

|                               |                                                                                                                                                           |                             |                       |
|-------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------|
| <b><u>APPLICATION NO:</u></b> | 25/00516/FUL                                                                                                                                              | <b><u>CASE OFFICER:</u></b> | Reece Black           |
| <b><u>WARD:</u></b>           | Halewood South                                                                                                                                            | <b><u>PARISH:</u></b>       | Halewood Town Council |
| <b><u>LOCATION:</u></b>       | 23 Elmswood Avenue, Halewood, Knowsley                                                                                                                    |                             |                       |
| <b><u>PROPOSAL:</u></b>       | ERECTION OF SINGLE STOREY SIDE AND REAR EXTENSION (INCORPORATING EXISTING GARAGE), PART TWO STOREY REAR EXTENSION AND SINGLE STOREY FRONT PORCH EXTENSION |                             |                       |

---

### **Site Description**

The application site is located at 23 Elmswood Avenue, Halewood and is situated within a Primarily Residential Area in the Development Plan. The application property is a two-storey, detached dwellinghouse and is served by a hipped roof. The property is brick facing to its elevations with white UPVC openings and grey, flat roof tiles. The property benefits from a detached garage, located adjacent the side and rear elevations of the dwelling. The site is located off of a private road within a cul-de-sac.

Hardstanding is positioned adjacent the dwelling and can accommodate a minimum of 2 no. vehicles, with the garage capable of providing a third. There is external access to the rear garden, accessed via a gate between the rear of the property and front of the garage and refuse bins are stored within the rear garden. The front of the property is open-plan in layout and design and characterised by soft landscaping.

The application property is situated within a modestly stepped building line. There are residential dwellings situated to the north, south and west of the application property, with an area of green open space to the east, beyond the front of the dwelling and separated by a tree line. The plot is largely rectangular in layout.

### **Proposal**

The proposal is for the erection of a single storey side and rear extension (including the conversion of the existing garage) with a first-floor rear extension and single storey front porch extension.

The proposed development to the ground floor would have a 'wrap-around' layout. The proposal would project from the existing side elevation of the dwelling by 3m, with a projection from the original rear wall of 3.5m and a width of 8.8m. The side and rear extension would be served by a hipped roof, which would measure 2.5m at the eaves and 3.4m at the tallest point.

The proposed front porch projection would have a projection of 1.1m from the front wall of the dwelling and a width of 2.6m. This would be served by a dual-pitched roof, which would measure 2.4m to the eaves and 3.7m at the ridgeline.

The proposed first-floor rear extension would project from the rear elevation by 2.5m with a width of 3.9m. This would be served by a hipped roof, which would measure 5m at the eaves and 6m at the ridgeline.

The application has seen revisions to the proposal since the original submission, however, the changes included have no greater material impact and therefore no further consultation with neighbours was deemed necessary.

### **Consultations**

Halewood Town Council: - No comments received.

### **Representations**

This application has been publicised by letters sent to 5 neighbours. It has also been advertised by way of site notice. 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

### **SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENTS (SPD's)**

Householder Development (2016)

New Residential Development SPD (2018)

#### **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**

#### **Side extension:**

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 side extension would be a modest, subordinate extension in scale, form and massing, given that it would occupy less than half the width of the original dwelling and contain a suitable set-back of 5.6m from the front elevation of the dwelling; therefore, the proposal would be discreet within the street scene. The proposal would integrate with the existing detached garage associated with the application property, although this would result in a muddled roofline at the intersection of the roofs, practically, there would not appear to be any viable alternatives that could markedly improve the design. Although, given it is single storey it would not present a significant degree of harm in the street scene or to visual amenities.

The proposal would incorporate the existing detached garage associated with the property and consequently, this could increase overshadowing and obstruction of light to the living room of the property of No.25 Elmswood Avenue. Although, given the existing relationships of the dwellings, (with the stepped arrangement) and given

where the detached garage is located, it is considered that there is an existing level of overshadowing and loss of light already present. It would not be considered that the modest infill section of the proposal would detrimentally exacerbate any present level of harm. Furthermore, given that the application property and No.25 are both detached, the proposal retaining a gap of approximately 1m to the boundary fence line, and the fact that the proposal would be served by a hipped roof, which would pull away from the boundary between the application property and No.25, these considerations would further reduce any detrimental worsening of loss of daylight and sunlight. The living room of No.25 also contains a window to the front elevation of the dwelling and therefore would still continue to receive daylight and sunlight from an unaffected source of light.

Considering outlook from the rear patio doors and the rear garden of No.25, the existing detached garage runs adjacent to the boundary by 5.9m and therefore, similarly, outlook towards the south-east is already greatly compromised at present and given the scale of development (modest infill extension and at single storey, so a reduced impact from undue dominance and appearing overbearing) it would not be considered to significantly worsen the existing relationship between the dwellings to an extent which would substantiate a refusal. It is considered that, as No.25 is a corner plot and bounded by highway to the rear and side of the plot, there would be no further development which would 'tunnel-in' or detrimentally affect residential amenities, outlook and living conditions to the property or the enjoyment of its rear garden. Outlook to the rear and north-western side boundary would be preserved and there would be no risk of cumulative actual and potential future developments unduly affecting residential amenities.

