

<u>APPLICATION NO:</u>	25/00144/FUL	<u>CASE OFFICER:</u>	Maxine Wishart
<u>WARD:</u>	Halewood North	<u>PARISH:</u>	Halewood Town Council
<u>LOCATION:</u>	10 Pheasant Grove, Halewood, Knowsley		
<u>PROPOSAL:</u>	ERECTION OF SINGLE STOREY REAR AND FRONT / SIDE EXTENSION TOGETHER WITH THE CONVERSION OF GARAGE TO HABITABLE ROOM.		

KNOWSLEY LOCAL PLAN POLICIES MAP ALLOCATION

Primarily Residential Development

Site Description

The application relates to a detached property located at 10 Pheasant Grove, Halewood. Pheasant Grove is located on an established residential estate. The property comprises a two-storey 3 bedroom dwelling with a hard standing to the site frontage providing in-curtilage car parking.

Proposal

This application seeks consent for development which comprises a single storey rear extension to provide open plan dining and kitchen and the conversion of an integral 'garage' to form a utility room and WC which would be extended to the front to form a study and new entrance porch.

The proposal would see the demolition of the existing conservatory to the rear. The front extension would replace an existing canopy over the front entrance.

The rear extension would have a flat roof and dimensions of 3.03 m deep by 8.87 m wide. It would have a maximum height of 2.8 m.

The extension to the front would measure between 1.34 – 2.75m front the main front elevation and would be 5.4 m wide. It would have a mono-pitched roof attaining a maximum height of 3.37 m.

As originally submitted the development included a flue serving a wood burner which protruded from the roof of the rear extension. This element of the development has subsequently been removed from the scheme.

Consultations

Halewood Town Council - No Comments Received.

Environmental Health - Raise concerns in relation to the height of a proposed log burner flue is not sufficient. This element of the proposal has subsequently been

withdrawn.

Cadent Gas Limited - No objections in principle, request informative regarding proximity of development to their medium and low pressure assets.

Representations

This application has been publicised by letters sent to 7 neighbours.

There have been no letters of objection and 1 letter of support. The representations are summarised as follows:-

- a) We fully support and encourage planning permission be granted for this project and have no objections to its proposal.

Planning History

APP. NO: K/APP/13848 (74/13846/HIST)
PROPOSAL: LAND AT CHURCH ROAD HALEWOOD: - ERECTION OF 63 NUMBER DWELLINGS AND CONSTRUCTION OF NEW VEHICULAR ACCESS
DECISION: Granted
DECISION DATE: 9 July 1992

APP. NO: K/APP/14680 (74/14599/HIST)
PROPOSAL: PLOTS 166-171 184-188 197-198 CHURCH PARK OFF CHURCH ROAD HALEWOOD: - ERECTION OF 16 NUMBER DWELLINGS AND CONSTRUCTION OF NEW ACCESS
DECISION: Granted
DECISION DATE: 5 February 1993

APP. NO: K/APP/14836 (74/14803/HIST)
PROPOSAL: PLOTS 113-115 117-179 185-188 AND 197 CHURCH PARK DEVELOPMENT HALEWOOD: - SUBSTITUTION OF HOUSE TYPES
DECISION: Granted
DECISION DATE: 2 April 1993

APP. NO: 03/00568/FUL
PROPOSAL: ERECTION OF TWO STOREY EXTENSION TO SIDE OF DWELLING TO FORM GARAGE/ STORAGE AREA WITH 1 NO. BEDROOM AND STUDY ABOVE.
DECISION: Refused
DECISION DATE: 14 August 2003

APP. NO: 03/00859/FUL
PROPOSAL: ERECTION OF TWO STOREY SIDE EXTENSION TO FORM STORE AND EXTENDED KITCHEN TO GROUND FLOOR WITH 1 NO. BEDROOM ABOVE
DECISION: Granted
DECISION DATE: 3 December 2003

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.

NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY FRAMEWORK

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

The Joint Merseyside and Halton Waste Local Plan 2013

WM9 - Sustainable Waste Management Design and Layout of New Development

SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENTS

Householder Development SPD (2016)

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.

Background

The proposal under consideration was subject to a pre-application referenced 25/00003/PREAPP earlier this year.

Assessment

The application site is allocated as a Primarily Residential Area on the Local Plan Policy Map, a proposal to extend an existing dwelling in a residential area is acceptable in principle subject to compliance with relevant planning policies and guidance.

Layout

Saved Policies H5 and H8 of the Unitary Development Plan (2006), Policies CS2 and CS19 of the Local Plan Core Strategy (2016) together with the Householder Development SPD (2016) are relevant. The Council's Householder Development SPD also forms a material consideration for the purposes of determining planning applications providing additional guidance in relation to householder development within the borough.

