

APPLICATION NO: 26/00285/FUL **CASE OFFICER:** Reece Black

WARD: Roby **PARISH:**

LOCATION: 34 Briar Drive, Roby, Knowsley

PROPOSAL: ERECTION OF A SINGLE STOREY FRONT AND SIDE
EXTENSION AND REAR EXTENSION

Site Description

The application site is located at 34 Briar Drive, Roby, and is situated within a Primary Residential Area in the Development Plan. The application property is a two-storey, semi-detached dwellinghouse.

The property benefits from a single storey 'wrap-around' side and rear extension. There is a single outbuilding to the bottom of the rear garden. The front garden area is predominately hard-surfaced in brick paving, capable of accommodating a minimum of 1 no. vehicles, with a small area of soft landscaping and bound by a small brick wall. Refuse bins are currently stored within adjacent the side elevation of the dwelling. The local area comprises of semi-detached dwellinghouses, which have been altered and extended in a range of ways.

Proposal

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

The proposed front porch and side extension would form a 'wrap-around layout' and would project forward from the original front elevation of the dwelling by 1m, with a width of 4.5m, it would then span a depth (parallel the party boundary shared with No.36) of 6.1m; the proposed side extension would have an additional width of 0.7m beyond the existing side and rear extension at the property. This element of the proposed development would be served by a pitched roof, which would measure 2.7m at the eaves and attain a maximum height of 4.6m to the ridgeline.

The proposed rear extension would 'square-off' the stepped rear elevations of the existing rear extensions, it would span a depth of 1.9m and a width of 3.8m. The proposed rear extension would be served by a pitched roof, which would measure 2.5m at the eaves and 4.7m at the tallest point (and tie into the ridgeline of the proposed front and side extension).

The proposed development has been amended since its original submission. These changes include the withdrawal of the first-floor aspect of the originally submitted two-storey side extension. The proposal would comprise only ground floor extensions; given that these revisions to the description and the proposed plans have lesser of material impact, it is therefore, not considered necessary to re-consult any originally consulted neighbours.

The submitted plan titled 'Parking and Bin Storage', received 14/08/2026 is for indicative purposes only and will not be an approved document.

Consultations

None required.

Representations

This application has been publicised by letters sent to 7 neighbours.

Two letters of objection have been received; however, they are both in objection from the same property.

Comprehensively, the letter(s) of objection raise concerns due to:

- Principle of development
- Visual and character impact – conflict with the two-storey policy requirements of the Householder Development SPD.
- References whether (specifically) paragraphs 6.4, 6.14, 6.15, 6.19 – 6.22 & 7.2 of the Householder Development have been complied with.
- Impacts from the proposal appearing overbearing and causing overshadowing, loss of daylight.
- Raises concern that No.36 has side facing windows serving habitable rooms at both ground and first floor level.
- Overdevelopment – the existing extensions and new extensions will make a total of 17 metres on ground floor.
- Queries as whether the scheme is deliverable as drawn as the eaves and guttering would over sail onto land of No.36, as would the foundation.
- No means of maintaining the new flank wall without entering our property.
- The proposed development would be insubordinate and disrupt the symmetry of the semi-detached dwelling and would not be a subordinate addition.

Amended plans were received on 14.08.2026 and following this a further objection (from the same property) was received on 27.08.2026 in response to these amended plans. The points of objection are summarised as:

- Reducing the side element from two storeys to one does little to change the impact of the proposal at 4.75 metres to the ridge and 2.4 meters to eaves, the amended element sits closer in scale to a two-storey form than anything that would ordinarily be understood as a single storey extension which conflicts with Policy CS19 of the Knowsley Local Plan: Core Strategy, which requires new development to respond to the scale, mass and form of its surroundings.
- The proposal does not appear to comply with 6.15, 6.14, 7.2 of the Householder Development SPD.
- The element continues forward of the host dwelling's design and the street scene which conflicts with 7.3 and 7.5 of the Householder Development SPD. This would be very visible from the street scene and would dominate the front elevation of the dwelling.
- The roof of the amended proposal is gabled, set against a host dwelling that is hipped. This conflicts with general design guidance at 6.5 and 6.12 of the Householder Development SPD which expects an extension's roofline to echo the original wherever an existing dwelling has a distinctive roof form.
- Residential amenity harm – the height, bulk and forward projection of the amended element continue to fall directly on the principal habitable room window serving No.36, reducing the light and outlook currently enjoyed at these windows and introducing an overbearing presence close to the shared boundary. The 45-degree rule test at 6.23 of the Householder Development

