

<u>APPLICATION NO:</u>	23/00137/FUL	<u>CASE OFFICER:</u>	Reece Black
<u>WARD:</u>	Roby	<u>PARISH:</u>	
<u>LOCATION:</u>	22 The Rooley, Huyton, Knowsley		
<u>PROPOSAL:</u>	ERECTION OF A FRONT PORCH EXTENSION		

Site Description

The application site is located at 22 The Rooley, Huyton and is located in an area that is allocated as a Primarily Residential Area in the Development Plan. The property is a detached dwelling and is brick facing on its front, side and rear elevations. It features white UPVC openings and grey, flat, interlocking roof tiles.

The property benefits from a single storey rear extension and a small porch roof that defines an open porch area. The existing front elevation is located approximately 8.2m from the front boundary brick wall and 11m away from public highway.

Proposal

The application seeks permission for the erection of a front porch extension. The proposed development would have a projection would be 0.90m and would have a width of 2m. The proposal would be served by a mono-pitched roof, that would measure 2.74m at its eaves and 3.39m at its highest point.

The proposed front porch would sit flush with the protruding section of the existing front elevation.

Consultations

None Required.

Representations

This application has been publicised by letters sent to 8 neighbours. No representations have been received.

Planning History

APP. NO:	08/00207/FUL
PROPOSAL:	ERECTION OF SINGLE STOREY EXTENSION TO REAR OF DWELLING
DECISION:	GRANTED
DECISION DATE:	15 May 2008

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that accord with an up-to-date development plan without delay; or where the development plan is absent, silent or out of date planning permission should be granted unless the application of policies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
SAVED POLICIES - KNOWSLEY REPLACEMENT UNITARY DEVELOPMENT
PLAN (ADOPTED JUNE 2006)**

CS2 - Development Principles

CS19 - Design Quality and Accessibility in New Development

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

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 the residential areas.

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.

The existing dwelling is brick facing on its elevations with white UPVC openings and tiled roofing. The proposed development would include materials to match the existing and be keeping in with those found at the application property and have a brick facing finish. The proposed development would retain and respect overall, the style and design of the existing front elevation of the dwelling.

It is considered the proposed development would respond appropriately to the original dwelling. The design is considered as acceptable and as being in accord with the Householder Development SPD and Saved Policy H8.

Amenity

The Householder Development SPD states that account should be taken of the building line, although, small porches and canopies of a satisfactory design in materials projecting in front of the building line will normally be permitted.

It also states that the size and projection of front extensions and porches that may be permitted depends on the type of dwelling and degree of set-back from the highway. It is considered that there would be an appropriate set back retained as there would be no overall change from the distance between the existing front elevation of the dwelling to the public highway and given the scale and mass of the proposal, it would be an appropriate addition to the dwelling.

It is considered that the proposed development would not cause any significant issues on any local amenities and would be in accord with the Householder Development SPD.

The Householder Development SPD that extensions should not unacceptably obstruct the outlook of neighbouring dwellings or detract from their privacy.

20 The Rooley

No.20 is the adjacent, detached dwelling and is sited to the South from the application property. The front elevation of no.20 sits in line with the existing projecting section of the front elevation of the application site. The proposed development would sit flush with that section and would not project past that. Subsequently, the proposal would be screened by this section and would not be readily visible to the occupants of no.20. Therefore, it is considered the proposed development would not result in any unacceptable obstruction of outlook or significantly impact the privacy of the occupants of no.20 and would be in accord with the Householder Development SPD.

24 The Rooley

No.24 is the other adjacent, detached dwelling and is sited to the North from the application property. The front elevation of no.24 sits in line with the set-back section of the front elevation of the application property. The proposed development would project 0.90m out. It is considered that the proposal would not appear unduly dominant or obstruct amenity views. The scale and mass of the proposal is an appropriate addition to the dwelling. It is considered that the proposed development would not result in any unacceptable obstruction of outlook or significantly impact the privacy of the occupants of no.24 and would be in accord with the Householder Development SPD.

Highways

The application site has a driveway to the front of the dwelling to fit at least two vehicles. The proposed development would not result in the loss of any significant amount of the driveway and would not have an overall impact to the existing parking provisions or cause an adverse impact on highway safety. Therefore, the proposed development would be acceptable and in accord with the Householder Development SPD.

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
19/04/2023	-	-	PROPOSED SITE PLAN
19/04/2023	-	-	EXISTING AND PROPOSED FLOOR PLANS
19/04/2023	-	-	EXISTING AND PROPOSED ELEVATIONS
04/04/2023	TQRQM2309210135 8141	-	LOCATION PLAN
19/04/2023	-	-	EXISTING SITE PLAN

Signed Case Officer¹:

Reece Black

Signed Authorising
Officer²:

K Foster

Date:

24 May 2023

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

Appendix 1 – Site Photographs