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.

Amenity Space

The property has an enclosed private garden to the rear. An acceptable level of amenity space for the size of dwelling would be maintained.

Parking Provision

The proposal would not result in additional bedrooms requiring an uplift in parking provision. 2 no. vehicles would be maintained.

Waste Management

Continued provision to store bins and facilitate kerbside bin collection would be maintained in accordance with the Householder SPD and Policy WM9 of the Waste Local Plan.

Design

Rear Extension

The rear extension would not exceed the 4 m projection limitation set out in the Householder SPD as being normally accepted.

Roof

The rear extension would involve a flat roof incorporating 2 no. roof lanterns. Whilst this does not echo the roof style of the host property, the proposed extension would be located at the rear of the dwelling and it is considered that in this instance, given that the extension would not be visible from the street the proposed development would not result in an acceptable design.

Windows

Large bi-folding doors are proposed within the rear elevation which are a common feature of many extensions that have been approved across the Borough. It is also proposed to install 2 no. full height windows within the side elevation facing the boundary with no. 12 Pheasant Grove. The window detailing is considered acceptable.

Materials

The Householder SPD advocates matching materials. The drawings indicate that the materials for the proposed rear extension would comprise a composite board finish. It is acknowledged that the ground floor can be treated differently from the upper floor of the dwelling due to the extension being located in the rear garden area with limited views. The applicant has provided a sample of the proposed cladding which would comprise: AC Composite – Elite Composite – Oak.

The choice of cladding would integrate into the site and harmonise with the materials and style of the host property.

Front Extension

There is a staggered arrangement of the dwellings on Pheasant Grove such that the host property is already set forward of the neighbouring plot (No. 12) and the property to the other side (No. 8) is set at an angle to the host dwelling. It is not considered that this element of the proposal would result in an unacceptable relationship with the building line and streetscene.

Roof

The front extension would incorporate a mono-pitched roof attaining a maximum height of 3.35 m. The roof design would adequately reflect the style of the main roof of the property.

Windows

The proposal would see the loss of a garage door on the front elevation and the extension would incorporate a new window at ground floor level together with a new front door. A small window would be inserted into the side elevation of the porch. The proportions of the windows would match that of the dwelling and of acceptable design and generally, it is considered that the appearance of the front extension would harmonise with the original property without harm to the character and appearance of the host property or the streetscene.

Materials

The front extension would be constructed in facing brick and roof tiles to match the existing dwelling.

The plans indicate that all new windows, doors and roof lights would comprise of a uPVC finish with no detail of the colour. If planning permission is granted a condition requiring the materials to match the host dwelling would be secured.

Scale

The rear extension is of an acceptable scale and would provide a contemporary and simple design which does not raise any concern. The front extension is considered to be of acceptable proportions compared to the host dwelling, the extent of the plot frontage and the set back from street.

Conclusion on Layout and Design

The proposal does not raise any layout or design concerns, and it is considered that the proposed development would not have unacceptable detrimental impacts on visual amenity it therefore complies with Policies CS2 and CS19 of the Knowsley Local Plan: Core Strategy and Saved Policies H5 and H8 of the UDP.

Highway Considerations

The proposed development proposes the conversion of a “garage”, however, the Householder SPD states that garages will normally count as contributing to the car parking provision where their internal dimensions are sufficient to allow them to be satisfactorily used as such. Minimum internal dimensions of 5.5m x 2.75m are required to count towards a usable parking space.

The existing ‘garage’ space measures 2.39 x 2.60m and cannot be considered suitable for the parking of a car and is essentially a storage space. As such this would not result in the loss of a parking space.

The front extension would encroach onto existing hardstanding at the site frontage; however, 2 no. parking spaces could still be accommodated on the site frontage.

Conclusion on Highway Considerations

Parking standards as set out in the *Ensuring a Choice of Travel SPD* would be met and the proposal would not present any concerns relating to parking provision or highway safety.

Residential Amenity

Saved Policies H5 and H8 of the Knowsley UDP and Policies CS2 and CS19 of the Local Plan seek to ensure that new development avoids unacceptable impacts on existing residents. The Householder Development SPD requires that extensions adequately protect neighbours' right to enjoy their own home. Extensions must not overshadow or have an overbearing effect on neighbouring dwelling to an unacceptable degree.

