rather than 2 sides like a typical residential area, there it is likely to have only half the amount of on street parking of a typical residential area. Overall, any harm to highway safety would not cause severe impacts and would not be substantial enough to warrant refusal. Therefore, the proposal complies with NPPF para 111.

### Conclusion

The proposal would be acceptable in relation to Street scene, neighbour amenity and highway safety. 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. Plans and Elevations 1 (Rev A) - (received 26/09/2022)

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 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:**

**Andrew Hunt**

**Signed Authorising  
Officer:**

**Alan Kilroe**

**Date:**

**7 November 2022**

## **Informatives**

N/A

## Appendix 1 – Site Photographs

