

|                               |                                                                                                                                 |                             |             |
|-------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------|
| <b><u>APPLICATION NO:</u></b> | 25/00117/FUL                                                                                                                    | <b><u>CASE OFFICER:</u></b> | Andrew Hunt |
| <b><u>WARD:</u></b>           | Whitefield                                                                                                                      | <b><u>PARISH:</u></b>       | N/A         |
| <b><u>LOCATION:</u></b>       | 2 Millbrook Crescent, Kirkby Park, Kirkby, Knowsley, L32 1TJ                                                                    |                             |             |
| <b><u>PROPOSAL:</u></b>       | ERECTION OF SINGLE STOREY REAR, SIDE AND FRONT EXTENSIONS (DEMOLITION OF CONSERVATORY, FLAT ROOF EXTENSION AND DETACHED GARAGE) |                             |             |

---

### **Site Description**

The application site is a semi detached house set within a rectangular plot. There is an attached dwelling to the west and a row of dwellings to the east with a different orientation with the rear of these dwellings facing east. There are also dwellings to the north and south. The property has an existing conservatory and single storey flat roof extension and a detached garage to the side, all of which are to be demolished to accommodate the proposed extension. There are existing extensions at other neighbouring properties.

### **Proposal**

The proposal is for the erection of a single storey rear side and front extension, which would wrap around the dwelling

The single storey side extension would measure 3.8m wide; 2.5m high to the eaves and 4m high to the ridge. The extension would project 0.6m from the original front wall of the dwelling and would run 4m beyond the original rear wall of the dwelling.

As stated above, the single storey rear element would continue 4m beyond the original rear wall of the dwelling and would be 9.8m wide, 2.7m high to the eaves and 3.6m high to the ridge.

The proposed roof would be pitched at the front and side of the dwelling facing towards the street scene and flat at the rear on the north east part of the extension. It would then change to a pitched roof on the norther western part next to the boundary with the adjacent semi-detached house.

### **Consultations**

N/A

### **Representations**

This application has been publicised by letters sent to ten neighbours. Three objections have been received (from one address) and two letters of support (from two different addresses). These consist of the following main points.

## Objections

- Loss of light
- Loss of view
- The extension is overly large.
- Concerned about gutters and soakaway.
- Noise pollution will affect our amenity.
- The application will set a precedent for further extensions.
- The existing conifer trees already take light from our property, this will make it worse.
- Soil degradation and water waste will be affected.
- Harmful effect on character and appearance of the area.
- This will harm our garden area.
- This will reduce our property prices.

## Support

- Seems fine from my stand point

## Planning History

N/A

## 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.

## **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)**

H8 - Extensions and Alterations to Residential Properties

### **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**

#### **Character of Area**

The proposal seeks the erection of a single storey wrap around extension, which is common for dwellings of this type and in this area.

In relation to the character of the area, the side extension would be pitched like the main roof. This is considered to be an improvement over the existing flat roof of the single storey rear extension. Whilst the extension is large, there is already an existing conservatory and side garage therefore, there would not be significantly more built development than the existing dwelling. The front part of the extension would only project a small amount (60cm) beyond the existing front of the dwelling. As a result, there would be no harm to the character of the area.

#### **Design**

The majority of the proposal would be pitched like the main roof of the dwelling and would be acceptable in design terms with a small flat element on the north eastern corner. However, this reduces impact on the amenity of neighbours and is not readily visible in the street scene, therefore this is considered acceptable. The proposal complies with policy H8 and the Householder Development SPD.

#### **Neighbour Amenity**

In relation to the neighbouring semi-detached property (4 Millbrook Crescent), the extension would extend around 4 metres at the rear. This was originally 5 metres but has now been reduced to 4 metres. This complies with the 4 metres generally

permissible under the Householder Development SPD. As the extension does not extend beyond 4 metres the 45 degree rule does not apply.

*“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”.*

Overall, the proposal is considered acceptable in relation to impact on 4 Millbrook Crescent.

In relation to 15 Millbrook Drive, the proposed side extension would be single storey with a maximum height of 4 metres, however, due to its sloping profile it would only be 4 metres high in the middle and would be lower at the front (2.4 metres) and rear (2.97m). Number 15 Millbrook Drive also has a single storey garage, which would be adjacent to the proposed side extension, therefore mitigating its impact further. Overall it would not significantly impact the amenity of 15.

In relation to 17 Millbrook Drive, the north eastern part of the proposed extension nearest to 17 Millbrook Drive would be flat roofed with a height adjacent to the site boundary of 2.7m. The highest point of the rear extension at the rear would be 6.5 metres away from the site boundary with 17 Millbrook Drive.. There is a fence along the boundary between the application site and 17 Millbrook Drive (around 2.37m high at its highest point reducing to around 1.8 metres) which would also partly reduce any visual impact. Therefore only between 0.6m and 1.17m of the proposed extension would be visible above the height of the boundary fence. The conservatory at 17 Millbrook Crescent is around 5 metres away from the boundary, however due to the existing two storey dwelling just behind the extension and the presence of a fence along the boundary, there would not be significant additional loss of light or outlook from the extension.

Overall, the height of the extension would not cause significant impacts. As a result, whilst there may be some loss of light and outlook from the house and garden at 17 Millbrook Crescent, the level of harm would not be significant enough to warrant refusal.

Overall, the proposal would not result in harm to amenity.

### Parking

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.

In relation to parking, there is currently 1 parking space at the front on the driveway. There is an existing garage (but this is only 4.11 metres long internally and not big enough for a car).

- *Para 7.10 Householder Development 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”.*

Whilst 1 parking space is below standard, there would be no additional bedrooms proposed and the existing parking space on the front would be unaffected. Therefore, there would be no change in relation to existing parking arrangements or in the need for parking at the premises. Overall, there would not be significant harm to highway safety from lack of parking.

### Other Considerations

In relation to loss of a view, there is no right to a view in planning legislation. In relation to gutters and soakaway, this is covered by building control and is not a material planning consideration. In relation to noise pollution, there is no evidence that the extension would cause any greater noise impact than a typical extension. In relation to precedent, each application is assessed on its own merits so this would not set a precedent for other proposals. In relation to existing conifer trees, this is a pre existing condition and not caused by the proposal. In relation to impact on property prices, this is not a material planning consideration and cannot be taken into account. In relation to soil degradation and water waste, these are not material planning considerations.

### Conclusion

The proposal would be acceptable in relation to street scene, design, parking and neighbour amenity. The application complies with local planning policies and is 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 following approved plans and documents :-
  - a. Proposed Plans and Elevations – A102 – Rev A (received 14/04/2025).
  - b. Location Plan and Site Plans - A100 (received 14/04/2025).

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt.

- 3) Materials

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 Policy CS19 of the Knowsley Local Plan Core Strategy, adopted January 2016 and saved Policies H5 and H8 of the Knowsley Replacement Unitary Development Plan, adopted in June 2006.

## **SCHEDULE 1**

| <b>Date Received</b> | <b>Ref. No</b> | <b>Version</b> | <b>Drawing/Document Title</b>                            |
|----------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------------------------------------------------|
|                      |                |                |                                                          |
| <b>14/04/2025</b>    | <b>A100</b>    | <b>REV A</b>   | <b>LOCATION PLAN AND EXISTING AND PROPOSED SITE PLAN</b> |
| <b>14/04/2025</b>    | <b>A102</b>    | <b>REV A</b>   | <b>PROPOSED FLOOR PLANS AND ELEVATIONS</b>               |

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

**Andrew Hunt**

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

**Mark Quinn**

**Date:**

**23/04/2025**

## **Informatives**

N/A

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