

APPLICATION NO: 26/00119/FUL

CASE OFFICER: Kate Pickles

WARD: Roby

PARISH:

LOCATION: 6 Roby Nook, Roby, Knowsley, L36 4AD

PROPOSAL: ERECTION OF A SINGLE STOREY REAR AND SIDE EXTENSION

Site description

The application property is a two-storey, detached dwellinghouse set within an asymmetrical plot. The dwelling is situated within a residential area adjacent to the Roby Conservation area. The existing property has white UPVC windows to the front, side and rear and a grey composite front door. The wider area is characterised by detached and semi-detached dwellings with the railway to the north of the site. The properties within Roby Nook are newly built and were construction following the demolition of St. Bartholomew's Day Hospital in 2014.

Proposal

Planning permission is sought for the erection of a single storey rear and side extension. The rear extension would project 4.8m beyond the rear elevation of the existing dwelling, would have a width of 4.4m and a height of 3.8m with an eaves height of 2.3m. The rear extension would serve as an extended dining area. The proposed side extension would be 3.1m in width, 6.5m in length and 4.3m in height with an eaves height of 2.6m. The side extension would serve as a garage space.

Consultations

Growth Lancashire (Conservation): No objections raised.

Network rail: No objections raised.

Representations

This application has been publicised by way of site notice and via letters sent to 9 neighbours. No representations have been received as a result of this publicity.

Planning history

14/00480/FUL: - Demolition of former St. Bartholomew's Day Hospital and erection of 6no detached residential dwellings, together with associated access, parking and landscaping. Granted 02.09.2014.

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that accord with an up-to-date development plan without delay; or where the development plan is absent, silent or out of date planning permission should be granted unless the application of policies in the NPPF that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a clear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

H5 – Development within Primarily Residential Areas

H8 – Extensions and Alterations to Residential Properties

SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENTS

Householder Development SPD

Design Quality in New Development SPD

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 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

Scale, Design and Residential Amenity

Saved Policy H8 of the Replacement UDP (2006) states that extensions should not, by reason of their scale and massing, result in a disproportionate addition to the original dwelling or adversely affect the amenity of neighbouring properties. The proposed side extension complies with this policy by virtue of its modest scale, measuring 3m in width, 6m in depth, with a ridge height of 4.3m and eaves height of 2.6m. The scale and design ensure the extension would appear subordinate to the existing dwelling therefore complying with Policy H8. The proposed side extension would also be offset from the party boundary by 3.2m and would be set back from the highway by 6.6m. As such, the proposal would not result in unacceptable overshadowing or loss of light to neighbouring properties as adequate separation distances would be retained.

The Householder Development SPD advises that a single storey rear extension projecting more than 4m would normally only be permitted if it does not breach the 45-degree rule. The proposed rear extension would project 4.8m from the rear elevation of the existing dwelling with an overall projection of 5.1m as one side of the extension is level with the existing rear wall. Whilst exceeding 4m in projection, the extension would not result in unacceptable overshadowing or loss of light given that there are no neighbours to either side of the dwelling. Therefore, the proposal would not appear unduly dominant and would comply with SPD guidance.

The scale of the proposed side and rear extensions is therefore considered acceptable in terms of impact on residential amenity.

The white UPVC windows proposed to the rear elevation of the side and rear extensions would not give rise to any privacy concerns given their ground floor positioning, existing boundary treatments and the creation of no new viewpoints beyond those already available from the rear elevation. The proposed rear extension would also be offset from the rear boundary by 5.9m further mitigates the impact on privacy by way of overlooking or the perception of overlooking. Glass bi-folding doors are proposed to one of the side elevations of the rear extension and this is not considered to materially increase the impact on Neighbouring properties' privacy given the existing windows on the ground and first floor side elevation of the main dwelling.

The proposed side extension would feature a garage door with two small windows to the front elevation and a door with a window to the rear, both would be obscurely glazed and therefore do not give rise to any privacy concerns by way of overlooking or the perception of overlooking. As such, the development is considered to accord with the requirements of Policy H8 and Householder Development SPD guidance in protecting the privacy of neighbouring properties and is therefore acceptable in terms of impact on privacy.

The Householder Development SPD also advises that extensions should be constructed in materials to match the original dwelling and should normally have a pitched roof for aesthetic reasons. The proposed side and rear extensions would comply with this guidance through the mono pitched roof of the side extension and pitched roof of the rear extension. Both extensions would also use brickwork, render, roof tiles and UPVC windows to match that of the existing dwelling. The proposal would therefore be in keeping with the established character of the area and would have a minimal impact on the street scene.

Highways

The proposed side and rear extensions would not involve the creation of any additional bedrooms and therefore would not increase the demand for off-street parking within the curtilage of the property. The proposed extensions would also not impact the existing parking arrangement. As such, the proposal is considered acceptable from a highway safety perspective.

Other considerations

The application property is situated immediately adjacent to the Roby Conservation Area. Growth Lancashire have assessed the proposal and determined that the proposal would cause no discernible harm to the character or appearance of the conservation area.

The root protection area of 7no. Middle aged Lombardy Poplar trees falls within the rear garden of the application property. The proposal would not involve the removal of any of these trees and is therefore considered acceptable.

Conclusion

The proposed side and rear extensions are considered acceptable in terms of design, residential amenity and highway safety and is therefore recommended for approval.

Recommendation

That planning permission be granted subject to the following conditions:-

- 1) The development must be begun no later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date of this permission.

Reason: 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.

Knowsley Council
Regeneration and Economic Development Directorate.
Delegated Planning Report

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 interest of visual amenity and to comply with Saved Policy H8 of the Knowsley Replacement Unitary Development Plan, adopted June 2006, Policy CS19 of the Knowsley Local Plan Core Strategy, adopted January 2-16, and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Schedule 1

Date received	Drawing. No		Revision	Drawing/Document Title
06/05/2026	1250			Location Plan
13/05/2026	101		B	Proposed Floor Plans and Elevations
06/05/2026	201			Proposed Site Plan

Signed Case Officer: Kate Pickles

Signed Authorising Officer: Jo Sheridan

Date: 07/07/2026

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

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