

APPLICATION NO: 25/00187/FUL **CASE OFFICER:** Andrew Hunt

WARD: Swanside **PARISH:** N/A

LOCATION: 13 Church Road, Roby, Knowsley, L36 9TL

PROPOSAL: ERECTION OF A TWO STOREY SIDE EXTENSION TOGETHER
WITH A SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION AND A FRONT
CANOPY

Site Description

The application site is a semi -detached house set within a rectangular site in a residential area at Church Road, Roby. The site is bounded by residential properties to the north, south, west and east. There is a church (St Bartholomews) and cemetery further to the south.

Proposal

The proposal is for the erection of a two storey side extension together with a single storey rear extension and a front canopy.

- The two storey side extension would be 8.7 metres long, 2.6 metres wide and 7.1 metres high.
- The single storey rear extension would be 5.5 metres wide, 4.1 metres long and 3.8 metres tall.
- The canopy would extend 1.6 metres in front of the house and would be 5.6 metres wide.

Consultations

N/A

Representations

This application has been publicised by letters sent to 5 neighbours. No representations have been received.

Planning History

07/00643/FUL - ERECTION OF SINGLE STOREY EXTENSION TO REAR OF DWELLING AND TWO STOREY TO SIDE TOGETHER WITH ERECTION OF SINGLE STOREY EXTENSION TO FRONT OF EXISTING GARAGE TOGETHER WITH PORCH – approved 16/08/2025

15/00641/FUL - ERECTION OF PART TWO STOREY AND PART SINGLE STOREY

WRAPAROUND EXTENSION TO FRONT, SIDE AND REAR. – approved
10.02.2016

16/00534/FUL - ERECTION OF TWO STOREY SIDE AND SINGLE STOREY
FRONT AND REAR EXTENSIONS – approved 14.10.2016

21/00157/FUL - ERECTION OF TWO STOREY SIDE AND SINGLE STOREY
FRONT AND REAR EXTENSIONS (RESUBMISSION OF 16/00534/FUL) –
approved 30.03.2021

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that accord with an up-to-date development plan without delay; or where the development plan is absent, silent or out of date planning permission should be granted unless the application of policies in the NPPF that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a clear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

H5 – Development within Primarily Residential Areas

H8 - Extensions and Alterations to Residential Properties

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

Identical versions of the two storey side and single storey rear extensions have been previously approved twice (16/00534/FUL and 21/00157/FUL). There has been no significant change to planning policy or guidance regarding household extensions. The only change from these applications is the front canopy, which is a new element.

Character of Area

For two storey side extensions, the householder SPD requires a set back at first floor level by 1m or a minimum of 1 metre space is left at the side of the extension on the boundary with the neighbour. The proposal complies with this as it would be set back 1 metre from the side boundary and 0.8 metres from the front. No terracing effect would result from the proposal.

The two storey side extension would be pitched like the existing roof, and would be consistent with the character of the area. The front canopy and rear extension would also have a pitched roof which would match the existing main dwelling.

Overall, there would be no harm to the character of the area.

Neighbour Amenity

15 Church Road

In relation to 15 Church Road, the two storey extension would be on the opposite side of the house, the single storey rear extension would also be on the opposite side of the house and away from the boundary. The front canopy would be small scale and would not affect their amenity.

11 Church Road

The New Residential SPD states that a Principal elevation to gable should be a minimum of 12 metres. Whilst the side of 11 is not strictly a principal elevation, it does have main habitable room windows at first floor level. Therefore, the guidance is considered of relevance.

In relation to 11 Church Road, it is understood that there are first floor habitable room windows on the side of 11 which face number 13. The side window of 11 would be around 6.8 metres away from the extension. This contrasts to the current first floor landing window of 13 which is a further 1.75 metres away (8.55 metres away) but allows direct views of the habitable rooms of 11.

The extension would result in loss of light and outlook to the habitable room windows on 11, but would result in a gain in privacy as a landing window located 8.55 metres away would be replaced by a blank gable located 6.8 metres away. The proposed roof is sloped rather than a gable end, this reduces impact and still allows sufficient light and outlook for the side window of 11. This distance is considered just about acceptable in relation to a blank gable, given the hipped roof proposed. However, it would not be acceptable in relation to a window due to privacy concerns. Therefore, a condition will be attached to remove permitted development rights for windows for this side elevations.

A material consideration is that the same extension has been granted permission twice, (in 2016 and 2021). The current proposal is the same as the previous applications in relation to the two storey side extension and impact on 11.

Overall, the two storey side extension would not result in harm to the amenity of 11, as the slight reduction in light and outlook is outweighed by the gain in privacy, resulting in neutral impact overall.

The single storey rear extension and front canopy will have lesser impact on 11 and would not harm, the amenity, or outlook of 11.

Parking

In relation to parking, there are currently 2 parking spaces for a 3 bed house. There is a garage, however, this measures 2.35m by 4.85 m which is below the minimum space standard for a garage, therefore the garage does not count as a parking space.

Para 7.10 of the Householder Development SPD states that "Garages will normally count as contributing to the car parking provision where their internal dimensions are sufficient to allow them to be satisfactorily used as such. Minimum internal dimensions of 5.5m x 2.75m".

The extension would create an additional bedroom, however, the 2 existing parking spaces would be unaffected. Whilst 2 spaces would be slightly below the standard of 3 spaces for a 4 bedroom dwelling, it would not cause significant harm to highway safety.

Overall, there would be no changes proposed in relation to parking as existing arrangements would be unaffected. There would still be room for 2 parking spaces. Therefore, there would not be significant harm to highway safety.

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. Location Plan - (received 22/04/2025).
- b. Proposed Plans and Elevations - (received 22/04/2025).

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 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.

- 4) Permitted Development

Notwithstanding the provisions of Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that order), no windows shall be inserted in the side elevation of the two storey side extension hereby permitted at first floor level.

Reason: In the interests of privacy having regard to policy CS19 of the Knowsley Local Plan Core Strategy, adopted January 2016, and saved policy H8 of the Knowsley Replacement Unitary Development Plan, adopted June 2006.

Signed Case Officer¹:

Andrew Hunt

**Signed Authorising
Officer²:**

Jo Sheridan

Date:

23/05/2025

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