

<u>APPLICATION NO:</u>	26/00283/FUL	<u>CASE OFFICER:</u>	Louise Robinson
<u>WARD:</u>	Roby	<u>PARISH:</u>	N/A
<u>LOCATION:</u>	25 Laurel Grove, Huyton, Knowsley, L36 5UD		
<u>PROPOSAL:</u>	ERECTION OF A SINGLE STOREY FRONT EXTENSION, TWO-STOREY SIDE EXTENSION AND A PART TWO-STOREY / PART SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION, FOLLOWING THE DEMOLITION OF THE EXISTING FRONT PORCH.		

Site Description

The application site comprises a two-storey 3-bed semi-detached dwelling located on the cul-de-sac of Laurel Grove, Huyton. The property is characterised by render to all elevations and has a hipped tiled roof. The dwelling currently benefits from a small porch to the front elevation. There is parking available to the side of the dwelling.

The attached neighbouring dwelling 27 Laurel Grove benefits from a single storey 'wrap-around' extension to the side and rear. The detached neighbouring dwelling 23 Laurel Grove benefits from a two-storey side extension which sits 'flush' with the front elevation and a single storey front extension. The application site is surrounded by similarly designed two-storey semi-detached dwellings.

Proposal

Planning permission is sought for the erection of a single storey front extension, two-storey side extension and a part two-storey / part single storey rear extension, following the demolition of the existing front porch.

Single storey front extension

The proposed front extension would have a width of 1.7m, would have a depth of 0.6m and would not project beyond the existing bay window to the front of the application site. The extension would have a pitched tiled roof with an eaves height of 2.4m and a ridge height of 3.2m. The pitched roof would also incorporate the proposed canopy above the front entrance.

The extension has been amended to reduce the width of the extension from 5.2m to 1.7m and to reduce the projection of the extension from 1.2m to 0.6m, to allow for the parking provision of three vehicles within the curtilage of the dwellinghouse.

The extension would have a render finish to match the existing dwelling and would have one window within the front elevation.

Two-storey side extension

The two-storey side extension would have a width of 1.4m, would have a length of 7.2m and would be set in from the shared boundary with No.23 by 0.7m. The extension would sit in-line with the existing front elevation of the dwelling. The extension would have a hipped tiled roof with an eaves height of 4.9m and a ridge

height of 7.2m.

The extension would be finished in render to match the existing dwelling and would have one first-floor window within the side elevation.

Part two-storey / part single storey rear extension

The two-storey part of the extension would have a projection of 2.6m beyond the existing rear elevation of the dwelling and a width of 8.1m. The extension would be set in from the shared boundary with the attached neighbouring dwelling 27 Laurel Grove by 0.4m, be set in 0.7m from the shared boundary with the detached neighbouring dwelling 23 Laurel Grove and be set away from the rear shared boundary at its shortest point by 19.0m and at its longest point by 27.6m due to the shaping of the plot.

The extension would have a dual-pitched tiled roof with an eaves height of 4.9m and a ridge height of 7.2m.

The single storey part of the extension would have a projection of 2.4m beyond the proposed rear elevation of the two-storey part of the extension. The extension would have a width of 8.1m. The extension would be set in from the shared boundary with the attached neighbouring dwelling 27 Laurel Grove by 0.4m and set in 0.7m from the shared boundary with the detached neighbouring dwelling 23 Laurel Grove.

The extension would have a mono-pitched roof with four rooflights installed, with an eaves height of 2.4m and a ridge height of 3.4m.

The extension as a whole would have a total projection of 5.0m beyond the existing rear elevation of the application site and would be finished in render to match the existing dwelling. The extension would have bi-fold doors within the rear elevation and three first-floor windows within the rear elevation.

Consultations

None required.

Representations

This application has been publicised by letters sent to 8 neighbours. No representations were received as a result of the publicity given to the application.

Planning History

No relevant 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.

KNOWSLEY LOCAL PLAN: CORE STRATEGY

Policy CS2 Development Principles
Policy CS19 Design Quality and Accessibility in New Development

SAVED POLICIES - KNOWSLEY REPLACEMENT UNITARY DEVELOPMENT PLAN (ADOPTED JUNE 2006)

Policy H5 Primarily Residential Areas
Policy H8 Extensions and Alterations to Residential Properties

SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENTS

Householder Development SPD
Amended New Residential Development SPD

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

RESIDENTIAL AMENITY AND DESIGN

Single storey front extension

The Householder Development SPD advises that front extensions and porches can be particularly prominent in the street scene and should be carefully designed to retain the character of residential areas. It also advises that the style, design, materials and scale of front extensions and porches should respect the character of the surrounding area.

