

|                               |                                                   |                             |             |
|-------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------|
| <b><u>APPLICATION NO:</u></b> | 25/00500/FUL                                      | <b><u>CASE OFFICER:</u></b> | Reece Black |
| <b><u>WARD:</u></b>           | Roby                                              | <b><u>PARISH:</u></b>       |             |
| <b><u>LOCATION:</u></b>       | 23 Blacklow Brow, Huyton, Knowsley                |                             |             |
| <b><u>PROPOSAL:</u></b>       | ERECTION OF SINGLE STOREY SIDE AND REAR EXTENSION |                             |             |

---

### **Site Description**

The application site is located at 23 Blacklow Brow, Huyton and is situated within a Primarily Residential Area in the Development Plan. The application property is a single storey, detached bungalow which is T-shaped in layout and has been previously extended by a side extension and rear conservatory. The property is characterised by brick facing elevations, white UPVC openings and red, flat roof tiles.

The front garden area comprises gravel stones and grassed sections with shrubbery and is bound by a small brick wall and hedgerow. The plot is irregular in shape.

The property sits in a meandered building row of detached dwellings characterised by a lack of uniform character. There are properties to all directions from the site.

### **Proposal**

The proposal is for the erection of a single storey side and rear extension.

The proposed rear extension would project to a depth of 3.7m with a width of 6.2m. This would be served by a dual-pitched roof, which would measure at 2.5m at the eaves and 3.7m at the ridgeline.

The proposed side extension would project in width by 2.4m and span a depth of 7m. This would be served by a flat roof which would measure 2.3m at the eaves.

### **Consultations**

None required.

### **Representations**

This application has been publicised by letters sent to 7 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 assessing the proposal against all material considerations, including planning policies and any representations that may have been 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 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 proposed development would be erected 0.5 away from the party boundary shared with No.25. Although this would come within close proximity to the boundary, there are no side windows to the side elevation No.25 which would ensure that there would be no adverse impacts on residential amenities. The proposed development would include 2 no. windows to the side elevation; however, these would be obscurely glazed and due to the absence of windows to the side elevation of No.25 this would not result in any harm to amenities or privacy.

Although, the proposed side extension would be served by a flat roof, which would conflict with the SPD guidance – which advises that the roof design should take inspiration from the original dwelling and nearby properties, the employment of a flat roof, however, would be suitably screened and concealed by the dual-pitched roof of the existing side extension. Furthermore, this section would not be readily visible from any public vantage points along the highway given the proximity to No.25 and consequently, the proposal would not result in adverse harm to visual amenities or the street scene.

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. 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 from the original rear elevation by 3.7m and therefore would comply with the Householder Development SPD. The proposal would be set-off the party boundary shared with No.21 by 0.9m (at its closest) and would not surpass the rear elevation of No.21; there are no windows to the side elevation of No.21 and for these reasons it the proposal would have a negligible impact on the amenities and privacy of the occupants of No.21. All openings are concentrated to the rear elevation of the proposed rear extension and therefore no overlooking or visual intrusion concerns are raised. The proposal would be served by a dual-pitched roof, which would positively integrate with the roof profile of the property.

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 adequate space would be retained around the property that remain useable. The proposal would not remove external access to the

private amenity area or adversely impact on waste storage arrangements.

The proposed development would also see the installation of 14 no. rooflights across the dwelling. These are acceptable as there would be no concerns of overlooking into the interiors of nearby dwellings. For the consideration of views into the application property, this would come from the small window of No.21, located to the first-floor gable wall, although it would not be considered to cause detrimental levels of overlooking given that this is a small window and any injury to the residential amenities and privacy of the occupants of the application property would be self-inflicted and in the interest of future-proofing, could be removed if the 'perception of overlooking' became severe.

The dwelling is brick facing, with white UPVC openings and red, flat roof tiles. A standard planning condition will be included to ensure that external materials would match the existing dwelling and therefore ensure the proposal coherently integrates with the existing property.

## **HIGHWAYS**

The proposal is for the erection of a single storey side and rear extension which would provide a walk-in-wardrobe to an existing bedroom, an en-suite, utility space and extended kitchen together with a lounge space. The proposed development would not create any additional bedrooms and due to the location of the proposed extensions, it would not adversely impact on the existing parking provisions used by the occupants to the front of the property. Therefore, the proposal would not reduce the existing parking provisions or require any additional or replacement parking. No highway safety concerns are raised.

## **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.

## SCHEDULE 1

| Date Received | Ref. No | Version | Drawing/Document Title                       |
|---------------|---------|---------|----------------------------------------------|
|               |         |         |                                              |
| 02/09/2025    | -       | -       | LOCATION PLAN                                |
| 05/10/2025    | 2A      | -       | PROPOSED FLOOR PLAN, ELVATIONS AND 3D VISUAL |
| 02/09/2025    | 3       | -       | EXISTING AND PROPOSED SITE LAYOUT            |
|               |         |         |                                              |

**Signed Case Officer<sup>1</sup>:**

**Reece Black**

**Signed Authorising Officer<sup>2</sup>:**

**Jo Sheridan**

**Date:**

**06/10/2025**

## **Informatives**

Not applicable.

---

<sup>1</sup> 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

<sup>2</sup> 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