

APPLICATION NO: 26/00118/FUL

CASE OFFICER: Kate Pickles

WARD: St Gabriels

PARISH:

LOCATION: 103 St Johns Road, Huyton, Knowsley, L36 0UT

PROPOSAL: ERECTION OF A SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION TOGETHER WITH THE REMOVAL OF THE EXISTING REAR PORCH.

Site description

The application property is a single storey, semi-detached dwellinghouse within a rectangular plot fronting on to St Johns Road. The property is situated within a Primarily Residential Area in the Local Plan Policies Map, and the wider area is characterised by semi-detached and detached residential properties. The application property features a rear garden comprising of hard and soft landscaping. The attached neighbouring property No.101 St Johns Drive has a similar rear extension as the one proposed and the detached neighbouring property No.105 St Johns Road has a detached rear outhouse.

Proposal

The existing rear porch would be removed and replaced by the proposed rear extension. The proposed extension would be 9.4m in width and would feature a flat roof which would be 2.9m in height. The roof would be served by a glazed lantern which would protrude by 0.3m. Following the removal of the existing rear porch, the proposed extension would project 5.7m from the set back rear elevation of the main dwelling and 3m from the set forward rear elevation of the main dwelling. The proposed extension would be used as a bedroom and a dining room.

Consultations

None required.

Representations

This application was published by way of site notice and through letters sent to 6 neighbours. No representations have been received as a result of this publicity.

Planning history

No relevant planning history.

Relevant policy

Paragraph 11 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states that 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that accord with an up-to-date development plan without delay; or where the development plan is absent, silent or out of date, planning permission should be granted unless the application of policies in the NPPF that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a clear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 as a whole.

Paragraph 12 of the NPPF clarifies that the presumption in favour of sustainable development does not change the statutory status of the development plan as the starting point for decision making. Where a planning application conflicts with an up-to-date development plan, permission should not normally be granted. Local Planning Authorities may take decisions that depart from an up-to-date development plan, but only if material considerations in a particular case indicate that the plan should not be followed.

The development plan in Knowsley comprises the Saved Policies of the Replacement Unitary Development Plan, the Core Strategy Local Plan and the Joint Waste Local Plan. The following policies are relevant to the determination of this application.

KNOWSLEY LOCAL PLAN: CORE STRATEGY

CS2 – Development Principles

CS19 – Design Quality and Accessibility in New Development

SAVED POLICIES – KNOWSLEY REPLACEMENT UNITARY DEVELOPMENT PLAN

H5 – Development within Primarily Residential Areas

H8 – Extensions and Alterations to Residential Properties

SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENTS

Design Quality in New Development SPD

Householder Development SPD

Article 35 statement

The local planning authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by assessing the proposal against all material considerations, including planning policies and any representations received and subsequently determining to grant planning permission in accordance with the presumption in favour of sustainable development, as set out within the National Planning Policy Framework.

Assessment

Neighbouring amenity

The Householder Development SPD states that *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 extension would be located 150mm from the boundary of the neighbouring property No. 101 and would project 5.7m from the set back rear elevation of the main dwelling. While this is greater than the projection advised in the SPD, the proposed extension would project 1m beyond the existing rear extension of No.101, this means the proposal would not appear unduly dominant and the neighbouring properties access to light would be maintained. Given the modest projection beyond the neighbouring extension, the proposal would not appear visually intrusive or impact neighbouring amenity in terms of overshadowing or loss of outlook and is therefore considered acceptable.

The existing rear porch projects 4.6m from the setback rear elevation. Given that the proposed extension would project 1.1m more than the existing porch, the impact on neighbouring residential amenity is considered negligible due to the single-storey nature of the development and its modest additional projection beyond the existing built form.

The Householder Development SPD also 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.* The proposed extension complies with this guidance as the windows to the rear do not give rise to any privacy concerns via overlooking due to their ground floor positioning, existing boundary treatments and the considerable distance from rear neighbours. No windows are proposed to the side elevation, so the appearance of overlooking is minimised. The neighbouring property at No. 101 also benefits from a rear extension of similar proportions to that proposed. As such, the development is considered to be in keeping with the established character of the area and would not appear unduly dominant, as it would be balanced by the scale and form of neighbouring development.

No. 101 is located to the east of the application site, whilst no 11 Oakwood Drive lies to the west. The rear elevation of 11 Oakwood Drive would look over the side elevation of the proposed extension which would be sited 1.5m from the shared boundary. No windows are proposed in this side elevation. Due to this positioning, the relationship between the two properties is indirect, with the extension not having an impact on No. 11 in terms of overlooking.

Design

The SPD advises that *Extensions should normally have a pitched roof for aesthetic reasons* although the SPD further clarifies that *flat or lower-pitched roofs may be preferable in those circumstances where a matching style of roof would cause loss of light for neighbours*. The proposed extension would be served by a flat roof; this is considered acceptable given that a pitched roof would result in a greater impact on neighbouring amenity in terms of potential loss of light and outlook. Therefore, in this instance a flat roof is considered acceptable in terms of design.

The Householder Development SPD states that *extensions should be constructed in materials and style to match the original dwelling*. The proposed extension complies with this guidance through its use of black fascias, white soffits, cream render, white UPVC windows and black rainwater goods all to match those of the existing main dwelling. As such, the proposal is considered acceptable in terms of design. The Householder Development SPD also states that *the extension should leave adequate room around the dwelling to avoid a cramped appearance within the plot*. The proposed extension complies with this guidance as the garden would be reduced from 16.8m to 13.7m in length meaning over 50% of the existing garden space is retained. The proposal is therefore considered acceptable with regards to the retention of private amenity space and the avoidance of a cramped appearance.

Highways

The proposal will serve as a bedroom with an ensuite and a dining room which will replace the existing bedroom. As such, no additional bedrooms will be created and therefore the demand for off-street parking within the curtilage of the property is not increased and the existing parking arrangements remain sufficient. The proposal is therefore considered acceptable in terms of highway safety.

Conclusion

The proposed extension is considered acceptable in terms of design, residential amenity and highway safety 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 no later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date of this permission.

Reason: To comply with the requirements of Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended)

Knowsley Council
Regeneration and Economic Development Directorate.
Delegated Planning Report

- 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.

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

Schedule 1

Date received	Drawing. No	Revision	Drawing/Document Title
16/03/2026			Location Plan
16/03/2026			Site Plan
16/03/2026	REID/02		Proposed Floor Plans and Elevations

Signed Case Officer: Kate Pickles

Signed Authorising Officer: Jo Sheridan

Date: 01/05/2026

¹ I confirm that I do not have a personal relationship with the applicant, agent or other interested parties; I also confirm that I do not have a financial interest in the site or the development proposed

¹ I confirm that I do not have a personal relationship with the applicant, agent or other interested parties; I also confirm that I do not have a financial interest in the site or the development proposed