

APPLICATION NO: 26/00290/FUL

CASE OFFICER: Kate Pickles

WARD: Swanside

PARISH:

LOCATION: 42 Greystone Road, Roby, Knowsley, L14 6UG

PROPOSAL: ERECTION OF A TWO STOREY SIDE EXTENSION AND PART SINGLE PART TWO STOREY REAR EXTENSION

Site description

The application property is a two-storey, end-terraced dwellinghouse set within an asymmetrical plot fronting on to Greystone Road. The dwelling is within a Primarily Residential Area and the wider area is characterised by semi-detached and terraced housing with greenspace to the east.

Proposal

Permission is sought for the erection of a two-storey side extension and a part two-storey, part single-storey rear extension.

The two storey side extension would have a ridge height of be 8.4m and an eaves height of 5.3m; be 1.8m in width, have a total depth of 8.9m and would wrap around to form the two-storey element of the rear extension.

The proposed two-storey element of the rear extension would project 3.3m from the original rear wall of the dwelling; would have a ridge height of 7m with an eaves height of 5.1m. The first floor elevation of the rear extension would be 4.1m in width

The single storey rear extension would project 3.3m from the rear elevation of the existing dwelling and would be served by a flat roof 3.5m in height. The ground floor elevation of the rear extension would have a total width of 2.9m

The ground floor side extension would serve as a utility room, and the ground floor of the rear extension would serve as a kitchen and snug. The second storey of the side and rear extension would function as a master bedroom, dressing area and en-suite.

Consultations

None required.

Representations

This application was publicised by way of site notice and through letters sent to 4 neighbours. No representations have been received as a result of this publicity.

Planning history

No relevant planning history

Relevant policy

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

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.

2. Where a development proposal falls partly within and partly outside a settlement, policies S4 and S5 should be applied to the relevant parts which are inside or outside of the settlement boundary (as appropriate), before coming to an overall view on the proposal.

S4: Principle of development within settlements

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.

2. In applying policy S4, the circumstances in which the benefits of approving development are likely to be substantially outweighed by adverse effects include (but are not restricted to) situations where the development proposal would: a. Have a substantial adverse impact in relation to:

i. The allocation or safeguarding of land or buildings for particular uses in the development plan, unless there is no reasonable prospect of an application coming 24

forward for the allocated use, or there is evidence that the safeguarding is no longer appropriate; or

ii. The application of the policies in this Framework for existing recreational land and facilities (HC7), Local Green Space (HC8), areas of particular importance for biodiversity and geodiversity (N6), Protected Landscapes (N4) and development within residential curtilages (L2(1)(d)).

b. Involve the whole or partial loss of undeveloped land which is used for a cemetery or burial ground; or for water storage and/or flood risk management (unless suitable compensatory provision is made that does not increase the risk of flooding either on or off-site); or

c. Fail to comply with one of the national decision-making policies which state that development proposals should be refused in specific circumstances.

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

Householder Development SPD

Design Quality in New 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

Residential Amenity

Part two-storey, part single-storey rear extension

The proposed two storey rear extension would project 3.3m from the original rear wall of the dwelling. The Householder Development SPD states that two storey rear extensions are acceptable, and anything beyond this would only be acceptable if the extension does not breach the 45-degree rule. In this instance, the 45-degree rule would not be breached in terms of the impact on No.44. In relation to No. 40, the extension would also comply with the 45-degree rule due to the staggered relationship between the plots. As such the proposal is considered acceptable in terms of scale.

The impact on the adjacent rear neighbour, No.18 Greystone Crescent, is considered acceptable. The New Residential Development SPD requires that a minimum interface distance of 22m is retained between rear elevations. The interface distance between No.42 and No.18 would be reduced to 29m which still exceeds the guidance within the SPD and is therefore considered sufficient to mitigate any harmful impact on residential amenity.

The single storey rear element of the proposal would project 3.3m from the original rear wall. The Householder Development SPD advises 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 part single storey rear extension complies with this guidance as the extension would be offset from the boundary of No.44 by 0.2m but would have a modest projection of 3.3m. This ensures that the proposal would not appear unduly dominant or result in loss of light or outlook. As such, the impact on No.44 is considered acceptable.

