

<u>APPLICATION NO:</u>	25/00113/FUL	<u>CASE OFFICER:</u>	Andrew Hunt
<u>WARD:</u>	Northwood	<u>PARISH:</u>	N/A
<u>LOCATION:</u>	58 Thistley Hey Road, Southdene, Kirkby, Knowsley, L32 8UJ		
<u>PROPOSAL:</u>	ERECTION OF SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION		

Site Description

The application site is an end terrace dwelling set within a rectangular plot. There are dwellings to the north south and east with an amenity area immediately to the west with dwellings beyond. There are existing outriggers on several properties nearby including the application site and a large rear extension at no 52.

Proposal

The proposal is for the erection of a single storey rear extension. This would be following the demolition of the existing outrigger which is original. The extension would be 2.6 metres long and 3.6 metres wide. It would be 3.5 m high with an eaves height of 2.5m. It would be 3.4 metres away from the boundary with 60.

Consultations

N/A

Representations

This application has been publicised by letters sent to 6 neighbours. No objections have been received.

Planning History

A similar extension was approved in 2021 - 21/00196/FUL (approved 12/05/2021).

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that accord with an up-to-date development plan without delay; or where the development plan is absent, silent or out of date planning permission should be granted unless the application of policies in the NPPF that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a clear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

In relation to the character of the area, the rear extension would not be visible from the streetscene, therefore there would be no harm to the character of the area.

Design

The proposal would be pitched like the main roof of the dwelling and would be acceptable in design terms. The proposal complies with policy H8 and the Householder Development SPD.

Neighbour Amenity

In relation to the neighbouring semi-detached property (60), the extension would extend around 2.6 metres at the rear. This is less than the 4 metres generally permissible under the Householder Development SPD. The extension would also be around 3.4 metres away from the boundary with 60.

In relation to 52, the extension would be single storey only and would not materially impact on light or outlook.

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

Permitted Development Fallback Position

The extension would be permitted development if it were slightly less in width than the current scheme, which is a material consideration (the proposal is just over half the width of the dwelling).

The proposal is not permitted development as it would conflict with Schedule 2 Part 1: Class A j (iii). The extension would be more than half the width of the original house and would extend beyond a side wall of the original house. (The outrigger store is original and other nearby dwellings have this. Therefore, it is considered a side wall of the original house).

“(j)the enlarged part of the dwellinghouse would extend beyond a wall forming a side elevation of the original dwellinghouse, and would—.....

(iii)have a width greater than half the width of the original dwellinghouse;”...

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. Proposed Plans and Elevations – 24/013 - (received 26/02/2025).
- b. Location Plan - (received 26/02/2025).

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.

<u>Signed Case Officer¹:</u>	<u>Andrew Hunt</u>
<u>Signed Authorising Officer²:</u>	<u>Jo Sheridan</u>
<u>Date:</u>	<u>31/03/2025</u>

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

