

APPLICATION NO: 26/00351/FUL

CASE OFFICER: Kate Pickles

WARD: Prescott North

PARISH: Knowsley Parish Council

LOCATION: 46 Sugar Lane, Knowsley, Knowsley, L34, 0ER

PROPOSAL: ERECTION OF A SINGLE STOREY FRONT, SIDE AND REAR EXTENSION.
DEMOLITION OF EXISTING FRONT EXTENSION.

Site description

The application property is a two-storey, end-terraced dwellinghouse set within an asymmetrical plot fronting on to Sugar Lane. The property is within a Primarily Residential Area and is characterised by terraced, semi-detached and detached housing with the Knowsley Village Conservation Area to the west.

Proposal

Permission is sought for the erection of a single storey front, side and rear extension following the demolition of the existing front extension.

Rear extension

The proposed rear extension would project 4m from the existing rear elevation of the host dwelling, would be 7.5m in width and would be served by a flat roof 2.6m in height. A roof lantern is also proposed which would protrude 0.4m from the roof bringing the total height to 3m. The rear extension would function as an extended kitchen and dining area.

Front and side extension

The proposed front extension would project 1m from the front elevation of the host dwelling and would 'wrap around' to form the side extension.

The front extension would have a pitched roof that is hipped where the side and front extension meet. Both the side and front elements would have a ridge height of 3.2m and an eaves height of 2.5m.

The roof of the front extension would have an open-sided canopy element extending beyond the footprint of the extension. The front extension would have a width of 4.9m, and the roof would have a total width of 7.4m. The side extension would be 2m in width

and 2.9m in length. The front and side extension would function as an entrance hallway and an office space.

Consultations

None required.

Representations

This application was publicised by 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 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

Design and residential amenity

Rear extension

The Householder Development SPD advises that a single storey rear located on or immediately adjacent to the party boundary will normally be acceptable if it does not project more than 4m from the rear elevation of the existing dwelling. The extension would be immediately adjacent to the shared boundaries with Nos. 44 and 48 but would have a projection of 4m therefore complying with SPD guidance. As such, it is not considered that the development would result in an unacceptable overbearing impact, loss of outlook, or undue sense of enclosure for the occupiers of these neighbouring properties. The scale and positioning of the extension are therefore considered acceptable.

The Householder Development SPD further advises that extensions should not have an unacceptable impact on residential amenity by way of overshadowing, loss of outlook, loss of light or privacy. The proposed extension is considered to comply with this guidance as the impact on neighbouring properties No.44 and No.48 is considered acceptable. The 4m projection and modest 2.6m height ensure the avoidance of undue dominance and overshadowing and no windows are proposed to either side elevations which minimises opportunities for overlooking or the perception of overlooking. The windows proposed to the rear elevation also do not give rise to any privacy concerns due to their ground floor siting, existing boundary treatments, and the creation of no new viewpoints beyond those already available from the ground floor.

The Householder Development SPD advises that extensions should be constructed in materials that are the same or similar to those of the existing dwelling. The proposed rear extension complies with this guidance through the use of brown roof tiles and white UPVC windows to match the existing dwelling. The rear extension would have a render finish, while this is somewhat out of character with the red brick of the existing dwelling, it is considered acceptable due to the location at the rear of the property. This means that the extension would not be readily visible from the street scene of Sugar Lane and would not materially impact visual amenity.

The SPD also advises that the roof of an extension should echo that of the main dwelling, the rear extension would be served by a flat roof which differs from the pitched roof of the host property. The flat roof would remain somewhat in keeping with the established character of the dwelling given that the existing dormer extension features a flat roof design. A flat roof would also reduce the overall massing of the extension and would therefore limit the opportunity for overshadowing or loss of light. As such, a flat roof is considered acceptable in this instance.

Side and front extension

The Householder Development SPD states that front extensions should be designed to retain the character of the street scene and should not harm residential amenity by way of appearing unduly dominant, overshadowing, loss of privacy or outlook.

The proposed front extension would be visible from the street scene of Sugar Lane and would be modest in size with a projection of 1m from the front elevation of the existing dwelling. This ensures that the extension would be subordinate to the host dwelling and would not materially harm the character of the street scene. A 3.8m distance from the highway would also be maintained. This set back from the highway is similar to neighbouring plots such as No.48 which means that the extension would not appear overly prominent or out of place within the street scene.

No encroachment would occur to either No.44 and No.48 as a result of the proposed side and front development. There would be no impact on the amenity of No.44 given the open sided nature of the front extension roof. The roof would be offset from the boundary of No.44 by 0.3m, but the built element of the extension would be offset by 2.8m. Therefore, the 45-degree rule would not be breached, and the extension would not impact No.44 by way of dominance, overshadowing or loss of light.

The impact on No.48 is also considered acceptable due to the staggered arrangements of the plots. While the front and side extension would be located directly adjacent to the boundary, No.48 is positioned further forward than No.46. Due to this staggered arrangement, the front extension would project 0.5m beyond the front elevation of No.48 and would therefore not breach the 45 degree rule or impact No.48 in terms of loss of light, outlook or undue dominance.

The proposed front and side extension would also not give rise to any privacy concerns as the windows proposed to the front elevation are adjacent to a junction and would not directly overlook neighbouring habitable room windows. As such, no opportunities for overlooking are created. The perception of overlooking would also not materially increase due to the modest projection of 1m and the creation of no new viewpoints beyond those already available from the front elevation of the existing dwelling. The proposal is therefore considered acceptable in terms of privacy.

The Householder Development SPD advises that extensions should be constructed in materials that are the same or similar to the existing dwelling. The front and side extensions comply with this guidance given the use of red facing brick, dark brown roof tiles and white UPVC windows to match the existing dwelling. The front and side extensions would be visible from the street scene of Sugar Lane, and the use of matching materials ensures that visual coherence is maintained with the host property. The front extension would also have a pitched roof that is hipped where the side and front extensions meet. This is in keeping with the pitched roof style of the existing dwelling. As such, the proposed front and side extension would not harm visual amenity and are acceptable in terms of design.

Highways

The Householder Development SPD states that a three-bedroom dwelling should have two parking spaces within the curtilage of the property. The property currently has three bedrooms and three off street parking spaces which exceeds the minimum parking standards outlined in the SPD. The proposed extensions would not affect the existing parking arrangements at the property or increase the number of bedrooms within the dwelling. As such, the existing arrangement of 3 parking spaces is considered sufficient to serve the property.

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

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.

Knowsley Council
Regeneration and Economic Development Directorate.
Delegated Planning Report

Schedule 1

Date received	Drawing. No	Revision	Drawing/Document Title
24/07/2026			Proposed Location Plan
27/07/2026	SL100/PRO1/01	B	Proposed Elevations
30/09/2026	FL100/PRE0/02		Proposed Floor Plans

Signed Case Officer: Kate Pickles

Signed Authorising Officer: Jo Sheridan

Date: 05/10/2026

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