

<u>APPLICATION NO:</u>	25/00194/FUL	<u>CASE OFFICER:</u>	Reece Black
<u>WARD:</u>	Roby	<u>PARISH:</u>	
<u>LOCATION:</u>	5 Pine Tree Road		
<u>PROPOSAL:</u>	ERECTION OF SINGLE STOREY REAR, SIDE AND FRONT EXTENSION		

Site Description

The application site is located at 5 Pine Tree Road, Huyton and is located within a Primary Residential Area in the Local Plan Policies Map. The application property is a semi-detached, two-storey dwellinghouse and benefits from an existing front porch with a conservatory to the rear.

The front garden is hard surfaced by a tarmac driveway with soft landscaping and vegetation to the side enclosed by a small brick boundary wall.

Proposal

The proposal is for the erection of a single storey front, side and rear extension together with the demolition of existing porch and conservatory.

This would form a 'wrap-around layout'. The proposed development would have a front projection of 1.5m with a width of 5m (cumulatively), the side extension would have a projection of 2.3m and the rear extension would have a projection of 2.3m with a width of 8.9m (cumulatively).

The proposal would be served by a hipped roof that would follow the 'wrap-around' layout and would measure 2.7m at the eaves and 3.8m at the tallest point.

Consultations

None required.

Representations

This application has been publicised by letters sent to 8 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out of date planning permission should be granted unless the application of policies in the NPPF that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a clear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.

The site is identified as a site allocated for housing development in the adopted Unitary Development Plan. As such, a domestic extension to the existing residential property is considered acceptable in principle, subject to compliance with local planning policy and guidance.

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 identifying matters of concern within the application (as originally submitted) and negotiating with the applicant, acceptable amendments to the proposal to address those concerns. As a result, the Local Planning Authority has been able to grant planning permission for an acceptable proposal, 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

DESIGN AND RESIDENTIAL AMENITY

Front extension:

The SPD also states that front extensions and porches can be particularly prominent in the street scene and should be particularly carefully designed to retain the character of residential areas, and that style, design, materials and scale of front extensions should respect the character of the surrounding residential area. Furthermore, any forward projection would only be acceptable if it would be appropriate to the dwelling's design and the wider street scene and setting.

The proposed development would have a modest projection of 1.5m. The front extensions (comprising of porch and side extensions front projection) would be acceptable in scale and subsequently not appear overbearing in the street scene. Although the proposed development would marginally break the building line of the front elevations in the street scene, it would not be considered to dominate the existing dwelling or significantly disrupt the uniformity of the other semi-detached dwellings in the street scene, as per the guidance in the SPD.

Side extension:

The Householder Development SPD states that single storey side extensions should be designed so that they preserve the street scene, protect light and privacy of neighbours and ensure that they provide sufficient parking spaces.

The proposed side extension would be erected adjacent the party boundary shared with No.7, set off the boundary by 0.15m. The side extension is acceptable in design with an acceptable scale, matching external materials and a pitched roof. The ground floor gable wall of No.7 contains 3 no. windows, two of which are finished in obscure glazing and so no adverse amenity concerns are raised. The furthest window, located close to the rear elevation is understood to serve a kitchen, although some partial loss of light would occur this would not be considered unacceptable as some distance (circa 2.25m) between the existing gable wall of No.7 and the proposed side elevation would remain. A rear access door with a window would also provide a source of light and ensure no unacceptable loss of light occurs. Moreover, it is not considered that there would be severely adverse harm to the amenities of No.7 as the outlook from the kitchen at present is facing a gable wall and therefore, it being located 2m closer would not cause unacceptable harm by views or outlook. 2 no. rooflights would be installed to the side extension, although these do not raise any concerns to residential amenities or privacy.

The Householder Development SPD 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 etc.

The submitted plans demonstrate that sufficient space to the front and rear would remain usable and subsequently not result in a cramped appearance. External

access to the rear would be removed, however, refuse bin stores are included in the proposed site plan.

