

<u>APPLICATION NO:</u>	25/00482/FUL	<u>CASE OFFICER:</u>	Reece Black
<u>WARD:</u>	Whitefield	<u>PARISH:</u>	
<u>LOCATION:</u>	5 Mill Lane, Kirkby Park, Kirkby		
<u>PROPOSAL:</u>	ERECTION OF SINGLE STOREY SIDE EXTENSION INSTALLATION OF LANTERN ROOF LIGHT TO REAR		

Site Description

The application site is located at 5 Mill Lane, Kirkby Park, and is situated within a Primarily Residential Area in the Development Plan. The application property is a 1.5 storey, detached bungalow, served predominately by a dual-pitched roof, which benefits from previous extensions including a side and rear extension to the west-facing side elevation with a rear projection. The external materials to the dwelling include a combination of brick and white render facing to the external walls, navy UPVC and grey, flat roof tiles. The plot is an irregular rectangle shape in layout. Waste bins are currently stored within the front garden area of the property.

The rear garden contains a timber pergola structure, an outbuilding and several trees. The front garden area is laid out by compressed materials which informally serves as hardstanding to accommodate a minimum of 3 no. vehicles in-plot. There are residential properties located to all directions of the site; to the west of the site lie No's. 1 & 3 Mill Lane (Grade II) Listed Building, list entry number: 1356209.

Proposal

The proposal is for the erection of a single storey side extension and the installation of lantern rooflight to the rear.

The proposed side extension would have a width of 2.8m and a depth of 6.6m. This would be served by a flat roof, which would measure 2.5m at the eaves and 2.8m at the tallest point of the roof. The proposal would be set-back from the front elevation of the dwelling by 10.8m.

The proposed glazed rooflight to be installed to the existing rear projection of the dwelling, would measure a width of 1.5m, a depth of 3m, would attain a height of 0.4m from the roof and would stand 3.2m proud from the external ground level.

Consultations

None required.

Representations

This application has been publicised by letters sent to 10 neighbours. No representations have been received.

Planning History

APP. NO: 21/00259/FUL
PROPOSAL: ERECTION OF A SINGLE-STOREY SIDE EXTENSION
(EXISTING GARAGE TO BE DEMOLISHED),
CONSOLIDATION AND RECONFIGURATION OF EXISTING
EXTENSIONS TO FORM A NEW UNIFIED LAYOUT, THE
ERECTION OF RAISED DECKING TO THE REAR AND NEW
ROOF TO THE WHOLE OF THE PROPERTY
DECISION: GRANTED
DECISION DATE: 30 November 2021

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

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 SPD further advises that for the consideration of impact on neighbours when assessing proposals, *extensions must adequately protect your neighbours' right to enjoy their own home. Extensions must not overshadow or have an overbearing effect on a neighbouring dwelling to an unacceptable degree.*

The proposed side extension would be erected 0.10m away from the party boundary shared with No.5A and would leave an interface distance of 1.4m between the gable wall and the side elevation of the proposed development. The proposals scale, form and massing would be appropriate, given it is a single storey side extension, with a modest width (which is less than half the width of the existing dwelling).

The gable wall of No.5A contains 2 no. windows, the forwardmost window is obscurely-glazed and serves a non-habitable room (bathroom) with the second window, which is clear-glazed, serves a habitable room (bedroom). This is the only window which served this bedroom, as the additional window to the original rear elevation of the dwelling was previously removed to facilitate the widening of the rear extension. The bedroom window of No.5A would be the only window affected by the proposed development, as the bathroom window would be unaffected.

The proposed side extension would not surpass beyond the bedroom window and would be set 1.3m away from this window. The proposal would still be erected within close proximity to the bedroom window of No.5A; however, the proposal would not detrimentally restrict the degree of daylight and sunlight which this bedroom receives.

The existing interface distance between the side elevations of the application property and No.5A is 4.1m, which from the bedroom window, this distance would remain. The proposed side extension would be readily visible from an oblique, diagonal angle from the bedroom window, however, given the narrow interface distance between the existing dwellings (which already restricts the amount of daylight and sunlight this room receives), and the fact that the proposed single storey side extension would not surpass the bedroom window, the proposed side extension itself would not disproportionately exacerbate the existing levels of light received to a degree which would warrant a refusal of the application.

The outlook largely would remain as existing, which currently is the side elevation of the application property and the existing boundary fence, although the proposal would be readily visible diagonally from the bedroom window, it would not detrimentally negatively worsen outlook from this window or present unduly dominant or oppressive given its distance from this window and would be adequately screened by the existing 1.8m tall timber boundary fence, which would screen the majority of the height of the proposal and therefore soften any visual impact.