SPD exists precisely to identify this outcome, and the amended element, retaining the depth and siting now proposed, fails that test in the same way as the version it replaces. The amended plans address the height of the proposal rather than its relationship to the neighbouring property.

- Amenity concerns raised from the side window, although this window is indicated as obscure glazed, its position immediately adjacent to the boundary with No.36 conflicts with 6.21 of the Householder Development SPD, which does not permit windows abutting a boundary. Obscured glazing does not overcome the concerns of 6.21.
- Policy DP3 of the National Planning Policy Framework requires new development to respond positively to its context, built form and relationship to its surroundings, among the wider set of principles policy sets for achieving well-designed places, and provides that development conflicting with those principles without clear justification should be refused, with substantial weight given to compliance with relevant local design policies of this kind.
- The amended plans show only two refuse and recycling bins, whereas No.34 currently has five bins in active use, plans propose to store these against the boundary fence with No.36, conflicts with 6.25 of the Householder Development SPD. The proposed arrangements will cause issues with odour, visual clutter and nuisance for the occupiers of No.36. The proposed parking arrangements are also unresolved. The plans show parking within the front garden of No.34, an area which currently contains a tree and areas of planting and has no dropped kerb or vehicle crossing permitting vehicular access from the highway. Without a lawful and deliverable means of vehicular access, the parking plan shown on the plans cannot be relied upon.

The original objection(s) received from No.36 were predominately focused on the originally submitted proposal, which comprised a two-storey side extension. Since the application has been amended, the concerns related specifically to the two-storey side extension no longer are material to the assessment of the application. Any general outstanding material planning concerns or other specific points of concern raised within the objections received in response to the amended plans considered as part of the assessment of the application are set out within the report.

Planning History

No relevant recorded planning history.

Relevant Policy

Policy S3 (Presumption in favour of sustainable development) of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states that:

1. Decisions on development proposals should apply a presumption in favour of sustainable development. This means:
 - a. Policy S4 in this Framework should be applied when considering development proposals within settlements;
 - b. Outside settlements, policy S5 should be applied; and
 - c. In all locations, development proposals that accord with both an up-to-date

development plan and the decision-making policies in this Framework should be approved without delay.

Policy S4: Principle of development within settlements states that:

1. Development proposals within settlements should be approved unless the benefits of doing so would be substantially outweighed by any adverse effects, when assessed against the national decision-making policies in this Framework.

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.

The site is identified as a site allocated for housing development in the adopted Unitary Development Plan. As such, a domestic extension to the existing residential property is considered acceptable in principle, subject to compliance with local planning policy and guidance.

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

SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENTS (SPD's)

Householder Development (2016)

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

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 AND RESIDENTIAL AMENITY

6.19 of the Householder Development SPD states that *extensions must adequately protect your neighbours' right to enjoy their own home. Extensions must not overshadow or have an overbearing effect on neighbouring dwellings to an unacceptable degree.*

6.20 of the Householder Development SPD states that *windows in extensions should not directly overlook adjacent property in close proximity and should not allow overlooking into neighbours' dwellings.*

6.21 of the Householder Development SPD states that *windows abutting a boundary will not be allowed. These can prejudice future development at neighbouring dwellings and are particularly vulnerable to being blocked by fencing or vegetation on a neighbours' land. The only exception to this rule is where a conservatory is being built to abut a boundary where obscured glass will be used.*