The proposed front extension would have a width of 1.7m, would have a depth of 0.6m and would not project beyond the existing bay window to the front of the application site. The extension has been amended to reduce the depth of the

extension from 1.2m to 0.6m and to reduce the width of the extension from 5.2m to 1.7m, to allow for the parking provision of three vehicles within the curtilage.

The proposed extension would project 1.3m beyond the front elevation of the detached neighbouring dwelling 23 Laurel Grove and would sit 0.7m away from the shared boundary with No.23. As such, the front extension would not breach the 45-degree rule and is considered to be acceptable.

The extension would have no impact on the attached neighbouring dwelling 27 Laurel Grove, as the extension would be situated behind the existing bay window found at the host dwelling.

The extension would be finished in render to match the wider dwellinghouse and proposed extensions and would have a pitched tiled roof. The extension would also incorporate the proposed pitched canopy to the front elevation. As the materials and roof design would match that of the existing dwelling, it is considered that the extension would be in keeping with the host dwelling and the character of the local area and is considered to be acceptable in visual terms.

The window within the front elevation does not raise any overlooking concerns, as it would not provide any additional views not already available from the front of the dwelling. Additionally, as this window would serve a ground floor W.C., a condition will be included to ensure that this window has obscure glazing installed, to protect privacy.

In summary, the single storey front extension is considered to be acceptable in terms of any impacts on the residential and visual amenity of the host property and the surrounding area and complies with Policy H8 and guidance provided by the Householder Development SPD.

Two-storey side extension

The Householder Development SPD outlines that two-storey side extensions or first-floor side extensions should be designed to avoid having an overbearing effect or causing unacceptable loss of light or privacy for neighbours. They should also avoid causing a terracing effect either by themselves or in conjunction with similar extensions.

The SPD also outlines that either a minimum space of 1m should be preserved between the extension and the party boundary to the side of the property, or the front wall of the first-floor of the extension should be set back at least 1m from the immediately adjoining part of the main front wall of the original dwelling.

The two-storey side extension would have a width of 1.4m, would have a length of 7.2m and would be set in from the shared boundary with No.23 by 0.7m. The extension would sit flush with the existing front elevation of the dwelling.

It is noted by the LPA that the extension would not incorporate a 1.0m first-floor set back or be set in from the shared boundary by 1.0m. The detached neighbouring dwelling No.23 currently benefits from a two-storey side extension which sits flush with the front elevation, does not incorporate a dropped ridge, and sits hard on the shared boundary with the application site. Given that No.23 is set back from the host property by 0.7m and the proposed extension would be set away from the gable elevation of No.23 by 0.7m it is unlikely that the application site would extend any further in the future, due to the proposed limited space to the side of the host dwelling. Additionally,

No.23 is unable to extend any further to the side, due to the existing two-storey side extension sitting hard on the shared boundary. Therefore, it is considered that the extension would not create an actual or potential terracing effect and the guidance to set back the first-floor by 1m can be relaxed in this instance.

Additionally, the SPD outlines that the above requirements may be relaxed if there is a staggered arrangement between the dwellings. Whilst it is noted that there is currently a two-storey extension under construction at 15 Laurel Grove which incorporates a 1.0m first-floor set back, this initial design was submitted to the LPA in this format. In this instance, the proposed two-storey side extension is considered to be acceptable, as it would not create an actual or potential terracing effect.

Considering the impact on the detached neighbouring dwelling 23 Laurel Grove, the extension would sit next to the blank gable elevation of No.23 and would be set away from the shared boundary by 0.7m. Whilst, due to the stagger between the host property and No.23, the side extension would project 0.7m beyond the front elevation of No.23, the extension would not breach the 45-degree principle and is considered to be acceptable in this instance.

The extension would have no impact on the amenity of the attached neighbouring dwelling 27 Laurel Grove, as the extension would be located to the opposite side.

The extension would be finished in render and would have a hipped tiled roof to match the existing dwelling. Therefore, as the materials and roof design would match that of the existing dwellinghouse, it is considered that the extension would be in keeping with the host dwelling and the character of the local area and is considered to be acceptable in visual terms.

