

Knowsley Council  
Regeneration and Economic Development Directorate.  
Delegated Planning Report

|                               |                                                                                       |                             |                         |
|-------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------|
| <b><u>APPLICATION NO:</u></b> | 25/00133/FUL                                                                          | <b><u>CASE OFFICER:</u></b> | Andrew Hunt             |
| <b><u>WARD:</u></b>           | Whiston & Cronton                                                                     | <b><u>PARISH:</u></b>       | Whiston<br>Town Council |
| <b><u>LOCATION:</u></b>       | 46 Lickers Lane, Whiston, Knowsley, L35 3PW                                           |                             |                         |
| <b><u>PROPOSAL:</u></b>       | ERECTION OF TWO STOREY SIDE EXTENSION (DEMOLITION OF<br>SINGLE STOREY SIDE EXTENSION) |                             |                         |

---

### **Site Description**

The application site is a semi -detached house set within a rectangular site in a residential area at Lickers Lane, Whiston. The site is bounded by residential properties to the north, west and east and a grassed area with trees to the south. There are two dwellings to the side of the property, 44 and 48 Lickers lane both have single storey rear extensions.

### **Proposal**

The proposal is for the erection of a two storey side extension. This would be following the demolition of the single storey side extension. The extension would be 3.2m wide, 6.5 metres long and 7.3 metres at the highest point (roof). It would be set back 0.6cm from the main front of 46.

### **Consultations**

N/A

### **Representations**

This application has been publicised by letters sent to 5 neighbours. No representations have been received.

### **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that accord with an up-to-date development plan without delay; or where the development plan is absent, silent or out of date planning permission should be granted unless the application of policies in the NPPF that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a clear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 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**

##### **Character of Area**

For two storey side extensions, the householder SPD requires a set back at first floor level by 1m or a minimum of 1 metre space is left at the side of the extension on the boundary with the neighbour.

The two storey side extension would be set back from the main bay window by 0.65 metres house due to the staggered arrangement of the house. The extension would be 15cm away from the boundary at ground and first floor level. Whilst, the extension would not fully comply with the SPD, the set back of 65 cm from the main front bay window combined with the 15cm distance to the boundary, means that the proposal

would not result in significant terracing effect or result in significant harm to the streetscene. Overall, on balance the proposal is acceptable.

The extension is 3.3 metres wide would be over half the width of the dwelling (4.66 metres), however, there is no specific guidance that requires extension to be less than half the width of the dwelling provided that it would not harm the character of the area. (Para 7.6 only applies to single storey extensions on corner plots)  
The existing single storey extension is 2.45 metres wide, and additional 0.85 metres would not result in significant harm to the streetscene nor result in a dwelling which is excessively wide for the plot.

Both 44 (11/00546/FUL) and 48 have similarly wide side extensions and the extension would therefore not be out of place within the streetscene.

### Neighbour Amenity

In relation to 48 Lickers Lane, the extension would take place on the opposite side of the house and would not impact on the amenity of 48.

In relation to 44 Lickers Lane, the extension would not impact the amenity of 44 as there are no side windows on the side of 44 that would be affected by this. The extension would also not project beyond the rear of 44 and therefore would not result in loss of light or outlook.

### Parking

NPPF para 116 states that 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.

There would be no changes proposed in relation to parking as existing arrangements would be unaffected. There would still be room for 2 parking spaces. Therefore, there would not be significant harm to highway safety.

### Conclusion

The proposal would be acceptable in relation to Street scene 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. Location Plan - (received 03/03/2025).
- b. Proposed Plans and Elevations - 02 - (received 03/03/2025).

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 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.

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

**Andrew Hunt**

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

**Jo Sheridan**

**Date:**

**04/04/2025**

### **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

