

<u>APPLICATION NO:</u>	26/00128/FUL	<u>CASE OFFICER:</u>	Louise Robinson
<u>WARD:</u>	Swanside	<u>PARISH:</u>	N/A
<u>LOCATION:</u>	84 Greystone Road, Roby, Knowsley, L14 6UQ		
<u>PROPOSAL:</u>	ERECTION OF SINGLE STOREY SIDE EXTENSION		

Site Description

The application site comprises a two-storey 3-bed semi-detached dwelling located on a corner plot on Greystone Road, Roby. The dwelling is characterised by render to the front elevation, brick to the side and rear elevations and a hipped tiled roof. The property currently benefits from a single storey rear extension and a small porch to the front. There is off-street parking available to the side and the vehicle crossover.

The surrounding area is characterised by two-storey semi-detached dwellinghouses of a similar design.

Proposal

Planning permission is sought for the erection of a single storey extension to the side.

The extension would have a width of 2.8m towards the front of the extension and a width of 2.0m towards the rear of the extension. The total length of the extension would be 9.7m, which would see the extension be stepped in by 0.8m, after a length of 4.8m, and would comprise the whole of the side elevation. The extension would have a hipped tiled roof with two rooflights installed within the side roof-plane, with an eaves height of 2.5m and a ridge height of 3.7m.

The extension would have a render finish to match the wider dwellinghouse and have one window within the front elevation, one window and a door within the side elevation and one window within the rear elevation.

Other alterations

A new render finish would be applied to the existing side and rear elevations, as well as the existing rear extension.

Consultations

None required.

Representations

This application has been publicised by letters sent to 10 neighbours. No representations were received as a result of publicity given to the application.

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that accord with an up-to-date development plan without delay; or where the development plan is absent, silent or out of date planning permission should be granted unless the application of policies in the NPPF that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a clear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
Amended New Residential 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 that may have been 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 AND DESIGN

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 SPD also outlines that particular attention should be paid to the design of extensions on corner plots. This is because 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 solutions.

The SPD outlines that single storey side extensions on corner plots should normally be set in 2m from the side boundary and not exceed half the width of the existing dwelling.

The proposed side extension would have a width of 2.8m towards the front of the extension and a width of 2.0m towards the rear of the extension. The length of the extension would comprise the whole of the side elevation of the dwellinghouse, and would have a length of 4.8m, be stepped in by 0.8m, and would have a further length of 4.9m.

The extension would not exceed half the width of the existing dwelling, as there is an existing width of 5.6m. Additionally, the extension would be set in from the side boundary by 4.5m, complying with the SPD's guidance.

Whilst the extension would project beyond the building line frontage of the properties to the rear situated on Hillary Avenue by a total of 2.8m, side extensions on corner plots are not uncommon in the surrounding area, as shown by the existing single storey side extension found at 77 Greystone Road (opposite the application site).

Additionally, there would be an interface distance of 10.7m between the rear elevation of the proposed extension and the side elevation of 219 Hillary Avenue. Whilst the interface distance would have a shortfall of 1.3m of the required 12m outlined in the New Residential Development SPD, given the single storey nature of the extension and the fact it would not breach the 45-degree principle, it is considered that the extension would not have a negative impact on the amenity of No.219. Furthermore, the extension would not significantly impact the street scene, as the extension would be slightly obscured by existing boundary treatments and hedging.

Considering any impacts on 165 Hillary Avenue (dwelling across the road from the application site), there would be an interface distance of 18.5m between the front elevation of No.165 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.165.

There would be no impact on 82 Greystone Road, as the extension would be located away from No.82.

The extension would have a hipped tiled roof with two rooflights installed. Whilst the SPD outlines that single storey side extensions should have a pitched roof, given that the proposed roof-profile would match that of the wider dwelling's main roof-profile (hipped), the proposed roof is considered to be acceptable.

The extension would be finished in render. As render can be found to the existing front elevation of the property, and a render finish would be applied to the wider dwellinghouses, the proposed material finish of the extension is considered to be acceptable in visual terms.

The one window within the front elevation and one window within the rear elevation do not raise any overlooking concerns as they would not create any additional views not already available from the front / rear of the property. Additionally, one window and door would be installed within the side elevation. Whilst the SPD outlines that side windows serving main habitable rooms are rarely acceptable, given that a habitable window can be found within the existing side elevation at ground floor level, and the proposed fenestrations would be obscured to some level by the existing boundary treatments, the proposed window and door within the side elevation are considered to be acceptable.

In summary, the single 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 CS19 of the Core Strategy, Policy H8 of the Replacement Knowsley UDP, and guidance provided by the Householder Development SPD.

Other alterations

The application of a new render finish to the existing side and rear elevations of the dwellinghouse, as well as the existing rear extension raises no concerns, as whilst the render finish would slightly change the exterior design of the application site, render can be found to the existing front elevation and in the wider area, and would not negatively impact the visual amenity of the street scene.

Highways

The dwellinghouse would remain as a three-bedroom property.

The Householder Development SPD advises that sufficient car parking should be retained or provided when erecting a single storey side extension. The Householder Development SPD advises that the parking provision of a three-bedroom property should provide 2 spaces within the curtilage and that car spaces provided on side driveways should have dimensions of 5.0m x 2.75m.

At present, the application site benefits from a driveway to the side/front of the property measuring 5.4m x 6.2m. Based on the shaping of the driveway, it is likely that only one vehicle can park on the driveway. Whilst there is a shortfall of one parking space on the existing driveway, the additional vehicle is able to park on the vehicle crossover, which is a common attribute in the wider surrounding area.

As the existing driveway and vehicle crossover can accommodate two vehicles, the proposal is considered to be acceptable in terms of any impacts on the highway, as the extension would not cause significant harm in relation to the highway safety and is considered to be acceptable.

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 materials to be used on the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall be render / brick.

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
20.03.2026	-	-	LOCATION PLAN
20.03.2026	DG 26/19/02	-	PROPOSED FLOOR PLANS
20.03.2026	DG 26/19/05	-	PROPOSED SITE PLAN
25.03.2026	DG 26/19/03	-	EXISTING AND PROPOSED ELEVATIONS

Signed Case Officer¹: **Louise Robinson**

Signed Authorising Officer²: **Jo Sheridan**

Date: **14/05/2026**

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

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

Informatives

None required.