Rear Extension:

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 and 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 also states *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 project 2.3m and subsequently accord with the projection parameter of the SPD. The rear extension would be considered to have a negligible impact on No.3 given it would not surpass their existing rear extension. There are no windows on the side of No.3's rear extension or the proposed development, subsequently no privacy concerns are raised.

Due to the stepped arrangement of No.7 in contrast to the application site, the proposed development would only project 1.65m from its rear elevation and therefore would comply with the projection parameters of the SPD and be acceptable. No privacy concerns are raised.

Materials:

Notwithstanding the discussed point of the brick detailing of the porch, the remainder of the proposed development would be served by matching external materials, further secured by way of the standard planning condition and therefore would be acceptable.

HIGHWAYS

The application property currently can accommodate 1 no. vehicles in the curtilage of the dwelling. The submitted plans demonstrate that a second space would be created within the front garden area to increase this to 2 no. vehicles spaces in curtilage; both spaces would measure 3m x 5m and would comply with the Householder Development SPD's minimum dimensions. An ACO drain would be installed between the hardstanding and public footpath.

The proposal would introduce an additional bedroom which would result in a total of 4 no. bedrooms at the property. The SPD requests that 3 no. vehicles spaces should be provided in the curtilage of the dwelling, however, these are maximum standards, and a shortfall of a 1 no. space would not be considered to warrant a refusal or contravene with the NPPF Paragraph 116, which stipulates *development should only be prevented or refused on highway grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network, following mitigation, would be severe, taking into account all reasonable future scenarios.*

Therefore, as an additional space would be provided, this would ensure the proposed development would not raise unacceptable highway safety or parking 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) Notwithstanding the brick facing exterior walls of the proposed front porch, hereby permitted, all other 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.

- 4) The parking arrangements as shown on the submitted plan, Proposed Context, dwg no. PTR-CPH-MH-XX-DR-CC-001 REV 02, hereby approved, shall be implemented in full accordance prior to the first occupation of the proposed development. The additional parking, together with the driveway retained, shall remain for parking purposes at all times thereafter.

Reason: To ensure that adequate off-street parking is available in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (2024), Policies CS2, CS7 and CS19 of the Knowsley Local Plan: Core Strategy, adopted January 2016, Saved Policies H5 and H8 of the Knowsley Replacement Unitary Development Plan, adopted June 2006, Ensuring a Choice of Travel SPD (2010) and Householder Development SPD (2016).

SCHEDULE 1

Date Received	Ref. No	Version	Drawing/Document Title
14.03.2025	PTR-CPH-MH-00-DR-GA-001	REV 01	EXISTING AND PROPOSED GROUND FLOOR PLAN
14.03.2025	PTR-CPH-MH-01-DR-GA-001	REV 01	EXISTING AND PROPOSED FIRST FLOOR PLAN
14.03.2025	PTR-CPH-MH-02-DR-GA-001	REV 01	EXISTING AND PROPOSED ROOF PLAN
14.03.2025	PTR-CPH-MH-XX-DR-LP-001	REV 01	LOCATION PLAN
14.03.2025	PTR-CPH-MH-XX-DR-PE-001	REV 01	PROPOSED FRONT AND REAR ELEVATIONS
14.03.2025	PTR-CPH-MH-XX-DR-PE-002	REV 01	PROPOSED SIDE ELEVATIONS
21.05.2025	PTR-CPH-MH-XX-DR-PC-001	REV 02	PROPOSED BLOCK PLAN

Signed Case Officer¹:

Reece Black

Signed Authorising Officer²:

Alan Kilroe

Date:

29 May 2025

Informatives

- 1 It is an offence to drive over a footway without dropped kerbs and it is also an offence to carry out any works within the public highway without the permission of the Highway Authority. Only the Highway Authority or a contractor approved by the Highway Authority can carry out works within the adopted highway. The applicant should contact the Council's Maintenance Contractor Tarmac on Knowsley.highways@tarmac.com should they be minded to extend their dropped kerb to improve access.

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