

<u>APPLICATION NO:</u>	25/00538/FUL	<u>CASE OFFICER:</u>	Louise Robinson
<u>WARD:</u>	Roby	<u>PARISH:</u>	N/A
<u>LOCATION:</u>	1A Roby Mount Avenue, Roby, Knowsley, L36 4HP		
<u>PROPOSAL:</u>	ERECTION OF A SINGLE STOREY SIDE AND REAR EXTENSION, TWO-STOREY FRONT EXTENSION, FIRST-FLOOR REAR EXTENSION AND NEW PITCHED ROOF TO PROPERTY, TOGETHER WITH THE DEMOLITION OF THE EXISTING GARAGE, CONSERVATORY, FRONT EXTENSION AND CHIMNEY STACK.		

Site Description

The property is a two-storey 3-bedroom detached dwelling located on the cul-de-sac of Roby Mount Avenue, Roby. The dwellinghouse is characterised by a mixture of white render and white-painted brick, a gable tiled roof with 1 dormer window to the rear roof plane and white UPVC windows with black exterior shutter details. There is also a brick chimney stack to the north-side elevation (side of 3 Roby Mount Avenue).

The property previously benefited from an extension to the front, a garage to the side and conservatory to the rear. However, at the point of carrying out a site visit on 14 November 2025, these features had been demolished.

The property also has a large 'in and out' curved driveway to the front of the property.

Proposal

Planning permission is sought for the erection of a single storey extension to the side and rear, a two-storey extension to the front, a first-floor extension to the rear, and a new pitched roof to the property, following the demolition of the existing garage, conservatory, front extension and chimney stack.

Single storey side extension

The single storey side extension would have a total length of 19.3m and a width of 3.5m. The extension would project beyond the existing rear elevation by 11.9m.

The roof height has been amended as of 26 November 2025. The extension would now have a pitched tiled roof with an eaves height of 2.6m and a ridge height of 3.5m, which would decrease to 3.1m towards the rear of the extension.

The extension would have a rendered masonry finish to match the existing dwellinghouse and would have a garage door installed within the front elevation, and UPVC bi-fold doors, 1 UPVC access door and 1 UPVC window installed within the south-side elevation (side of 1 Roby Mount Avenue).

The extension would allow for a new garage, tv lounge, gym and storeroom.

Single storey rear extension

The single storey rear extension would have a projection of 3.4m beyond the existing rear elevation and a width of 9.6m.

The extension would have a flat roof with 2 roof-lanterns installed with a height of 2.9m (total height of 3.4m when including the roof lanterns).

The extension would have a rendered masonry finish to match the existing dwellinghouse and would have UPVC bi-fold doors and 1 UPVC window installed within the rear elevation.

The extension would allow for a new kitchen / dining area.

Two-storey front extension

The two-storey front extension would have a projection of 2m beyond the existing front elevation and a width of 3.1m.

The extension would have a pitched tiled roof with an eaves height of 4.9m and a ridge height of 6.7m.

The extension would be finished in a mixture of brick to the front and side elevations and rendered masonry to the front elevation. The extension would also have an aluminium security door within the front elevation, 1 window the south-side elevation and 1 window within the north-side elevation.

The extension would allow for a new entry into the hallway and would allow the landing to be extended at first-floor level.

First-floor rear extension

The first-floor rear extension would not project beyond the existing rear elevation of the property and would have a width of 9.9m (matching the width of the existing dwellinghouse).

The extension would have a pitched tiled roof (in connection with the replacement roof to the property) with an eaves height of 5m and a ridge height of 7.3m).

The extension would have a rendered masonry finish to match the existing dwellinghouse and would have 3 UPVC windows installed within the rear elevation.

The extension would allow for the first-floor to be re-configured to have 4 bedrooms, bathroom, en-suite and storeroom.

Other alterations

Other alterations to the property include a new gable roof to the property which would be finished in smooth faced concrete interlocking tiles with a ridge height of 7.3m.

An additional UPVC window and UPVC door (at ground floor level) and 1 UPVC window at first-floor level would be installed within the south-side elevation (side of 1 Roby Mount Avenue).

Consultations

None required.

Representations

This application has been publicised by letters sent to 9 neighbours. 1 objection was received as a result of the publicity given to the application.

The objection received outlined the following concerns:

1. Excessive height on the boundary (4.2m roof height proposed)
2. Overbearing and enclosing impact
3. Significant loss of natural light
4. The extension is not in accordance with council and national guidance.

