

APPLICATION NO: 26/00382/FUL

CASE OFFICER: Kate Pickles

WARD: Roby

PARISH:

LOCATION: 10 Pear Tree Road, Huyton, Knowsley, L36 5UB

PROPOSAL: ERECTION OF A TWO STOREY SIDE EXTENSION

Site description

The application property is a two-storey, semi-detached dwellinghouse set within a rectangular plot fronting on to Pear Tree Drive. The dwelling is in a Primarily Residential Area and the wider area is characterised by semi-detached and terraced housing with green space to the north and south.

Proposal

Permission is sought for the erection of a two-storey side extension with a ridge height of 6.4m and an eaves height of 4.8m. The proposed extension would be 4m in width and would have a depth of 5.3m at ground floor level and 4.4m at first floor level. The extension would function as a lounge and an additional bedroom.

Consultations

None required.

Representations

This application was publicised by way of site notice and through letters sent to 9 neighbours. No representations have been received as a result of this publicity.

Planning history

20/00210/FUL: - Erection of a single storey side and rear extension (demolition of existing side extension and detached garage). Granted: 19/06/2020.

Relevant policy

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

Knowsley Council
Regeneration and Economic Development Directorate.
Delegated Planning Report

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 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.

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

Design and residential amenity

The Householder Development SPD advises that for two storey side extensions, either a minimum space of 1m should be preserved between the extension and the party boundary or the front wall of the first-floor extension should be set back at least 1m from the immediately adjoining front wall of the original dwelling. The proposed two storey side extension complies with this guidance as 1.4m would be retained between the extension and the boundary of No.1 Laurel Grove. Alongside the different orientation of the plots, this distance ensures the avoidance of a terracing effect therefore maintaining the character the street scene. As such, the proposal is considered acceptable in terms of siting and scale.

The proposed extension would increase the width of the dwelling from 5.8m to 9.8m and would be visible from the street scene of Pear Tree Road. Notwithstanding this increase, the extension is considered to remain subordinate to the host dwelling by virtue of its roofline being 1.1m below the original ridge. The 1.4m retained from the side boundary further ensures that the openness of the street scene is maintained ensuring the avoidance of a terracing effect. The proposal would also have a hipped roof type which echoes that of the host dwelling. This ensures that the extension would be in keeping with the original dwellinghouse and street scene and is therefore acceptable in terms of design.

The Householder Development SPD also advises that extensions must adequately protect your neighbours' right to enjoy their own home. Extensions must not overshadow or have an overbearing effect on neighbouring dwelling to an unacceptable degree. The proposed two storey side extension would not have any impact on the attached neighbouring property No.12 Pear Tree Road given its location to the opposite side elevation. The impact on No.1 Laurel Grove is considered negligible due to the sufficient distance of 1.4m retained between the development and the site boundary. The site boundary abuts the rear garden of No.1 which further reduces the potential for overshadowing or overbearance.

The Householder Development SPD also advises that a 12m interface distance should be retained between gable and rear elevations. The proposed two-storey side extension would result in an interface distance of 12 metres between the proposed side gable and the neighbouring rear elevation at first-floor level therefore complying with the SPD

guidance. Whilst the interface distance reduces to approximately 9.2 metres at ground-floor level, this is considered acceptable in this instance as the relationship is with a conservatory extension rather than the original dwellinghouse. When considered in the planning balance and the compliance with SPD guidance relating to offset from the boundary, the proposal is not considered result in an unacceptable overbearing impact or loss of outlook.

The proposed extension is not considered to impact the amenity of the adjacent neighbouring property, No.13 Pear Tree Road as the 20m interface distance between would be retained which ensures that no material increase in overbearance, overshadowing or loss of outlook would occur. The impact on the rear neighbouring property No.9 Laurel Grove is considered acceptable as an interface distance of 28m would be retained between the dwellings which exceeds the 22m advised by the New Residential Development SPD. The proposed extension is therefore not considered to result in any material increase in overbearance, overshadowing or loss of outlook and is considered acceptable in terms of residential amenity.

The Householder Development SPD also advises that extensions should protect neighbouring privacy. The proposal complies with this guidance as no windows are proposed to the side elevation which ensures no overlooking or the perception of overlooking can occur between the application property and the neighbouring property to the side, No.1 Laurel Grove. No windows are proposed to the rear of the extension which means there would be no impact on the privacy of the rear neighbouring property No.9. The windows proposed to the front elevation do not give rise to any privacy concerns as no new viewpoints are created beyond those already available from the front elevation. The proposal would not affect the existing 20m interface distance to the adjacent dwelling, No. 13 and would therefore not result in any material impact on privacy or overlooking. The proposal is therefore acceptable in terms of privacy.

The Householder Development SPD also advises that extensions should use materials that are the same or similar to the existing dwelling and should usually have a matching roof type. The proposed extension complies with this guidance through the use of white render finish, grey concrete roof tiles and white UPVC windows to match the existing. As such, the proposal would be in keeping with the character of the original dwellinghouse and wider area is not considered to materially impact the character of the street scene and is acceptable in terms of design.

Highways

The proposed extension would function as an additional bedroom which would increase the number of bedrooms from two to three. The Householder Development SPD advises that three-bedroom dwellings should have two off street parking spaces within the curtilage. The proposal complies with this guidance as there are two off street parking spaces within the curtilage of the property. The proposed extension is therefore considered acceptable in terms of the impact on highway safety.

Other considerations

Coal Low Risk Area: - See informative.

Conclusion

The proposed two storey side extension is considered acceptable in terms of design, residential amenity and highway safety. The proposal also complies with the relevant NPPF, Knowsley Local Plan Core Strategy, Replacement UDP and SPD guidance and is therefore 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

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
11/08/2026	00		Location Plan
11/08/2026	05		Proposed Ground Floor Plan
11/08/2026	06		Proposed First Floor Plan
11/08/2026	07		Proposed Elevations

Signed Case Officer: Kate Pickles

Knowsley Council
Regeneration and Economic Development Directorate.
Delegated Planning Report

Signed Authorising Officer: Jo Sheridan

Date: 29/09/2026

Informative

The proposed development lies within a coal mining area which may contain unrecorded coal mining related hazards. If any coal mining feature is encountered during development, this should be reported immediately to the Mining Remediation Authority on 0345 762 6846 or if a hazard is encountered on site call the emergency line 0800 288 4242.

Further information is also available on the Mining Remediation Authority website at: Mining Remediation Authority - GOV.UK

Standing Advice valid from 1st January 2025 until 31st December 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