

<u>APPLICATION NO:</u>	25/00150/FUL	<u>CASE OFFICER:</u>	Reece Black
<u>WARD:</u>	Halewood North	<u>PARISH:</u>	
<u>LOCATION:</u>	29 Elworthy Avenue, Halewood, Knowsley		
<u>PROPOSAL:</u>	ERECTION OF SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION		

Site Description

The application site is located at 29 Elworthy Avenue, Halewood North and is situated within a Primarily Residential Area as allocated within the Local Plan Policies Map. The application property is a 2-storey, semi-detached dwellinghouse and is brick facing to its front, side and rear elevations, together with white UPVC openings and brown, interlocking roof tiles.

The property benefits from a modest front porch extension. The front elevation is south/south-west facing. The front garden area is surfaced with patio paving slabs to provide hardstanding for up to 3 no. vehicles with a grassed section, bound by a low, brick-built front boundary wall. Refuse bins are stored adjacent the fence. There is external access to the rear garden via a gate. The rear garden comprises of patio and grassed sections, is rectangular in shape and spans a depth of 13.10m. Beyond the rear garden lies Church Road. The application site and the adjacent properties follow a stepped arrangement.

Proposal

The proposal is for the erection of a single storey rear extension.

The proposed development would feature dog-legged sections. At its deepest the furthest projection would be 5.95m from the rear elevation of the dwelling and at its widest would be 5.7m in width. The proposal would be served by a dual-pitched roof, in which the eaves would measure 2.37m and the ridgeline would measure 3.47m. 1 no. windows would be installed to the rear elevation and 1 no. door would be inserted to the north-west side elevation. The south-east facing roof slope would include 1 no. rooflight.

The proposal would also comprise the insertion of 2 no. windows to the original gable wall of the dwellinghouse.

Consultations

Halewood Town Council - No Comments Received.

Representations

This application has been publicised by letters sent to 6 neighbours. No representations have been received.

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.

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 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

The Householder Development SPD states that single storey 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.

DESIGN AND RESIDENTIAL AMENITY

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 SPD furthers 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. A single storey extension beyond 4m (or in a situation where the application property has a rear elevation which is set further back than the rear elevation of the neighbouring dwelling) will normally only be permitted if it does not breach the 45-degree rule.*

The application has been supported by a proposed site plan which marks out the 45-degree rule.

The proposed development would run along the side boundary shared with the paired property of No.30 Elworthy Avenue for 3.9m, to which it would then be set away from the party boundary by 2m before continuing for a further 2m (cumulative depth of 5.9m). The rear elevation of No.30 sits parallel to the application property. The proposed site plan shows that the 45-degree rule is breached by the proposal, however, the section that breaches this section does not exceed the 4m parameter projection advocated within the SPD; the 45-degree rule is not used to assess the impact of rear extensions until they surpass the projection parameters. For the consideration of the section of the projection which surpasses the 4m depth, it is considered that the set-in from the party boundary is of a suitable distance to mitigate any unacceptable and adverse impacts such as an unduly dominant appearance or any impact from overshadowing, loss of outlook etc. The closest habitable window affected serves a kitchen, to which it is considered no unacceptable impacts would be caused because of the proposal. There are no windows to the side elevation which faces No.30 and therefore no privacy concerns are raised. The proposed roofline would not raise any amenity or privacy concerns.

The proposal would also have a total projection of 5.9m along the party boundary shared with No.28; the entirety of the proposal would be set off the party boundary by 1m. The rear elevation of No.28 is stepped back from the rear elevation of the application property by 4m and the front elevation of the rear extension would be set 5.3m further than the rear elevation of No.28. Although the proposal would display a large depth, given the set-back of No.28, there is a large gap (as discussed) and therefore this distance between the rear kitchen window of No.28 and the proposed development would be sufficient. There is also fairly large outbuilding immediately adjacent the boundary treatment between the two properties, however, this could easily be demolished and therefore holds limited weight. Notwithstanding this, however, it is considered given the set-back of No.28 and the interface distance that would remain, along with the 2m high timber boundary fence, the impact of the

proposed rear extension would be limited and not considered detrimentally harmful to amenities to substantiate a refusal due to its limited impact. The proposed development would appear within the views from the kitchen window, however, for the reasons outlined, the impacts would be limited and not considered to result in an unduly dominant appearance or cause unacceptable overshadowing, loss of outlook etc.

There are no windows to the side elevation of the proposal, other than a window contained within the access door to the side elevation, however, this has been agreed to be obscurely-glazed to avoid any concerns of overlooking and visual intrusion should the adjacent outbuilding in the rear garden of No.28 be demolished. For the consideration of the two windows inserted to the gable wall of the application property, it has also been agreed that these would be obscurely-glazed to allow for daylight and natural ventilation into the kitchen whilst also ensuring that no unacceptable overlooking into the rear garden and patio immediately adjacent the rear elevation of No.28 would occur.

The Householder Development SPD (6.14) stipulates that *the extension should leave adequate room around the dwelling to avoid a cramped appearance within the plot. It should also leave adequate garden areas for sitting out, the storing of refuse bins, etc.*

The proposal would not remove external access to the rear garden or affect existing storing of refuse bins. As over 50% of usable garden space would be retained and given it would, largely, display set-ins from the plot boundary's, the proposal would not result in a cramped appearance.

The proposal would be served by a dual-pitched roof which would emulate the roof of the original dwellinghouse. The submitted plans contain a schedule of the external facing materials, in which the plans outline that all external facing materials would be to match the existing the existing dwellinghouse.

HIGHWAYS

The proposed development is for a rear extension of the dwelling. The proposal would increase the number of habitable rooms from 2 to 3. The SPD (6.16) requires that for properties which have 2-3 bedrooms that these should have 2 no. parking spaces within the curtilage of the dwelling. It is considered that the existing parking provision at the property would be sufficient for the dwelling as a minimum of 2 no. vehicles can be accommodated to the existing hardstanding located to the side and rear of the dwelling. Consequently, the proposal would not have any adverse impact on parking arrangements or pose 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.

SCHEDULE 1

Date Received	Ref. No	Version	Drawing/Document Title
07.03.2025	524115-01	-	EIXSTING LAYOUT & LOCATION PLAN.
07.05.2025	524115-02	REV B	PROPOSED FLOOR PLAN AND ELEVATIONS. LOCATION PLAN

Signed Case Officer¹:

Reece Black

Signed Authorising Officer²:

Jo Sheridan

Date:

09/05/2025

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