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
Ensuring a Choice of Travel SPD
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

Saved Policy H8 in the Replacement Unitary Development Plan (2006) states that proposals for extensions to dwellings, or for the erection of enlargement of domestic garages and outbuildings, 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 to be 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 to highway users by obstructing visibility for pedestrians or drivers of motor vehicles.
- e) Adequate parking and garden space would remain for use by the residents of the extended property.

Principle of Development

The application site is identified as being allocated as a Primarily Residential Area in the Knowsley Local Plan: Core Strategy. As such, the domestic extensions and alterations are considered to be acceptable in principle, subject to compliance with local planning policy and guidance.

Residential Amenity

Single storey side extension

The Householder Development SPD advises 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 single storey side extension would have a width of 3.5m and a total length of 19.3m. The extension would project beyond the existing rear elevation by 11.9m.

The side extension would have a mono pitched roof towards the front of the extension and a dual-pitched roof towards the rear of the extension. As the proposed roof-profile would match that of the new roof to the dwelling, the roof-profile is considered to be acceptable.

Considering the impact on the neighbouring property to the left 1 Roby Mount Avenue, the extension would be located away from No.1 and therefore would have no impact on the amenity of the neighbouring dwelling. Whilst the extension would project beyond the rear elevation of No.1 by 14.2m, the extension would not exceed the 45-degree rule and is considered to be acceptable.

Considering the impact on the neighbouring property to the right 3 Roby Mount Avenue, due to a change in orientation of the neighbouring dwelling, the proposed side extension would project between 4.1m – 7.7m beyond the front elevation of No.3, causing the 45-degree principle to be applied. When measuring a 45-degree angle from the nearest habitable window of No.3, the existing dwelling on the application site itself breached the 45-degree rule. Additionally, the footprint of the extension to the side of the dwelling (excluding the rear projection) would be similar to that of the existing garage and car-port covered structure. The extension would be situated approximately 1.5m away from the shared boundary with No.3, and a further 3.1m to the side elevation of the neighbouring dwelling (at its closest point due to the shape of the neighbouring plot). There are 2 windows located within the side elevation of No.3 at ground floor level which serve a snug room and a family room (as per planning reference 19/0049/FUL). Both of these are considered to be habitable rooms. Whilst the extension would have some impact on both of these windows, there is a further window to the front elevation of the property which serves the snug room and bi-fold doors within the rear elevation which serve the family room. As such, any impact on light into these habitable rooms would be mitigated, due to the additional light sources within the front and rear elevations. Additionally, this impact is not considered enough to warrant the refusal of the application.

The additional bi-fold doors, 1 access door and 1 window within the south-side elevation of the extension raise no overlooking concerns, as they would look out onto the application sites own rear garden. Additionally, the fenestrations would be situated approximately 12.8m away from the shared boundary with No.1, and as such raise no concerns.

The doors and window to be installed would be UPVC. The materials would match the materials of the existing fenestrations found at the dwelling and are acceptable in this instance.

Therefore, the 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 H8 and guidance provided by the Householder Development SPD.

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 single storey rear extension would have a projection of 3.4m beyond the existing rear elevation and a width of 3.9m. As such, the extension would comply with the Householder Development SPD in terms of its projection.

The rear extension would have a flat roof with 2 roof-lanterns installed. As the extension would not be visible from the wider street scene, the proposed roof-profile is considered to be acceptable and would not negatively impact the visual amenity.

Considering the impact on the neighbouring property to the left 1 Roby Mount Avenue, the extension would project beyond the rear elevation of No.1 by 5.7m, as this would exceed the SPD's guidance, there is a requirement to apply the 45-degree rule. After measuring the 45-degree line from the mid-point of the neighbouring dwellings bi-fold doors, the extension would not breach the 45-degree rule. As such, it is considered that the proposed extension would not have a negative impact on the amenity of No.1 and would be acceptable.

Considering the impact on the neighbouring property to the right 3 Roby Mount Avenue, the extension would not project beyond the rear elevation of No.3, as it would be situated behind the proposed side extension. As such, the extension would not have a negative impact on the amenity of No.3 and would be acceptable.

The proposed rear extension would not be visible from the wider street scene of Roby Mount Avenue, as it would be situated behind the existing dwellinghouse. The extension would have a rendered masonry finish to match the wider dwellinghouse. As the materials would match that of the wider dwellinghouse, the extension is considered to be acceptable in visual terms.

The additional bi-fold doors and 1 window raise no overlooking concerns due to boundary treatments, ground floor sitting and orientation of the fenestration within the rear elevation of the extension.