The first-floor window within the side elevation raises no overlooking concerns. Whilst the SPD outlines that windows in side elevations that serve main habitable rooms are rarely acceptable, given that the window would serve the bathroom (non-habitable) and would look onto the blank gable of No.23, the window is considered to be acceptable in this instance. A condition will be included to ensure that this window has obscure glazing installed, to protect privacy.

In summary, the two-storey side extension is considered to be acceptable in terms of any impacts on the residential and visual amenity of the host property and the surrounding area and complies with Policy H8 and guidance provided by the Householder Development SPD.

Part two-storey / part single storey rear extension

The Householder Development SPD advises 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.

The SPD advises that single storey rear extensions located on or immediately adjacent to the party boundary with a neighbouring dwelling will normally be acceptable if it does not project more than 4.0m from the rear elevation of the dwelling. The SPD also advises that two-storey extensions with a projection of up to 3.0m will normally be acceptable, should not come within 7.0m from the rear boundary and should normally have a pitched roof.

The two-storey aspect of the extension would have a projection of 2.6m beyond the

existing rear elevation of the dwelling and would have a width of 8.1m. The extension would be set in from the shared boundary with the attached neighbouring dwelling 27 Laurel Grove by 0.4m, would be set in from the detached neighbouring dwelling 23 Laurel Grove by 0.7m and would be set away from the rear shared boundary at its shortest point by 19.0m and 27.6m at its longest point, due to the shaping of the plot. As such, as the projection and set in distances from the rear shared boundary would comply with the SPD's guidance, the two-storey part of the rear extension is considered to be acceptable in this instance.

The single storey part of the extension would project an additional 2.4m beyond the proposed rear elevation of the two-storey part of the extension. The extension would be set in from the shared boundary with No.27 by 0.4m and set in from the shared boundary with No.23 by 0.7m. The extension as a whole would project 5.0m beyond the existing rear elevation of the host dwelling.

Considering the impact on the attached neighbouring dwelling 27 Laurel Grove, the rear extension would be set in from the shared boundary by 0.4m. The two-storey part of the extension would project 2.6m beyond the original two-storey rear elevation of No.27. As such, this projection more than complies with the SPD's 3.0m guidance for two-storey rear extensions. With regard to the single part of the extension, this aspect of the extension would project 1.9m beyond the rear elevation of No.27's single storey rear extension. As such, the single storey part of the extension would comply with the SPD's 4.0m guidance for single storey rear extensions.

Considering the impact on the detached neighbouring dwelling 23 Laurel Grove, the rear extension would be set in from the shared boundary by 0.7m. Due to a stagger between the application site and No.23, the two-storey part of the extension would only project 0.1m beyond the rear elevation of No.23. As such, the two-storey part of the extension would more than comply with the SPD's guidance. With regard to the single storey part of the extension, this aspect would project 2.5m beyond the rear elevation of No.23. As such, the single storey part of the extension would comply with the SPD's guidance.

The SPD advises that two-storey rear extensions should not come within 7.0m from the rear boundary. The proposed extension would be set away from the rear shared boundary by 19.0m at its shortest point and 27.6m at its longest point, due to the shaping of the plot, and therefore complies with the SPD's guidance. The New Residential Development SPD advises that development should retain 22m interface distances between existing rear principal elevations and proposed principal elevations for two-storey properties. As there would be an interface distance of somewhat 32.5m between the existing dwellings to the rear and the proposed two-storey part of the extension, the interface distances raise no concerns.

The two-storey part of the extension would have a dual-pitched roof, and the single storey part of the extension would have a mono-pitched roof with four rooflights installed. As the roof design(s) would comply with the Householder Development SPD's guidance, the proposed roof-profiles are considered to be acceptable in this instance.

The extension as a whole would be finished in render to match the existing dwelling. As the materials would match that of the existing dwellinghouse, it is considered that the extension would be in keeping with the host dwelling and the character of the local area and is considered to be acceptable in visual terms.

The bi-fold doors within the rear elevation of the single storey part of the extension

raise no overlooking concerns, due to their ground floor siting, orientation within the rear elevation and boundary treatments. Whilst three windows would be installed within the two-storey part of the extension, they would not create any additional views not already available from the rear of the existing dwelling. Additionally, as the window within the middle of the elevation would serve an en-suite, a condition will be included to ensure that this window has obscure glazing installed, to protect privacy.

