

APPLICATION NO: 26/00034/FUL

CASE OFFICER: Kate Pickles

WARD: Halewood North

PARISH: Halewood Town Council

LOCATION: 42 Elder Place, Halewood, Knowsley, L25 9RP

PROPOSAL: ERECTION OF A SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION

Site description

The application is sited within a well-established residential area. The property is a two-storey, semi-detached dwelling set within an irregular shaped plot fronting on to a private drive. The property has no interfacing rear neighbours; however, its rear garden adjoins other rear gardens. The property benefits from a 10m long rear garden consisting of concrete flags and grassed areas.

Proposal

The application seeks permission to erect a single storey rear extension with a projection of 3.3m from the existing rear elevation of the dwelling. The extension would be served by a mono pitched roof featuring 2 rooflights, with a ridge height of 3.5m and an eaves height of 2.4m. The proposed extension would be 6m in width. The extension would serve as a second living room for the property.

Consultations

None required.

Representations

This application was publicised via letters sent to 7 neighbours. No representations have been received as a result of this publicity.

Planning history

No relevant planning history.

Relevant policy

Paragraph 11 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states that 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that accord with an up-to-date development plan without delay; or where the development plan is absent, silent or out of date, planning permission should be granted unless the application of policies in NPPF that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a clear reason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 Policies

CS19 – Design Quality and Accessibility in New development

SAVED POLICIES – KNOWSLEY REPLACEMENT UNITARY DEVELOPMENT PLAN

H5 – Development within Primary Residential Areas

H8 – Extensions and Alterations to Residential Properties

SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENTS

Design Quality in New Development SPD

Householder Development SPD

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 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 proposal would not (due to their scale and massing) result in a disproportionate addition to the original dwelling
- b) The design 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.

Design and Residential Amenity

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*. It further clarifies 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*.

The proposed rear extension would be located adjacent to, but not on, the party boundary of the attached neighbouring property No. 4. The proposed extension would project 3.3m from the original rear wall of the dwelling and as such, the proposal would comply with guidance contained within the SPD. The proposal is considered to have a negligible impact on neighbouring residential amenity via, dominance or loss of outlook. There are no privacy concerns via overlooking as raised through the proposed windows and door of the extension due to their first-floor siting, existing boundary treatments and no additional views created not already visible from the rear elevation.

The Householder Development SPD states 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 storage of refuse bins, etc.* “The submitted plans indicate that the rear garden would be reduced from 10 metres to 6.7 metres in length. This means that over 50% of the original garden area would be retained, and the proposal would therefore remain compliant with the relevant policy requirements.”

The materials for the proposed rear extension such as the brickwork, windows and roof tiles would match those of the existing. As such, the proposal is considered acceptable in terms of design.

The application property is located in close proximity to a Site of Biological or Local Geological Interest; however, the proposed development is considered to have no impact on the neighbouring site.

Highways

The application is for a single storey rear extension that would not increase the number of bedrooms or reduce the number of off-street parking spaces. Consequently, the proposal would not pose any highway safety concerns or impact existing parking arrangements and therefore is considered acceptable.

Conclusion

The proposal would be acceptable in terms of design, residential amenity and highway safety. The proposal also complies with the relevant Core Strategy, Replacement UDP policies and NPPF guidance 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 no later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date of this permission.

Reason: 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 interest of visual amenity and to comply with Saved Policy H8 of the Knowsley Replacement Unitary Development Plan, adopted June 2006, Policy CS19 of the Knowsley Local Plan Core Strategy, adopted January 2-16, and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Schedule1

Date received	Drawing. No	Revision	Drawing/Document Title
05/02/2026			Location Plan
05/02/2026	42EP-002		Proposed Front and Rear Elevations
05/02/2026	42EP-004		Proposed Side Elevation

Knowsley Council
Regeneration and Economic Development Directorate.
Delegated Planning Report

05/02/2026	42EP-006		Proposed Roof Plan
05/02/2026	42EP-008		Proposed Ground Floor Plan

Signed Case Officer: Kate Pickles

Signed Authorising Officer: Jo Sheridan

Date: 19/03/2026

Informative

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

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