The Householder Development SPD (5.5) defines what is considered a habitable room. *Main habitable rooms include lounge / living spaces, games rooms, studies, family rooms, morning rooms, kitchens and bedrooms. Non-habitable or minor habitable rooms include bathrooms, WCs, utility rooms and garages.*

Side extension:

The Householder Development SPD states that *single storey side extensions should be designed so that they preserve the street scene, protect light and privacy of neighbours and provide sufficient parking spaces.*

The proposed side extension would be erected within close proximity (0.15m) to the party boundary shared with No.36. Whilst the proposal would be immediately adjacent to the party boundary and tall in its scale and form, it would not result in any unacceptable harm to residential amenities. This is because, the side elevation of No.36 contains windows, which are understood at ground floor, to serve an entrance hallway and a store, and would be considered to be the most impacted windows as a result of the proposed side extension, are both obscurely-glazed and do not serve main habitable rooms. Therefore, it is not considered that the impact from the proposal would result in any unacceptable degree of harm to amenities.

The ground floor side elevation of No.36 also contains a secondary access door (containing transparent glass) which serves the hallway / entrance to the kitchen and there is also a transparent window to the front elevation of No.34's side and rear extension (approved under 06/00076/FUL), which is understood to serve the kitchen as shown on the approved plans for 06/00076/FUL and confirmed by the occupant of No.36. 6.23 of the Householder Development SPD stipulates that *extensions need to comply with the 45-degree rule and should be designed so as not to cross the 45-degree line from a neighbour's nearest habitable window. The 45-degree line is drawn in a horizontal plane and taken from the middle of the neighbour's window. The rule is designed to protect the amenities of neighbouring dwellings from overshadowing or obstruction of outlook. It is principally applied to extensions that project beyond the building line either at the front or rear.*

It is accepted that the proposed side extension would breach the 45-degree rule when taken from the window positioned to the front elevation of the side and rear extension of No.36 and whilst a kitchen is considered a main habitable room, this window is a small, secondary window and source of light. The primary, enlarged window is located to the rear elevation, which would not be affected by the proposal. It is accepted that there may be a partial and appreciable degree of overshadowing, loss of light and loss of outlook to and from the window located to the front elevation of No.34's side and rear extension and the window contained within the access door, however, given that these are not the primary windows, it would not be considered to result in significant, unacceptable levels of harm. Overall, the kitchen would still receive adequate daylight / sunlight. Moreover, whilst the proposed side extension, would be in close proximity to the boundary, it would not be immediately adjacent to the kitchen window, given that this window would be located circa 2.5m away from the proposal, would reduce the degree of overshadowing and loss of light to this window.

The proposed side extension would be served by an obscurely-glazed window to the side elevation. Whilst this would conflict with 6.21 of the Householder Development SPD, it would still comply with 7.3 of the SPD which advises against side windows in habitable rooms, however, as covered within 5.5, a bathroom / toilet is not considered a habitable room and moreover would not prejudice any potential future development at No.36 as the proposed window does not serve a habitable room. Therefore, this proposed window to the side elevation of the proposed side extension would not be considered to result in any significant harm, given that it would be constructed with obscure-glazing (which would be further secured by way of condition). Furthermore, the windows it would be directly orientated toward, would be the non-habitable, obscurely-glazed windows of the entrance hallway and the store. Therefore, for these reasons, this proposed window would not facilitate any direct overlooking between the application property and No.36. The closest habitable windows, (as set out earlier within the report) serve the kitchen, at an oblique angle and therefore, would ensure no direct overlooking or privacy concerns are raised.

Despite the proximity to the boundary and height of the proposal, it would not result in any appreciable impact to amenities to the first-floor windows. Furthermore, these windows serve the upstairs hallway landing and a bathroom, so the proposal would not be considered to raise significant concern to amenities or privacy at first-floor.