The doors and window to be installed would be UPVC. The materials would match the materials of the existing fenestrations found at the dwelling and are acceptable in this instance.

Therefore, the 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 H8 and guidance provided by the Householder Development SPD.

Two-storey front extension

The Householder Development SPD states 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. It also advises that the style, design, materials and scale of front extensions and porches should respect the character of the surrounding residential area.

The proposed front extension would have a projection of 2m beyond the existing front elevation and a width of 3.1m.

The extension would have a pitched tiled roof. As the existing dwelling's roof-profile would be a new pitched tiled roof, the proposed roof-profile is considered to be

acceptable.

Considering the impact on the neighbouring property to the left 1 Roby Mount Avenue, the application site is set back significantly from the front elevation of the neighbouring dwelling, and as such the proposed front extension would not have a negative impact on the residential amenity of No.1 and would be acceptable.

Considering the impact on the neighbouring property to the right 3 Roby Mount Avenue, due to a change in orientation between the application site and No.3, the proposed front extension would have no impact on the residential amenity of No.3 and would be acceptable.

The front extension would be visible from the wider street scene of Roby Mount Avenue. The extension would be finished in a mixture of brick to the front and side elevations and rendered masonry to the front elevation. As the material of rendered masonry would match that of the existing dwellinghouse, and brick finishes can be found within the locality, the extension is considered to be acceptable in visual terms.

The door and window within the front elevation raise no overlooking concerns due to their ground floor siting and would not create any additional views not already available from the front of the dwellinghouse.

The door to be installed would be an aluminium security door and the windows would be UPVC. They would match the materials of the existing fenestrations found at the dwelling and are acceptable in this instance. The introduction of an aluminium security door raises no concerns, as aluminium is becoming a common material to be used for fenestrations and given a similar design finish to that of UPVC.

Therefore, the two-storey front 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 H8 and guidance provided by the Householder Development SPD.

First-floor 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 two-storey rear extensions (or in this case first-floor rear extension) of up to 3.0m will normally be acceptable and should not come within 7.0m from the rear boundary.

The extension would have a pitched tiled roof. As the existing dwelling's roof-profile would be a new pitched tiled roof, the proposed roof-profile is considered to be acceptable

The first-floor rear extension would not project beyond the existing rear elevation of the property and would have a width of 9.9m to match that of the existing dwellinghouse. Additionally, the extension would be set approximately 18.2m away from the rear site boundary. As such, the extension would comply with the Householder Development SPD in terms of its projection and distance from the rear boundary.

Considering the impact on the neighbouring property to the left No.1 Roby Mount

Avenue, the extension would project 2.3m beyond the rear elevation of No.1, due to the application site being set back from the rear elevation of the neighbouring dwelling. As the extension would sit in-line with that of the existing ground floor of the application site and the projection meets the guidance provided by the SPD, the proposed extension would not have a negative impact on the amenity of the neighbouring dwelling and would be acceptable.

Considering the impact on the neighbouring property to the right No.3 Roby Mount Avenue, the proposed first-floor rear extension would be situated approximately 8.1m away from the side elevation of No.3 at its closest point. The first-floor extension would not increase the existing footprint of the dwelling in any way; it would simply in-fill the property at first-floor level to be on-line with the existing rear elevation. The extension would not breach the 45-degree rule any more than the existing dwellinghouse. Additionally, whilst the extension may have some impact on the first-floor window within the front elevation of No.3 which serves a bedroom, this room benefits from a further window within the side elevation at first-floor level. As such, any impact on light into this habitable room would be mitigated, due to the additional light sources within the side elevation.

Considering the impact on the neighbouring property to the rear No. 2 Eaton Close, there would be an interface distance of approximately 22m-23m between the rear elevation of the application site and the rear elevation of No.2. Appendix 4 of the New Residential Development SPD advises that 'development should retain 22 metre interface distances between existing rear principal elevations and proposed principal elevations for two-storey properties'. It is noted that the property to the rear is a single storey bungalow. Whilst a total of 3 windows are proposed within the rear elevation of the extension, 1 would serve a bathroom and would be conditioned to ensure that obscure glazing is installed for privacy. The window that would serve the new 4th bedroom raises no overlooking concerns as the window would not create any additional viewing output not already available from the previous dormer window which served the 3rd bedroom. Whilst the new window which would serve the 3rd bedroom would create a new viewing outlook from the property, given that there would be an interface distance of 22m – 23m, this new window does not raise any overlooking concerns.