Whilst the incorporation of the existing garage would result in the loss of external access to the rear garden, provision has been made to ensure that refuse bins can be stored to the rear of the driveway, adjacent the front elevation of the side extension, to allow for storage and bin collection.

#### Ground floor rear extension:

*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 3.5m and therefore would comply with the Householder Development SPD. The property of No.21 Elmswood Avenue, as existing, projects 4.3m beyond the rear elevation of the application property; the proposed rear extension would not surpass the rear elevation of No.21, which would ensure that there would be no detrimentally adverse impacts to habitable rooms or living conditions of the occupiers of No.21. The side elevation of No.21 contains 3 no. windows, however, these are all obscurely-glazed and serve non-habitable rooms (garage, utility room and en-suite) the proposed rear extension would not result in any detrimental harm to amenities to No.21 and therefore would be acceptable.

#### First-floor rear extension:

*The Householder Development SPD stipulates that two-storey extensions of up to 3 metres will normally be acceptable and that two-storey rear extensions would not*

*normally be allowed to come within 7 metres from the rear boundary.*

The proposed first-floor rear extension would not surpass the 3m policy guidance and 8m from the rear plot boundary would be retained, which would consequently accord with the policy requirements outlined in the SPD. The first-floor rear extension would contain a window located to the rear elevation and therefore, would not facilitate any greater degree of overlooking or 'perception of overlooking'; no windows would be installed to the side elevations. The first-floor rear extension would be served by a hipped roof with a corresponding pitch, which would integrate with the existing hipped roof of the main dwelling, set-down at a lower level to present the rear extension as a subordinate addition to the original dwelling.

The New Residential Development SPD (Appendix 4: Interface distances and private amenity) states that *Development should retain 22 metre interface distances between existing rear principal elevations and proposed principal elevations for two storey properties*. The rear elevation of the application property is orientated to view the rear elevation of No.31 Elmswood Avenue, and the existing interface distance is 25m. The proposal would reduce this to 22.5m and therefore the minimum interface distance would be retained between the rear elevations of the application property and No.31.

#### Front extension:

The Householder Development SPD states that *front extensions and porches can be particularly prominent in the street scene and should be particularly carefully designed to retain the character of residential areas and that style, design, materials and scale of front extensions and porches should respect the character of the surrounding residential area with consideration that account should be taken of the building line, although, for example, small porches and canopies of a satisfactory design in materials projecting in front of the building line will normally be permitted.*

The proposed front porch extension would be a modest and subordinate addition to the dwelling and would not appear overly prominent or discordant in the street scene. Given the stepped arrangement, the front projection would not significantly breach the existing building line. The design would include matching materials and a corresponding roof design; the existing front elevation of the dwelling displays a two-storey projecting gable, served by a dual-pitched roof. The front porch extension would emulate the roof design and positively integrate and compliment this existing feature. The front projection would have a very minor impact on the wider street scene given it is located within a discrete elevation of the cul-de-sac and the front elevation of the dwelling is orientated toward green open space.

## **HIGHWAYS**

The NPPF (Paragraph 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.

The application property currently is a 4 no. bedroom dwelling. The proposal would not result in the creation of any additional bedrooms. The conversion of the garage, however, would result in the loss of a parking space within the curtilage of the dwelling, which would reduce the existing parking provision from 3 no. spaces to 2 no. spaces. This is because the garage meets the minimum internal dimensions, contained within the Householder Development SPD (2.75m x 5.5m) to be

considered a parking space. Although, during the assessment of the application, it was agreed with the agent to set-back the front elevation of the side extension to ensure that the minimum dimensions required for a parking space to the side of the dwelling (2.75m x 5m) could be retained. The existing hardstanding would retain a minimum depth of 10m to allow for 2 no. vehicles to be stored within the curtilage of the dwelling.

The Householder Development SPD states that 4+ bedroom properties should ensure that 3 no. vehicles can be accommodated in-plot. These, however, are maximum standards. Given that amendments have been secured to ensure that a minimum of 2 no. vehicles can be parked within the plot and that these are maximum standards, it would be considered that the proposed development would not result in any unacceptable impact to highway safety or generate a significant increase to on-street parking or strain on the local highway network.

### **Conclusion**

The proposal would be acceptable in terms of design, residential amenity and highways. The proposal also complies with the relevant Core Strategy and Replacement UDP policies 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. For the avoidance of doubt this will include any brick detailing of the existing dwellinghouse being carried over and emulated to the external elevations of the proposed development, hereby permitted.

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                         |
|---------------|-----------|---------|------------------------------------------------|
|               |           |         |                                                |
| 10/11/2025    | 25041 -01 | REV A   | LOCATION PLAN, EXISTING SITE PLANS AND VISUALS |
| 11/12/2025    | 25041- 07 | REV C   | PROPOSED ELEVATIONS                            |
| 11/12/2025    | 25041 -06 | REV C   | PROPOSED FIRST FLOOR PLAN                      |
| 11/12/2025    | 25041 -05 | REV C   | PROPOSED GROUND FLOOR PLAN                     |
| 11/12/2025    | 25041 -04 | REV C   | PROPOSED SITE PLAN AND VISUALS                 |
|               |           |         |                                                |

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

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

**Date:**                                              **17/12/2025**

## **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.

---

<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