

Regeneration and Economic Development Department

APPLICATION NO: 21/00608/FUL

APPLICANT: Mr And Mrs Owen

WARD AFFECTED: Roby

DEVELOPMENT: ERECTION OF A TWO STOREY SIDE EXTENSION

LOCATION OF SITE: 10 Acacia Avenue, Huyton, Knowsley, L36 5TW,

KNOWSLEY LOCAL PLAN ALLOCATION –

Primary Residential Development - Primary Residential Development

RELEVANT POLICIES

Knowsley Local Plan Core Strategy (2016):

CS2 - Development Principles

CS19 - Design Quality and Accessibility in New Development

Knowsley Replacement Unitary Development Plan (2006):

H5 - Development within Primarily Residential Areas

H8 - Extensions and Alterations to Residential Properties

TECHNICAL CONSULTATIONS:

None Required.

NEIGHBOUR NOTIFICATION:

This application has been publicised by letters sent to 5 neighbours. There have been 0 letters of objection, 1 letter of support and 0 letters of comment. The representations are summarised as follows:-

- We have no problem with...building a two storey side extension

ARTICLE 35

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.

ISSUES AND ASSESSMENT:

PROPOSAL

The application is for the erection of a two storey side extension to the semi-detached property at 10 Acacia Avenue in Huyton. The proposal would provide a new garage/store and additional living space for an existing bedroom.

The ground floor element of the proposed extension would sit flush with the principal elevation of the property whilst the first floor element would be set back 1.0m from this elevation. The development would extend approximately 2.0m at the side and would measure 7.8m in length. It would also have a part lean-to/part pitched roof and at its maximum height, it would measure 5.3m to the eaves and 7.2m to the ridge.

Document Reference	Document Issue Number	Document Issue Date
PS/DC/OP04/05	003	23/9/02

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

None.

POLICY CONSIDERATIONS

The site is identified as land for primarily residential development and a domestic extension would therefore be acceptable in principle, subject to compliance with local planning policy and guidance. The application complies with policies CS2 and CS19 of the Local Plan Core Strategy (2016) and saved policies H5 and H8 of the UDP (2006), together with the Householder Development SPD (2016).

These policies and guidance require that new development demonstrates a high standard of design, which does not adversely affect the character of the property or street scene; maintains a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants; avoiding overlooking and overshadowing, as well as an unacceptable overbearing impact; and that adequate parking and garden space would remain for use by residents of the extended property.

DESIGN

The first floor element of the proposed extension would be set back from the principal elevation of the property and the roof of the extension would sit below the main roof of the property. These factors together would ensure that the development appears subservient to the existing property and does not create a terracing effect with the adjacent neighbouring property.

The proposal would be faced in materials which match the existing property and would be in keeping with the scale and appearance of the property. It would not be detrimental to the character of the street scene and is therefore acceptable with regards to design.

RESIDENTIAL AMENITY

Given the position and proximity of the proposal to 12 Acacia Avenue, the development would not be visible from this property and would not adversely affect the amenity of occupiers.

The proposal would extend adjacent to the shared boundary with 8 Acacia Avenue and next to a single storey garage/store room. There are no habitable windows on the gable wall of No. 8 and as the garage/store is non-habitable, the development would not significantly affect the outlook or levels of light to this property and is acceptable. It is considered that there are no other properties that would be affected by the proposal given their sufficient distance from development.

HIGHWAYS

The proposal would not affect the existing level of parking at the property.

OTHER ISSUES

None.

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.

RECOMMENDATION:

That planning permission will 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.

Document Reference	Document Issue Number	Document Issue Date
PS/DC/OP04/05	003	23/9/02

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
07/06/2021	-	-	LOCATION PLAN
07/06/2021	001	-	EXISTING AND PROPOSED FLOOR PLANS AND ELEVATIONS

Informatives

Chloe Roberts

6 September 2021

Alan Kilroe
9 September 2021

Document Reference	Document Issue Number	Document Issue Date
PS/DC/OP04/05	003	23/9/02