

APPLICATION NO: 25/00322/FUL **CASE OFFICER:** Reece Black

WARD: Shevington **PARISH:**

LOCATION: 9 Calder Close, Tower Hill, Kirkby

PROPOSAL: ERECTION OF A FIRST-FLOOR SIDE EXTENSION.

Site Description

The application site is located at 9 Calder Close, Tower Hill and is within an allocated Primarily Residential Area within the Local Plan. The application property is a two-storey, semi-detached dwellinghouse located within a building row of (predominantly) semi-detached properties. The property benefits from an existing front, side and rear 'wrap-around' extension and contains an integral garage.

The front garden area is surfaced with hardstanding (capable of accommodating a minimum of 2 no. vehicles in-plot) and within the front garden is a refuse bin store. The front garden is bounded by a 1m tall boundary treatment with gated access; there is a dropped-kerb section sufficient for the width of one vehicle to access the hardstanding. To the north/north-east of the site, beyond the rear plot boundary lies a river with a field beyond that. The rear curtilage of the plot is located within Flood Zone 3, however the application property itself is not situated within either Flood Zone 2 or 3.

The Local Planning Authority does not hold any record of the application property having its Permitted Development Rights withdrawn.

Proposal

The proposal is for the erection of a first-floor side extension.

The proposed side extension would have a width of 2.3m and a depth of 6.8m. The front elevation of the proposal would be set-back from the original front elevation of the dwelling by 1m. The proposed side extension would be served by a dual-pitched roof, which would measure 4.8m at the eaves, 7m at the ridgeline and would be set 0.2m lower than the existing roof of the original dwelling.

The application as originally submitted included the conversion of the garage to form habitable room, however, given the works are predominately internal with minor external changes (removal of garage door, replacement fenestration and in-fill brickwork) and no forward projection or enlargement, this would not require Planning Permission and therefore removed from the description of development. Given that this revised description would have no greater material impact than originally submitted, it was not considered necessary to re-consult neighbours.

Consultations

Highway Authority: – No objections.

Representations

This application has been publicised by letters sent to 7 neighbours. It has also been advertised by way of site notice. No representations have been received.

Planning History

APP. NO: 14/00257/FUL

PROPOSAL: ERECTION OF SINGLE STOREY WRAPAROUND EXTENSION TO FRONT, SIDE AND REAR ELEVATIONS.

DECISION: GRANTED

DECISION DATE: 1 July 2014

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 and design 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

The Householder Development SPD outlines (7.2) *that two storey side extensions (and provision of first floors over existing single storey side extensions) should be designed to avoid having an overbearing effect or causing unacceptable loss of light or privacy for neighbours. They should also avoid creating a terracing effect, either by themselves or in conjunction with similar extensions which may exist or potentially be proposed for adjacent properties in the future.*

DESIGN AND RESIDENTIAL AMENITY

The SPD stipulates that *either a minimum space of 1m should be preserved between the extension and the party boundary to the side of the property, OR the front wall of the first floor of the extension should be set back at least 1m from the immediately adjoining part of the main front wall of the original dwelling.* The SPD furthers that *the roof of the extension should normally be at a lower level than the original.*

The proposed side extension would be set-back 1m from the immediately adjoining part of the main front wall and therefore would comply with the guidance of the SPD. The proposed development would be served by a dual-pitched roof, which would emulate the roof of the original dwelling and display a lower ridge to the original ridgeline and therefore present as a subordinate addition in scale, form and massing, would not appear incongruous in the street scene and would comply with the guidance of the SPD.

The application property's existing gable wall faces the gable wall of the adjacent dwelling (No.7 Calder Close) and contains one window to the first-floor gable wall, which is obscurely-glazed and understood to serve a landing. The proposed development would result in a partial reduction of light entering this window, however, given that this window serves a non-habitable room and is obscurely-glazed, any impact to obstruction of daylight and sunlight would not be considered unacceptable. No harm to outlook would be raised by the proposal. The side

elevation of the proposed development would not contain any windows and therefore no issues of overlooking or loss of privacy are raised; windows are concentrated to the front and rear elevations. The proposal would not be considered to have any adverse impact on the residential amenities or privacy of the occupants of No.11 Calder Close, as the proposal would not project beyond the existing front and rear elevations of the dwelling and subsequently would not be readily visible from No.11.

HIGHWAYS

The application site contains hardstanding to the front of the dwelling, capable of accommodating a minimum of 2 no. parked vehicles. The existing front drive measures 8.3m in width and 4.75m in depth.

The proposed development would introduce an additional bedroom to the property and increase the no. of bedrooms to 4 no. The Householder Development SPD stipulates that for properties with 4+ bedrooms then it would be expected that 3 no. in-curtilage parking spaces would be provided. Although, these are maximum standards and the SPD further outlines that *fewer spaces than set out in the parking standards will only be acceptable if the highway and environmental conditions in the locality allow, for example in areas with wider access roads and plots. Proposals that would result in an adverse impact on street parking conditions to the detriment of highway safety or the amenity of local residents would not be acceptable.*

The NPPF (Paragraph 116) outlines *development should only be prevented or refused on highways 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.*

The Local Highway Authority were consulted on the application and have raised no objection. The Highway Officer has reviewed the application and advised that 2 no. spaces would be acceptable as the spaces would be retained within the front garden area and any additional demand for a third parking space could be accommodated from on-street parking in the locality.

Highways have advised, however, that the front solid boundary treatment (including the gate and fencing to the site frontage) must be removed to allow the existing driveway to accommodate a minimum of 2 no. vehicles within the curtilage and to ensure that at the minimum the 2 no. off-street parking spaces are accessible and useable (which would include the widening of the existing dropped kerb to allow for a double-width driveway).

Notwithstanding the above, the hardstanding as existing can accommodate 2 no. vehicles sufficiently within the plot, therefore would ensure that an acceptable level of off-street parking would be retained and the existing vehicular access to the hardstanding would not be required to be widened or the front boundary treatment removed. The proposal would not be deemed to raise any highway safety concerns or result in any detrimentally harmful increase of off-street parking and therefore would be acceptable.

OTHER ISSUES:

FLOOD RISK ZONE

The rear curtilage of the plot falls within Flood Zone 3 due to the proximity to the riverbank located beyond the rear plot boundary, however the application property does not fall within Flood Zone 2 or 3. The application was not supported by any Flood Risk Assessment, although, this was not considered essential for the determination of this application, given the proposal relates to a first-floor side extension, which would not be affected from flooding.

Conclusion

The proposal would be acceptable in terms of design, residential amenity, highways. The proposal also complies with 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
03/06/2025	ABF-1179-XX-ZZ-DR-A-003	-	LOCATION PLAN
17/06/2025	ABF-1179-XX-ZZ-DR-A-002	REV B	PROPOSED FLOOR PLANS AND ELEVATIONS

Signed Case Officer¹: **Reece Black**

Signed Authorising Officer²: **Mark Quinn**

Date: **28/07/2025**

Informatives

- 1 NOTE FOR APPLICANT: The applicant's attention is drawn to the following comments;
- 2 The granting of planning permission does not confer consent to encroach on any neighbours land and would be a civil matter between the affected parties. Consideration should be given to this in respect of any gutters potentially overhanging over shared boundaries.

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