The proposed first-floor rear extension would be slightly visible from the wider street scene of Roby Mount Avenue. The extension would have a rendered masonry finish to match the wider dwellinghouse. As the materials would match that of the wider dwellinghouse, the extension is considered to be acceptable in visual terms.

The windows to be installed would be UPVC. The materials would match the materials of the existing fenestrations found at the dwelling and are acceptable in this instance.

Therefore, the first-floor 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 H8 and guidance provided by the Householder Development SPD and New Residential Development SPD.

Other alterations

An additional window and door are to be installed within the south-side elevation of the dwelling at ground-floor level. The window would serve a shower room, and the door would serve a utility room. As both of these rooms are considered to be non-habitable, a condition will be included to ensure that obscure glazing would be installed to protect the privacy and amenity of both the application site and

neighbouring dwelling No.1.

1 window is to be installed within the south-side elevation of the dwelling at first-floor level which would serve an ensuite. This new window raises no overlooking concerns as a condition will be included to ensure that that obscure glazing would be installed to protect privacy and amenity.

The windows to be installed would be UPVC. The materials would match the materials of the existing fenestrations found at the dwelling and are acceptable in this instance.

The new gable roof to the property would be finished in smooth faced concrete interlocking tiles and would have a ridge height of 7.3m. The ridge height would increase the existing height by 0.3m and would be set back from the previous ridge by approximately 1.2m. The roof would have a pitched design and would be incorporated into the new first-floor rear extension. As the previous roof type was an 'irregularly designed' pitched roof, this new roof would give a design of a standard pitched roof you would expect a standard dwellinghouse to have. As such, the proposed roof-profile is considered to be acceptable

Highways

The Householder Development SPD advises that sufficient car parking should be retained or provided when erecting a side extension or front extension. The SPD outlines that the parking provision for a 4+ bedroom property should provide 3 spaces within the curtilage.

The SPD states that car spaces provided on front drives should have dimensions of at least 5.0m x 3.0m. The existing driveway is a large, curved 'in and out' driveway to the front of the dwellinghouse. The driveway has a minimum of 3 parking spaces plus additional parking for more vehicles.

As there is amply off-street parking available to the front of the dwellinghouse, it is considered that that the proposal would not have any negative impacts on highway safety and would be in accordance with the Householder Development SPD and Policy H8 of the Replacement UDP.

Other Matters – Neighbour Objection

1 objection was received as a result of the publicity given to the application.

The points raised within the objection have been addressed within this report, however for clarity they will be further addressed within this section.

1. Extension height on the boundary (4.2m proposed).

The application has been amended as of 26 November 2025 to reduce the height of the proposed side extension from 4.2m to 3.5m at its highest ridge point. Additionally, the roof towards the rear of the extension has also been reduced to a height of 3.1m, to reduce any negative impacts the extension may have on the neighbouring property.

2. Overbearing and enclosing impact.

Whilst it is noted that the extension will have some impact on the ground floor windows within the side elevation of the neighbouring property which serve the snug room and family room, as there is a further window to the front elevation of the

property which serves the snug room and bi-fold doors within the rear elevation which serve the family room. As such, any impact on light into these habitable rooms would be mitigated, due to the additional light sources within the front and rear elevations.

3. Significant loss of light

Whilst there would be some loss of light, as the rooms stated above are served by further fenestrations, it is considered that any impact on light into these habitable rooms would be mitigated.

4. Council and national guidance.

The proposed single storey side extension is considered to comply with local planning policy, as per the reasons outlined within this report.

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 development hereby permitted shall have a rendered masonry finish to the proposed extensions and wider full exterior of the property and the proposed front porch extension shall have a mixture of a brick / rendered masonry finish, as stated within the Application Form.

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 which would serve the shower room and door which would serve the utility room within the south-side elevation at ground floor level and proposed window which would serve the en-suite within this south-side elevation at first-floor level as indicated on Drawing No. A1549 P 02 (REV C) has been glazed with obscure glass to level 4/5. The obscure glazing shall be retained as such 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.

SCHEDULE 1

Date Received	Ref. No	Version	Drawing/Document Title
25/09/2025	A1549 01		Site and Location Plans
04/12/2025	A1549 P 01	REV B	Proposed Plans
26/11/2025	A1549 P 02	REV C	Proposed Elevations

Signed Case Officer¹: **Louise Robinson**

Signed Authorising Officer²: **Jo Sheridan**

Date: **04/12/2025**

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

Site Photographs



