

<u>APPLICATION NO:</u>	25/00528/FUL	<u>CASE OFFICER:</u>	Reece Black
<u>WARD:</u>	Roby	<u>PARISH:</u>	Halewood Town Council
<u>LOCATION:</u>	Grove Farm, Halewood Road, Halewood		
<u>PROPOSAL:</u>	ERECTION OF A SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION AND A NEW FRONT PORCH TOGETHER WITH THE DEMOLITION OF EXISTING FRONT AND REAR PORCHES AND 2 EXISTING OUTBUILDINGS.		

Site Description

The application site is located at Grove Farm, Halewood, and is located within a Primarily Residential Area in the Development Plan. The application property is a detached, two-storey and standalone in relation to other dwellings. The property is served by an amalgamation of intersecting gabled roofs. The elevations of the property are brick faced, with grey, flat roof tiles and white timber framed sash windows serving the dwelling.

The property benefits from a front porch extension and rear porch extension. To the rear of the property, adjacent the side plot boundary, are 2 no. linked outbuildings. There is a detached, double garage to the east of the dwelling with a vast amount of hardstanding to the front of the garage, meeting the public highway. The plot is an irregular rectangle.

The plot features ample amounts of shrubbery and vegetation around the dwelling. Residential properties border the application site.

Proposal

The proposal is for the erection of a single storey rear extension and front porch together with the demolition of the existing front and rear porches and the 2 no. linked outbuildings.

The proposed rear extension would have a projection of 4.5m and a width of 12m. This would be served by a flat roof, which would attain a height of 3.2m and feature 3 no. glass rooflights which would measure 3.6m from the external ground level.

The proposed front porch extension would have a projection of 0.7m (at its shallowest) and 1.3m (at its deepest), to account for a stepped front elevation, and would have a width of 3m. This would also be served by a flat roof which would attain a maximum height of 3.2m.

Consultations

None required.

Representations

This application has been publicised by letters sent to 19 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 conversion of the existing detached garage to a habitable room 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)

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

Rear extension:

The Householder Development SPD states that *single storey 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*. It further states that *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 development would have a projection of 4.5m, although this exceeds the 4m guidelines, it would not adversely impact on any other properties given that the property is standalone location, with no dwellings immediately adjacent either side of the property. The proposed rear extension (at its closest) would be situated 3.6m away from the plot boundary. There would be sufficient distance from the properties which border the application site and the proposed development (the closest being No.6 Roxborough Walk, to the north of the application property, with an interface distance of 15m retained) to ensure that no harmful impacts to residential amenities, by way of overshadowing or harm to outlook would occur. The majority of proposed openings would be concentrated to the rear elevation and consequently, no overlooking or privacy concerns are raised by the proposed development.

The proposed development would be served by a flat roof, which is in conflict with the SPD, which advises that extensions should generally be served by pitched roofs, however, given the proposed development would be single storey and confined to the private rear amenity area, it is not prominently or readily visible from the street scene and therefore is acceptable.

The SPD (6.14) outlines 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, the storing of refuse bins, etc.*

The submitted plans demonstrate that over 50% of the rear garden would be retained and useable, and therefore ample private garden area is retained, and the proposal would not result in a cramped appearance. Existing refuse bins arrangements would not be affected.

Front porch extension:

The Householder Development SPD states that *style, design, materials and scale of front*

extensions and porches should respect the character of the surrounding residential area and 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 situated 5m from the front plot boundary, this would replace the existing front porch to roughly the same scale. The porch extension would be a very modest projection and scale, and consequently, a subordinate addition to the dwelling. The materials would match the rest of the dwelling to further integrate the proposed front extension to the property. Given the 5m distance from the public highway, which retains a sufficient set-back from the highway and the fact the property is detached, the property would be capable of accommodating the modest front extension, to replace the existing.

The Householder Development SPD states that *flat roofed extensions will normally not be appropriate*. The proposed front extension would be served by a flat roof. Although, this would conflict with the guidance of the SPD and detract from the pitched roof profile of the dwelling, the front extension would be of a very modest scale and shallow projection that a small flat roof would not be prominently noticeable or discordant in the street scene. It would also integrate with the existing front bay window projection, which is also flat-roofed, and as the height would sit level with this, it would positively integrate with the dwelling and consequently, would present as a discreet, subordinate addition. Moreover, the front garden area, adjacent the front boundary wall, contains a dense amount of foliage and shrubbery to soften the appearance in the street scene.

Materials:

The existing property is brick facing, with grey roof tiles and white timber framed sash windows. The elevation material key shown on the submitted elevations (Dwg No. 054 – 05A) annotate that broadly the exterior materials would be to match the existing dwelling. This is with the exception of the proposed doors inserted to the rear elevation, in which the materials are ambiguous currently, and annotated as *'UPVC/aluminium door. TBC by the client'*. Given that these doors located to the rear elevation of the proposed rear extension and therefore not readily visible from any public vantage points, the use of either UPVC or aluminium framed doors, would contrast to the rest of the existing materials found on the dwelling, however, would not result in any significant harm by design and therefore would be acceptable.

HIGHWAYS

The proposed development is for a rear extension and front porch extension. These works would not increase the level of off-street parking required or adversely impact the existing in-plot parking provision currently utilised by the occupiers of the property.

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):-

Knowsley Council
Regeneration and Economic Development Directorate.
Delegated Planning Report

- 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 development hereby permitted shall be constructed entirely of the materials details of which are listed within the elevation material key shown on plan No. 054 - 05A, plan Title. 'Proposed Elevations', received 04.11.2025.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity and to comply with Policies CS2 and CS19 of the Knowsley Local Plan Core Strategy, adopted January 2016 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
16/09/2025	054 - 01	-	LOCATION PLAN
04/11/2025	054 - 04	A	PROPOSED FLOOR PLANS AND SITE PLAN
04/11/2025	054 - 05	A	PROPOSED ELEVATIONS
16/09/2025	054 - 06	-	PROPOSED LOCATION PLAN

Signed Case Officer¹:

Reece Black

Signed Authorising Officer²:

Jo Sheridan

Date:

06/11/2025

Informatives

Not applicable.

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