In summary, the proposed part two-storey / part single storey rear extension is considered to be acceptable in terms of any impacts on the residential amenity and visual amenity of the host property and the surrounding area and complies with Policy CS19 of the Core Strategy, Policies H8 of the Replacement Knowsley UDP, and guidance provided by the Householder Development SPD.

HIGHWAYS

The property would be increased from a three-bed property to a four-bed property. At present, the application site has parking available for 1 vehicle on the driveway.

The Householder Development SPD advises that sufficient car parking should be retained or provided when erecting a first-floor side extension and a single storey front extension. The Householder Development SPD advises that the parking provision of a four-bedroom property should provide 3 spaces within the curtilage and that car spaces provided on front driveways should have dimensions of 5.0m x 3.0m.

At present, the application site benefits from a driveway to the side of the property for one vehicle. Drawing No. NPA 314.A05 indicates that the driveway would be extended to the front of the property to allow for three vehicles to parking within the curtilage. The new driveway would measure 5.0m x 9.3m, allowing for three parking spaces, each measuring 5.0m x 3.0m, to be provided within the curtilage. The proposed front extension has been reduced in depth from 1.2m to 0.6m, to ensure that this on-site parking could be achieved.

As the parking spaces would comply with the SPD's guidance, the proposal does not raise any highway safety concerns and is considered to be acceptable in this instance.

COAL CONSULTATION ZONE (LOW RISK AREA)

The application site is located within a Low-Risk Coal Consultation Zone. As such, the Coal Authorities Standing Advice will be included within the decision notice of this application.

Conclusion

The proposal would be acceptable in terms of any impacts on the residential and visual amenity and highway safety. The proposal also complies with the Knowsley Local Plan: Core Strategy, Replacement UDP Policies and guidance provided in the NPPF, and is therefore recommended for approval, subject to conditions.

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 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 extensions 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.

- 4) No part of the development hereby permitted shall be used or occupied until the proposed ground floor window (which would serve the W.C.) within the front elevation of the single storey side extension, the proposed first-floor window (which would serve the bathroom) within the side elevation of the two-storey side extension, and the proposed first-floor window (which would serve the en-suite) within the rear elevation of the two-storey part of the rear extension as indicated on Drawing No. NPA 314.A04 (REV B) have been glazed with obscure glass to level 4/5. The obscure glazing shall be retained thereafter.

Reason: In order to safeguard the residential amenities enjoyed by the occupants of neighbouring properties and to ensure the development complies with Policies CS2 and CS19 of the Knowsley Local Plan Core Strategy and Saved Policy H8 of the Knowsley Replacement Unitary Development Plan, adopted in June 2006, and the National Planning Policy Framework.

- 5) The parking provision shown within the curtilage of the dwelling on the approved plans shall be made of porous materials, or provision shall be made to direct run off water from the hard surface to a permeable or porous area or surface within the curtilage of the dwellinghouse. Prior to occupation of the extensions, the driveway must provide parking for three vehicles with each space measuring 5.0m x 3.0m. The parking provision shall be implemented and retained as such thereafter.

Reason: In the interests of highway and pedestrian safety, to reduce surface water run-off and to ensure the development complies with Policies CS19 and CS24 of the Knowsley Local Plan: Core Strategy, adopted January 2016.

SCHEDULE 1

Date Received	Ref. No	Version	Drawing/Document Title
12.06.2026	NPA 314.L01	-	LOCATION PLAN
12.06.2026	NPA 314.A03	-	PROPOSED FIRST FLOOR PLAN
04.08.2026	NPA 314.A05	-	PARKING DETAILS AND PROPOSED GROUND FLOOR PLAN
05.08.2026	NPA 314.A04	REV B	PROPOSED ELEVATIONS AND SECTION

Signed Case Officer¹: **Louise Robinson**

Signed Authorising Officer²: **Jo Sheridan**

Date: **06/08/2026**

Informatives

1. The proposed development lies within a coal mining area which may contain unrecorded coal mining related hazards. If any coal mining feature is encountered during development, this should be reported immediately to the Mining Remediation Authority on 0345 762 6846 or if a hazard is encountered on site call the emergency line 0800 288 4242.

Further information is also available on the Mining Remediation Authority website at: Mining Remediation Authority - GOV.UK

Standing Advice valid from 1st January 2025 until 31st December 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

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