The Householder Development SPD further advises that extensions should not detract from neighbouring privacy. The proposed rear extension complies with this guidance as the glass doors proposed to the ground floor rear elevation would not give rise to any privacy concerns due to their ground floor positioning, existing boundary treatments and the creation of no new viewpoints beyond those already available from the rear elevation. One window is proposed to the first-floor level of the rear elevation and is not considered to give rise to any privacy concerns due to the sufficient interface distance, the angled relationship between the plots and the creation of no new viewpoints beyond those already available from the first-floor rear elevation. As such, the proposal is considered acceptable in terms of residential amenity with regards to privacy.

Two storey side extension

The two storey side extension would be set back 2m from the original front wall of the dwelling and its ridge would be 200mm lower than the right of the original house. The

Householder Development SPD advises that side extensions should either maintain a 1m gap to the side boundary or be set back at first-floor level by at least 1m from the front elevation of the host dwelling. Although the proposed extension would be located adjacent to the boundary with No. 40 at the front, the plot widens towards the rear, increasing the separation distance to the boundary to 1m at the rear-most point. In addition, the extension would be set back 2.0m from the front elevation of the dwelling. Together with the lowering of the ridge and the angled relationship between the plots, this would avoid a terracing effect, maintain openness, and preserve the character of the street scene, in accordance with the SPD.

The Householder Development SPD advises that extensions should protect neighbouring amenity and must not overshadow, have an overbearing impact and should adequately protect neighbours' privacy. The proposed side extension would not impact the residential amenity of the attached neighbour, No.44 given its positioning to the opposite side elevation. In relation to No.40, the angled relationship between the plots reduces the perceived bulk and massing of the extension. The extension therefore would not appear unduly dominant or have an overbearing impact.

The applicant has confirmed that the two storey side extension would not encroach onto neighbouring land and would remain wholly within the application site boundary. Even so, the encroachment information will be added to the decision notice. This would further mitigate any overbearing impact or undue dominance. In terms of privacy, the proposed side extension is considered acceptable as the windows proposed to the side elevation would be obscurely glazed. This reduces the opportunity for overlooking or the perception of overlooking therefore maintaining neighbouring privacy. As such, the proposed side extension is considered acceptable in terms of residential amenity.

Design

The Householder Development SPD also states that extensions should materials that are the same or similar to those of the existing dwelling. The proposed side extension would be visible from the street scene of Greystone Road, and both the side and rear extensions would use roof tiles, brick, render and UPVC windows to match those of the existing dwelling. This complies with SPD guidance and would maintain visual coherence ensuring that the dwelling would remain in keeping with the established character of the surrounding area. As such, the proposal is considered acceptable in terms of design.

The Householder Development SPD further advises that the roof style of extensions should echo that of the original dwelling. The two-storey side and rear extensions comply with this guidance as the rear extension would feature a pitched roof that is hipped where the side and rear extensions meet. This echoes that of the host dwelling therefore maintains visual coherence ensuring the proposal is in keeping with the

character of the street scene. The proposal is therefore considered acceptable in terms of the impact on the street scene.

The single storey rear extension would be served by a flat roof which differs from the hipped roof type of the host dwelling and the proposed two storey extensions. However, this is considered acceptable given the limited scale and subordinate nature of the extension. The flat roof would reduce the overall height and bulk of the extension compared with a pitched roof alternative, thereby limiting its visual impact and any potential effect on neighbouring amenity. The roof form would not be readily visible within the street scene and is therefore considered to have a negligible impact on visual amenity.

Highways

The proposed side and rear extensions would not impact the existing parking arrangements within the plot. The extension would involve the creation of an additional bedroom which would increase the number of bedrooms within dwelling to three. The Householder Development SPD advises that a three-bedroom dwelling should have two off street parking spaces within the curtilage of the property. The dwelling has provision for two off street parking spaces within the curtilage therefore complying with SPD parking standards. As such, the proposal is considered acceptable in terms of highway safety.

Conclusion

The proposal is considered acceptable in terms of design, residential amenity and highway safety. The proposal complies with the relevant Core Strategy, Replacement UDP and NPPF policies and SPD guidance. As such, the proposal is recommended for approval.

Recommendation

That planning permission be granted subject to the following conditions

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)

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

Knowsley Council
Regeneration and Economic Development Directorate.
Delegated Planning Report

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
17/06/2026	378-PR-051-A3		Proposed Site Plan
17/06/2026			Location Plan
03/09/2026	379-PL-100	B	Proposed Floor Plans & Roof Plan
15/09/2026	378-PL-100	C	Proposed Elevations

Signed Case Officer: Kate Pickles

Signed Authorising Officer: Jo Sheridan

Date: 15/09/2026

Informative

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.

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

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