No. 12 Pheasant Grove

No. 12 Pheasant Grove is a two-storey detached dwelling located to the east of the application property which is set back behind the application property by approx. 5.3m. The proposed rear extension would be within the acceptable tolerances set out in the SPD and the neighbouring property would be set some distance behind the proposed extension. There is also an existing fence along the common boundary and no openings within the gable of No. 12.

In regard to the 2 no. full height windows within the side elevation facing the common boundary with this property, having regard to this neighbouring property being set further back, having no openings in the gable and the proximity of the proposed elevation to the existing fence line, it is considered that the side windows would not result in any loss of privacy or result in overlooking issues for either the neighbour or the occupiers of the host property.

Given the distance from the common boundary and the significant setback of No. 12 the front extension would not result in adverse impacts for this property.

No. 8 Pheasant Grove

No. 8 sits to the west of the application property and is positioned such that it is presents its rear elevation to the side boundary of the application site. The proposed rear extension would be located approximately 13 m from the rear elevation of No. 8.

Given the distance; the flat roof; and the existing fence along the common boundary, it is considered that this part of the development would not be likely to result in unacceptable overshadowing, or have an overbearing impact on the occupiers of No. 8.

The front extension would be set forward of an existing two-storey extension and be set behind an existing high level boundary wall along the common boundary t is therefore unlikely that the front extension would result in unacceptable harm to the neighbouring property.

Nos. 2 and 4 Pheasant Grove

These properties are located to the south west of the host dwelling and share their rear boundary with the application site. No. 2 is located approx. 7.5 m off the common boundary and No. 4 is approx.10 m off the common boundary.

Given the relationship between these properties and the host dwelling, it is not considered that the rear extension would be overbearing or result in overshadowing and that it would ensure that the residential amenity is protected. The front extension would have no impact.

Nos. 19 and 20 Pheasant Grove

No. 20 presents a gable elevation to the host property and would be located approximately 19.5m from the front extension. No. 19 is offset to the north east and does not directly face the application site. The proposal is not expected to negatively affect the residential amenity of these neighbours in terms of overlooking or loss of privacy.

Nos. 31 and 33 Clifton Avenue

No. 31 is located to the rear and shares a small section of common boundary and it is set at an oblique angle to the host property. A distance of approximately 11.8 m would remain between the rear extension and the rear boundary with No. 33. It is not envisaged that the development would result in detrimental impacts on these properties.

Conclusion of Residential Amenity

Having regard to the factors mentioned above, it is believed that the proposed development would not raise any undue concerns in regard to the impacts on the residential amenity of the surrounding properties.

Conclusion

In summary, the proposal would not conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework (2024), relevant Core Strategy and Replacement UDP policies and the guidance set out in relevant SPDs and is therefore 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 approved plans and documents listed in Schedule 1.

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt.

- 3) The external surfaces of the rear extension hereby permitted shall be constructed in the materials shown on Dwg. No. 0200 Rev. C – Proposed Elevations received 2 May 2025 and in accordance with the sample supplied to the Local Planning Authority which comprises Composite board external finish – Supplier Assured Composite Product Elite Slatted woodgrain Oak finish.

All other materials to be used on the external surfaces of the extensions 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 the National Planning Policy Framework (2024), Saved Policies H5 and H8 of the Knowsley Replacement Unitary Development Plan, adopted in June 2006, Policies CS2 and CS19 of the Knowsley Local Plan: Core Strategy, adopted January 2016 and the Householder Development SPD (2026).

- 4) A minimum of 2 no. car parking spaces shall be kept available at all times for the parking of motor vehicles by the occupants of the dwelling and their visitors and for no other purpose.

Reason: To ensure that adequate parking is provided within the curtilage of the site in the interests of highway safety and to comply with the National Planning Policy Framework (2024), Saved Policies H5 and H8 of the Knowsley Replacement Unitary Development Plan, adopted in June 2006, Policies CS2 and CS19 of the Knowsley Local Plan: Core Strategy, adopted January 2016 and the Householder Development SPD (2026).

SCHEDULE 1

Date Received	Ref. No	Version	Drawing/Document Title
06/03/2025	-	-	LOCATION PLAN
02/05/2025	0200	REV C	PROPOSED ELEVATIONS

02/05/2025	0100	REV C	PROPOSED PLANS
06/03/2025	0002	-	PROPOSED BLOCK PLAN
06/03/2025	0001	-	LOCATION AND EXISTING BLOCK PLANS

Signed Case Officer¹: **M Wishart**

Signed Authorising Officer²: **Jo Sheridan**

Date: **09/05/2025**

Informatives

- 1 NOTE FOR APPLICANT: The applicant's attention is drawn to the following comments;
- 2 The comments of Cadent in their email and plan dated 20 March 2025 as attached.

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