The side elevation of the proposed side extension would contain a window, which would serve a utility room, although on a diagonal angle this would be located 2m from the bedroom window, this window would be a high-level fixed window and obscurely-glazed and therefore would not facilitate any overlooking between the properties and therefore protect an acceptable level of privacy. For the consideration of overcoming any perceived overlooking, level 5 obscure-glazing can be secured by condition to ensure that privacy is protected. No other openings are proposed to the side elevation and are otherwise concentrated to the rear elevation.

The Householder Development outlines that *extensions should normally have a pitched roof for aesthetic reasons*. It furthers that *flat or lower-pitched roofs may be preferable in those circumstances where a matching style of roof would cause loss of light for neighbours or can be justified in design terms*.

The proposed side extension would be served by a flat roof, which although would depart from the dual-pitched roof of the original dwelling, would correspond with the flat roof which serves the existing west-facing side extension. The proposed development would be substantially set-back from the highway and sufficiently screened and softened by the front boundary treatment to ameliorate any visual impact from the flat roof and would consequently preserve the street scene. Furthermore, when considering the impact on neighbours, it is deemed on this occasion that the flat roof would be the most appropriate selection.

The proposed glass roof lantern would be situated to the rear of the property and not readily visible from the street scene or directly visible in views from No.5A and therefore would not raise any significant design concerns. Notwithstanding this, it would be of a modest scale and integrate well with the dwelling.

The Householder Development SPD states that adequate provision should be made for the storage refuse collection and recycling and stipulates that *extensions which remove access to the rear of a dwelling will normally only be acceptable if a secure bin store or alternative arrangements can be provided to the front of the dwelling, which would not have a detrimental impact on the street scene*. As refuse bins are currently stored to the front of the dwelling and given that the dwelling is substantially set-back from the public highway and suitably screened by boundary treatment and vegetation, the existing arrangements would not result in any unacceptable impacts to visual amenities within the street scene.

The existing property is a combination of brick and white render facing, with grey, flat roof tiles and navy UPVC openings. The submitted elevations contain a material key which match the existing material palette of the dwelling and would be further secured by planning condition.

Overall, the general design in appearance would not result in any significant harm to visual amenities or the character of the area. The impacts on residential amenities may be partially appreciable, however, these would not detrimentally worsen the existing relationship between the properties to a degree that would substantiate a refusal of the application.

HIGHWAYS

The proposal is for the erection of a single storey side and rear extension which would provide a dining area and utility room. The proposal would not create any additional bedrooms at the property and due to the location of the proposed development, would not project into the front garden and parking area utilised by the occupants of the property. Therefore, the proposal would not reduce or adversely affect the existing parking provisions or require any additional or replacement parking. No highway safety concerns are raised.

OTHER ISSUES:

TREES

The application has not been supported by a Tree Survey; however, the submitted plans outline that one existing tree (T10, Beech Monolith, as indicated on the Proposed Block/Site Plan) would be removed. There are no records of any Tree Preservation Orders on site and the tree indicated for removal is located within the rear garden and consequently, does not provide any amenity value within the street scene. Therefore, the removal of T10 would not raise any concerns.

HERITAGE (LISTED BUILDING)

To the west of the application site lie a pair of semi-detached houses linked with a single storey building titled 'The Old Smithy'. The Listed properties are dated 1885 and form part of a wider scattered group within the locality, which still retain a village centre character. The application has not been supported by a Heritage Statement

The application site is adjacent the Listed Buildings, however, the proposed single storey side extension would be erected to the east facing elevation of the application property. As the proposed development would be to the opposite side elevation, single storey, with a sufficient set-back from the front elevation of the dwelling and wider street scene, the proposal being assessed would not be considered to affect upon the setting of the Listed Buildings.

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) 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.

- 4) The proposed development, hereby approved, shall not be occupied until the side elevation high-level window shall accord with the approved details in drawings in Schedule 1 and shall also be non-opening and fitted with level 5 obscure glazing, which will be retained at all times thereafter.

Reason: In order to safeguard the residential amenities enjoyed by the occupants of adjoining residential properties and to ensure the development complies with Policies CS2 and CS19 of the Knowsley Local Plan Core Strategy and Saved Policy H8 of the Knowsley Replacement Unitary Development Plan, adopted in June 2006, and the National Planning Policy Framework.

SCHEDULE 1

Date Received	Ref. No	Version	Drawing/Document Title
19/08/2025	017_300	-	LOCATION PLAN AND EXISTING BLOCK PLAN
14/10/2025	P017_303B	REV B	PROPOSED BLOCK PLAN
14/10/2025	P017_304B	REV B	PROPOSED FLOOR PLAN
14/10/2025	P017_305B	REV B	PROPOSED ELEVATIONS

Signed Case Officer¹: Reece Black

Signed Authorising Officer²: Jo Sheridan

Date: 16/10/2025

Informatives

- 1 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