The objection(s) received also state that the proposed front and side extension will project beyond the front door of No.36. It is not considered that a significant degree of overshadowing would occur to this area, given it is not immediately adjacent the party boundary and the front projection is limited in its depth. Furthermore, the front entrance to the property is not considered a habitable room and any limited impacts would not be considered detrimentally adverse. Therefore, these reasons demonstrate how the proposal would be considered to comply with 6.19 of the Householder Development SPD and protect residential amenities. The front extension is assessed in more detail below.

The Householder Development SPD outlines that *extensions should normally have a pitched roof for aesthetic reason. Wherever possible, the angle of the pitch of the new roof should match that of the original dwelling. However, flat or lower-pitched roofs may be preferable in those circumstances where a matching style of roof would cause loss of light for neighbours or can be justified in design terms.*

The proposed development overall would be served by pitched roofs. Whilst it would differ from the main hipped roof found on the property, it would still ensure that the

proposal would be served by a pitched roof, in oppose to a flat roof, and therefore would be considered to result in an acceptable design.

At present, refuse bins are stored to the side of the dwelling. The agent has provided a site plan to show these would be stored within the front garden area. Other properties in the street scene which have removed external access to the side and rear of their properties store their refuse bins to the front of dwellings. It is noted that the submitted plan showing refuse bin storage does not show the 5 no. bins utilised by the applicant, however, it is considered there is sufficient space in the front garden area for the storage of refuse bins. It is not considered incongruous for refuse bins to be stored within front garden areas or adjacent party boundary treatments and therefore no severely adverse residential amenity concerns are raised. It is accepted that visually bins can have an adverse impact to visual amenities, however, for the reasons set out and the fact there is sufficient distance from the highway, the application would not warrant a refusal on these grounds. Therefore, the proposed bin storage arrangements would not be considered detrimental to the street scene.

Front extension:

The Householder Development SPD stipulates that front extensions and porches can be particularly prominent in the street scene and should be particularly carefully designed to retain the character of residential areas. Style, design, materials and scale of front extensions and porches should respect the character of the surrounding residential area. Account should be taken of the building line, although, for example, small porches and canopies of a satisfactory design in materials projecting in front of the building line will normally be permitted.

The proposed front extension would be a modest in scale, form and massing and a subordinate addition to the dwelling. Although the proposed front extension would moderately project beyond the established front building line of the properties in the street scene, due to its modest scale, form and retained distance from the highway, it would not appear significantly prominent in the street scene and would not significantly disrupt the building. Similar No's 21 and 22 benefit from modest front extensions and therefore, the proposed front extension would not appear incongruous within the street scene or harm the wider character of the area.

Rear extension:

The Householder Development SPD states 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 and 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. A single storey rear extension located on or immediately adjacent to the party boundary with a neighbouring dwelling will normally be acceptable if it does not project more than 4m from the rear elevation of the existing dwelling.

The proposed rear extension would project 1.9m from the rear elevation and would square-off the existing stepped arrangement to the rear of the property. The proposed rear extension would therefore comply with the Householder Development SPD. This element of the proposal is small and modest in scale and would not give way to any issues from overshadowing or visual intrusion given that any openings are concentrated to the rear.

Materials:

The existing property is a combination of brick and render facing, with brown, interlocking roof tiles and white UPVC openings. The submitted plans contain annotations on materials, which stipulate that external materials would be to match the existing exterior. This includes the brickwork design to the porch. Matching materials would be further secured by a condition.

HIGHWAYS

At present, the application property can accommodate 1 no. vehicle within the curtilage of the dwelling. The proposed development would not increase the number of bedrooms at the property and although the front and side 'wrap-around' extension would project forward by 1m, which would reduce some of the hardstanding to the front of the dwelling, sufficient hardstanding would remain to accommodate the existing level of parking provision. The existing vehicular access and dropped kerb would remain in use, an informative will be added for the benefit of the applicant should they wish to extend the existing vehicular access. Therefore, the proposed development would be acceptable on highway safety and parking considerations.

OTHER ISSUES:

OBJECTIONS(s)

The objection(s) received raise concern on encroachment. This matter has been discussed with the applicant / agent who have confirmed that the proposal would not result in encroachment and have submitted Certificate A. An informative will be included to remind the applicant that the proposal should result in any encroachment onto neighbouring land.

