

<u>APPLICATION NO:</u>	26/00193/FUL	<u>CASE OFFICER:</u>	Louise Robinson
<u>WARD:</u>	Northwood	<u>PARISH:</u>	N/A
<u>LOCATION:</u>	88 Roughwood Drive, Northwood, Kirkby, Knowsley, L33 9UN		
<u>PROPOSAL:</u>	ERECTION OF A SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION AND CREATION OF SHOWER ROOM.		

Site Description

The application site comprises a two-storey 3-bed semi-detached dwelling located on Roughwood Drive, Northwood. The dwelling is characterised by brick to all elevations and has a gable tiled roof. The property does not currently have any extensions. The dwelling also benefits from a driveway to the side of the property.

The surrounding area is characterised by similarly designed two-storey semi-detached and terraced dwellings.

Proposal

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

The rear extension would have a total projection of 6.0m beyond the existing rear elevation. The extension would be designed in a staggered nature which would project 2.8m, be set in 1.9m and then would project a further 3.2m. The extension would have a total width of 7.0m. The largest part of the rear extension would be set away from the rear elevation by 1.2m. The extension would have a dual pitched roof with an eaves height of 2.6m and a ridge height of 3.7m.

The extension would have a brick finish to match the existing dwelling. There would be two doors and one window within the rear elevation, one door within the side elevation (closest to the existing rear elevation of the dwelling) and one window within the front elevation which would face onto the existing rear elevation of the dwelling.

The extension would allow for an accessible ground floor bedroom and wet room for disability purposes.

Other alterations

Two ramps would be installed within the rear garden to facilitate access to the proposed rear extension.

Consultations

None required.

Representations

This application has been publicised by letters sent to 7 neighbours. No representations were received as a result of the publicity given to the application.

Planning History

96/00260/APP ERECTION OF 43 NO. RESIDENTIAL DWELLINGS
COMPRISING 2NO. BUNGALOWS AND 41 NO. TWO-
STOREY HOUSES

GRANTED (05 AUGUST 1996)

Permitted Development Rights for the property have been removed under Condition 3 of the original planning permission for the site:

Condition 3: Notwithstanding the provisions of Part 1 of Schedule 2 to the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development Order), 1995 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order) there shall be no extension, enlargement (or external alteration) to any building forming part of the development hereby permitted, or a garage, car port or other building or enclosure erected within the curtilage of the site, without a further specific planning permission having been sought and obtained beforehand.

Reason: To safeguard the character of this residential development and given the restricted size of private amenity areas.

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 Area
Policy H8	Extensions and Alterations to Residential Properties

SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENTS

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 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 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.

The proposed rear extension would have a total width of 7.0m and would have a total projection of 6.0m beyond the existing rear elevation, which would see the extension designed in a staggered nature which would project 2.8m, would be set in by 1.9m and then would project a further 3.2m. As the total projection would exceed the SPD's guidance by 2.0m, there is a requirement to apply the 45-degree principle.

Considering the impact on the attached neighbouring dwelling 90 Roughwood Drive, the rear extension would project 6.0m beyond the rear elevation. The smallest part of the extension would be set away from the shared boundary by 0.9m and project 2.8m, and the largest part of the extension would be set away from the shared boundary by 2.8m and project the remainder 3.2m.

The extension would breach the 45-degree rule, when measured from the nearest habitable window of No.90. However, it is noted by the LPA that the extension has been designed in a large nature to accommodate an accessible ground floor bedroom and wet room for a wheelchair user. Additionally, the extension has been designed to ensure that it has been set off the shared boundary to reduce some of the impact on the neighbouring dwellinghouse. Whilst the extension would have some impact on the amenity of No.90, as the extension incorporates a staggered nature to mitigate some of the impact on the neighbouring dwelling and the extension would be used for accessibility purposes, the breach of the 45-degree principle would not warrant the refusal of the application, and the extension is considered to be acceptable in this instance.

Considering the impact on the detached neighbouring dwelling 86 Roughwood Drive, as No.86 is set back from the application site by 0.9 - 1.0m, the rear extension would project 5.0m beyond the rear elevation of No.86. The extension would be set away from the shared boundary by 0.2m, and a further 2.5m to the gable elevation of No.86. The extension would not breach the 45-degree rule, when measured from the nearest habitable window of No.86. As such, the proposed rear extension would not have a negative impact on the amenity of No.86 and is considered to be acceptable.

The rear extension would be slightly visible from the wider street scene of Pentland Road and Lapford Crescent. The extension would be finished in brickwork and would have a dual-pitched roof. As the materials and roof design would match 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 doors and one window within the rear elevation raise no overlooking concerns due to their ground floor siting, boundary treatments and orientation within the rear elevation. The door within the side elevation raises no overlooking concerns, as the door would be situated 5.0m away from the shared boundary treatment with No.86 and any views would be obscured by the existing boundary treatment and the rear extension. The window within the front elevation of the extension raises no overlooking concerns as the window would primarily look onto the rear elevation of the existing dwellinghouse due to its placement.

In summary, the single storey rear 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 and guidance provided by the Householder Development SPD.

Other alterations

Two ramps would be installed within the rear garden, which would provide access from the rear extension into the rear garden. These ramps would not require planning permission as the ramps would have a height of 0.2m, which would not exceed the GDPO's guidance of 0.3m or more for a raised platform.

HIGHWAYS

The dwelling would be increased from a three-bedroom property to a four-bedroom property.

The Householder Development SPD advises that the parking provision of a four-bedroom property should provide 3 spaces within the curtilage and that car spaces provided on front driveways should have dimensions of 5.0m x 2.75m.

At present, the application site benefits from a driveway to the side of the property for one vehicle, measuring 5.9m x 2.5m. There is also additional parking availability for one vehicle to the front of the property on the widened public pavement, as this is common in the wider locality.

Whilst the dwelling would be increased to a 4-bed property which would create a shortfall of one parking space, as the existing dwelling is being extended to provide an accessible fourth bedroom, this shortfall of one parking space would not negatively impact the highway safety to warrant the refusal of the application, as two spaces

would be provided, and as such, the proposal is considered to be acceptable in highways terms.

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 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
22.04.2026	59924-01	-	EXISTING LAYOUT AND LOCATION PLAN
22.04.2026	5994-02	-	PROPOSED LAYOUT AND SITE PLAN

Signed Case Officer¹: **Louise Robinson**

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

**Signed Authorising
Officer²:**

Jo Sheridan

Date:

15/06/2026

Informatives

Not Applicable.

Site Photographs

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