
<u>APPLICATION NO:</u>	26/00041/FUL	<u>CASE OFFICER:</u>	Louise Robinson
<u>WARD:</u>	Prescot North	<u>PARISH:</u>	Knowsley Parish Council
<u>LOCATION:</u>	1 Singleton Drive, Knowsley Village, Knowsley, L34 0HP		
<u>PROPOSAL:</u>	ERECTION OF A SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION AND PART TWO-STOREY, PART SINGLE STOREY SIDE EXTENSION		

Site Description

The application site comprises a two-storey 3-bed semi-detached dwelling located on a corner plot on Singleton Drive, Knowsley Village. The dwelling is characterised by brick to all elevations and a gable tiled roof with two rooflights installed within the rear roof-plane. The property currently benefits from a lean-to storage area to the side and has off-street parking available to the side / front.

The attached neighbouring dwellinghouse 3 Singleton Drive benefits from a porch to the front, a single storey side extension and a conservatory to the rear. The surrounding area is characterised by two-storey semi-detached dwellinghouses of a similar design, with a small area of open-space sharing a boundary with the site to the south.

Proposal

Planning permission is sought for the erection of a single storey rear extension and a part two-storey / part single storey side extension.

Single storey rear / part single storey side extension

The single storey rear / part single storey side extension would have a total width of 5.7m and would project 2.0m beyond the existing rear elevation. The extension would have a mono-pitched roof with two rooflights installed with an eaves height of 2.3m and a ridge height of 3.3m.

The extension would be finished in brick to match the existing dwellinghouse.

Two-storey side extension

The two-storey side extension would have a width of 2.7m, a length of 6.5m and would be set back from the existing front elevation by 0.3m. The extension would have a pitched tiled roof with an eaves height of 5.0m, a ridge height of 6.8m and would incorporate a dropped ridge of 0.1m.

The extension would be finished in brick to match the existing dwellinghouse.

Other alterations

New double doors would be installed within the existing rear elevation to replace the existing ground floor window.

Consultations

Arboricultural Officer – No objections.

Representations

This application has been publicised by letters sent to 6 neighbours and a site notice displayed near to the site. One representation of support was received as a result of the publicity given to the application.

The letter of support stated that the neighbouring property has no objections to the proposal.

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
Policy CS21	Greenspaces and Trees

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 rear / part single storey side 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.

As the single storey part of the side extension would be situated to the rear of the property, this part of the extension will be assessed as a rear extension in this instance.

The proposed rear extension would have a width of 5.7m, would project 2.0m beyond the existing rear elevation and would be set in from the shared boundary with No.3 by 2.0m. As such, the single storey rear extension complies with the SPD in terms of its projection and would not have a negative impact on the amenity of No.3.

Commented [JS1]: This says the same - no need to assess separately.

The rear extension would be slightly visible from the wider street scene of Frederick Lunt Avenue. The extension would be finished in brick and would have a mono-pitched tiled roof with two rooflights installed. 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.

In summary, the proposed 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, Policy H8 of the Replacement Knowsley UDP, and guidance provided by the Householder Development SPD.

Two-storey side extension

The Householder Development SPD advises that particular attention should be paid to the design of extensions on corner plots, as they can encroach over the building line on either highway frontage, and therefore be particularly prominent in the street scene and sometimes create undesirable pinch points at the entrance to side roads. They can also interfere with highway visibility in some situations.

The SPD also advises that:

- Sufficient distance should be retained to the side boundary to preserve the character of the surrounding area and extensions should not be sited so close to the boundary that they would adversely impact on the street scene.
- Two-storey extensions should respect the established building lines on both street frontages and should avoid blank gables and should respect interface distances with neighbouring dwellings (12m between gable and front elevation) and should have a pitched roof.
- Sufficient car parking spaces should be retained or provided.

The Householder Development SPD outlines that two-storey 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 proposed two-storey side extension would have a width of 2.7m, a length of 6.5m and would be set back from the existing front elevation by 0.3m.

Whilst the extension would not be set-back at first floor level or be set in from the shared boundary by 1.0m, there is no direct neighbouring dwelling to the south of the application site. As such, the 1.0m requirement as outlined in the SPD would be mitigated, as the proposed two-storey side extension would not create a terracing effect.

The proposed side extension would sit in line with No.2's two-storey side extension, and as such would not disrupt the established building line.

Considering any impacts on 54, 56 and 58 Frederick Lunt Avenue, there would be interface distances of 29.4m – 30m between the front elevations of No's 54 - 58 and the side elevation of the proposed extension. As such, the interface distance would more than exceed the required 12m, as outlined in the New Residential Development SPD. Therefore, the extension would have no impact on the amenity of No's 54 – 58.

There would be no impact on 3 Singleton Drive as the extension would be located away from No.3.

The proposed two-storey side extension would be visible from the wider street scene

of Singleton Drive and Frederick Lunt Avenue. The extension would be finished in brick and would have a pitched tiled roof. 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 two additional windows within the front elevation (one at ground floor, one at first-floor) and one window within the rear elevation do not raise any overlooking concerns as they would not provide any additional views not already available from the front of the dwelling.

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.

Other alterations

The new double doors within the rear elevation and new canopy to the front elevation could be installed under Schedule 2, Class A, Part 1 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended).

HIGHWAYS

The dwelling would remain as a three-bedroom property.

The Householder Development SPD advises that sufficient car parking should be retained or provided when erecting a two-storey side extension. The SPD also advises that the parking provision of a three-bedroom property should provide 2 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/front of the property for one vehicle.

The driveway would be extended to the front of the property, to allow for a new larger driveway measuring 5.9m x 6.0m. The extended driveway would allow for two vehicles to park within the curtilage, whilst complying with the SPD's guidance of 5.0m x 3.0m for each space.

In summary, as the extended driveway would comply with the SPD's guidance, the proposal would not cause significant harm in relation to the highway safety and is considered to be acceptable.

TREES

As per the tree documentation provided, there is 1 Category B1 tree that is located off site on the adjacent highway verge that would not be removed, however the proposed works would fall within the Root Protection Area (RPA) that may lead to the potential loss of roots.

KMBC's arboricultural officer has reviewed the application, including the AIA and method statement and accepts the approach provided, with no further comments required.

Therefore, the proposal would be acceptable and would comply with Policy CS21 of

the Knowsley Local Plan: Core Strategy.

Conclusion

The proposal would be acceptable in terms of any impacts on the residential and visual amenity, highway safety and trees. 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 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 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.

SCHEDULE 1

Date Received	Ref. No	Version	Drawing/Document Title
06.02.2026	A103	-	PROPOSED PLANS
06.02.2026	A106	-	RENDERED 3DS
06.02.2026	A105	-	SKETCH 3DS
12.02.2026	A104	-	PROPOSED ELEVATIONS
02.03.2026	A100B	REV A	PROPOSED SITE PLANS
12.05.2026	MPTREES	-	ARBORICULTURE IMPACT ASSESSMENT AND METHOD STATEMENT

Signed Case Officer¹: **Louise Robinson**

Signed Authorising Officer²: **Jo Sheridan**

Date: **03/06/2026**

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