The principle of development has been covered within the report and householder extension / alterations to an existing dwellinghouse are considered acceptable, subject to compliance with relevant policy and guidance.

The objection(s) relate to specifically 6.4 of the Householder Development SPD, mainly on the scale of the proposal and assert that it would be overdevelopment due to the increase in floor space. It is acknowledged that when considering the cumulative works of the previous extensions and the proposal being assessed that this would result in a comprehensive wrap-around to the front, side and rear, the proposal has been assessed on each individual element and consideration has been given to the front, side and rear aspects. The proposal would still be considered to be a subordinate addition, from the street scene, the front porch and side extension would appear readily visible, however, given that the proposed side extension would measure at less than half the width of the original dwelling, it is considered that this aspect would be acceptable; the front extension is modest in projection (at 1m) and cumulatively, from the street scene it would not present as an unsympathetic or out of scale extension. The rest of the proposed works would be adequately screened and not readily visible in and from the street scene and consequently, no impacts to visual amenities or character of the wider area would be raised.

Reference is made to the space between dwellings being protected and preventing the creation of a terracing effect. The proposed development, although tall in scale and form, has been assessed as a single storey side extension. The proposal would not result in any creation of a terracing effect between the application property and its adjacent dwelling (No.36), even if the neighbouring property were to erect a two-

storey side extension and the proposal retains a subordinate form and massing to the main dwelling. Whilst it is desirable for regular spacing (and 6.15 of the SPD states that *extensions should take account of any regular spacing between buildings or in the front line of buildings*) in the street context, multiple properties have erected side extensions (predominately at ground floor) and subsequently, the proposed development would not have any detrimental impact on the character of the area.

Overall, despite the cumulative increase to the dwelling, it would not be considered overdevelopment of the property, and the scale would remain subordinate to the original dwelling. Whilst there would be a change to the appearance of the dwelling and its paired semi-detached property, it is for the reasons above that the scale of the works would not result in any great harm to the symmetrical appearance of the semi-detached dwelling, this is further supported by the fact that several properties in the street scene feature a range of extensions to sides of properties, that any impact from the proposal would not raise a significant concern on design terms or visual amenities to the street scene.

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. For the avoidance of doubt this will include any brick detailing of the existing building being carried over and emulated to the external elevations of the proposed development, hereby permitted.

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 window on the west facing side elevation has been glazed with obscure glass to level 4/5 as shown on the elevations of the proposed plan titled 'PROPOSED PLANS AND ELEVATIONS', Dwg.No. 02 REV C, date received, 14/08/2026. This window annotated as 'frosted glass window to

shower room' shall be retained as such with level 4/5 obscure glazing at all times thereafter.

Reason: In order to safeguard the residential amenities enjoyed by the occupants of adjoining residential property 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.

SCHEDULE 1

Date Received	Ref. No	Version	Drawing/Document Title
04/07/2026	LP1	-	LOCATION PLAN
14/08/2026	02 REV C	REV C	PROPOSED PLANS AND ELEVATIONS

Signed Case Officer¹: Reece Black

Signed Authorising Officer²: Jo Sheridan

Date: 28/08/2026

Informatives

- 1 The granting of planning permission does not confer consent to encroach on any neighbours land and would be a civil matter between the affected parties. Consideration should be given to this in respect of any gutters potentially overhanging over shared boundaries.
- 2 It is an offence to carry out any works within the public highway without the permission of the Highway Authority. This permission requires the construction, improvement or alteration of an access to the public highway. Under Section 184 of the Highways Act 1980, the Highway Authority must specify the works to be carried out. Only the Highway Authority or a contractor approved by the Highway Authority may carry out these works. For the avoidance of doubt, the applicant is advised that the widening of the vehicular dropped kerb must be undertaken by Knowsley Council's approved contractor, Tarmac.

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

Contact details:

Email: Knowsley.highways@tarmac.com

Telephone: 0800 023 2334