

<u>APPLICATION NO:</u>	26/00156/FUL	<u>CASE OFFICER:</u>	Louise Robinson
<u>WARD:</u>	Roby	<u>PARISH:</u>	N/A
<u>LOCATION:</u>	81 Bowring Park Avenue, Roby, Knowsley, L16 2NH		
<u>PROPOSAL:</u>	ERECTION OF FIRST FLOOR SIDE EXTENSION, PART TWO STOREY / PART SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION, SINGLE STOREY FRONT EXTENSION AND PART CONVERSION OF GARAGE TO HABITABLE ROOM		

Site Description

The application site comprises a two-storey 3-bed semi-detached dwelling located on Bowring Park Avenue, Roby. The property is characterised by brick / render to the front elevation, brick to the side and rear elevations and a hipped tiled roof. The dwelling currently benefits from a single storey garage and sunroom to the side and a small single storey extension to the rear. There is parking available to the side / front for one vehicle.

The attached neighbouring dwelling 83 Bowring Park Avenue does not have any extensions. The detached neighbouring dwelling, 79 Bowring Park Avenue benefits from a single storey 'wrap-around' extension to the front, side and rear. The application site is surrounded by similarly designed two-storey semi-detached dwellinghouses (many of which have been extended) to the north, west and south. The dwelling has a rear boundary with Bowring Park Golf Course.

Proposal

Planning permission is sought for the erection of a first-floor side extension, part two-storey / part single storey rear extension, single storey front extension and the part conversion of the existing garage into a habitable room.

First-floor side extension

The first-floor side extension would have a width of 3.0m and a length of 5.8m. The extension would have a hipped tiled roof with an eaves height of 5.6m and a ridge height of 6.9m. The ridge height would incorporate a dropped ridge of 0.4m from the existing dwellings roof height. The application has been amended to set the extension back from the front elevation by 1.0m.

The extension would have a render finish and would have one window within the front elevation.

Part two-storey / part single storey rear extension

The two-storey aspect of the extension would have a projection of 3.0m beyond the existing rear elevation of the dwelling and would have a width of 5.8m. The extension would be set in from the shared boundary with the attached neighbouring dwelling No.83 by 3.3m, set in 0.2m from the shared boundary with the detached neighbouring dwelling No.79 and be set away from the rear shared boundary by 29.9m.

The extension would have a hipped tiled roof with an eaves height of 5.6m and a ridge height of 6.9m. The ridge height would incorporate a dropped ridge of 0.4m from the existing dwellings roof height.

The single storey aspect of the extension would project 2.5m beyond the existing rear elevation adjacent to No.83. The extension would then be set in 4.7m and then would project a further 2.8m bringing the total projection to 5.3m adjacent to the boundary with No. 79. The extension would have a total width of 9.0m. The extension has been amended to reduce the projection closest to the neighbouring dwelling of No.83 from 3.0m to 2.5m.

The extension would have a flat roof with two roof lanterns installed, with a roof height of 3.0m, and a total roof height of 3.5m; when including the height of the roof lanterns.

The extension would be finished in render and would have bi-fold doors within the rear elevation, one long vertical window in the side elevation (side of No.83) and two first-floor windows within the rear elevation.

Single storey front extension

The single storey front extension would have a width of 5.8m and would project beyond the existing front elevation by 0.5m.

The extension would have a pitched tiled roof with an eaves height of 2.8m and a ridge height of 3.8m.

The extension would be finished in render and would have a garage door and one door within the front elevation.

Part-conversion of garage into habitable room

Towards the front of the existing garage would remain as a garage and would be served by a garage door. Towards the rear of the existing garage would be converted to allow for a new WC, utility room and new kitchen, in connection with the proposed rear extension.

Other alterations

A new render finish would be applied to the entire existing dwelling, as well as the proposed extensions.

Consultations

None required.

Representations

This application has been publicised by letters sent to 6 neighbours and a site notice displayed near to the site. No representations were received as a result of the 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 identifying matters of concern within the application (as originally submitted) and negotiating with the applicant, acceptable amendments to the proposal to address those concerns. As a result, the Local Planning Authority has been able to grant planning permission for an acceptable proposal, in accordance with the presumption in favour of sustainable development, as set out within the National Planning Policy Framework.

Assessment

RESIDENTIAL AMENITY AND DESIGN

First-floor side extension

The Householder Development SPD outlines that two-storey side extensions or first-floor side extensions should be designed to avoid having an overbearing effect or causing unacceptable loss of light or privacy for neighbours. They should also avoid causing a terracing effect either by themselves or in conjunction with similar extensions.

The SPD also outlines that either a minimum space of 1m should be preserved between the extension and the party boundary to the side of the property, or the front wall of the first-floor of the extension should be set back at least 1m from the immediately adjoining part of the main front wall of the original dwelling.

The proposed first-floor side extension would have a width of 3.0m and would have a length of 5.8m. The proposed extension would sit 0.2m away from the shared boundary with No.79.

The extension has been amended to set the extension back from the adjacent front elevation by 1.0m. As the first-floor set back would comply with the guidance outlined by the SPD, it is considered that no actual or potential terracing would occur. This is further supported by the incorporation of a 0.4m dropped ridge to further reduce any terracing effects.

Considering the impact on the detached neighbouring dwelling 79 Bowring Park Avenue, there are two first-floor windows within the side elevation of No.79. Based on the layout of these windows being identical to the windows found within side elevation of the application site, the curved window is considered to be non-habitable as it serves a stairway, and the second window is considered to be habitable as it serves a bedroom. The proposed first-floor side extension would sit 0.2m away from the shared boundary with No.79 and would bring the side elevation of the property around 3.1m closer to the neighbouring windows. The current distance between the habitable room window of No.79 and the gable of No. 81 is 6.1m.

The stairway window serves a non-habitable room and due to being set in the middle of the neighbouring side elevation, it would be the window that is the most affected by the side extension, however, given that the window is non-habitable, there would be no significant effect on the amenity.

It is likely that the proposed first-floor side extension would have some impact on the bedroom window, as this is the only window that serves this habitable room. This bedroom window within the side elevation is a common design feature within the wider estate of Bowring Park Avenue, as it is unusual to find a main habitable window within the side elevation of a property, as they are usually expected to be found within the front or rear elevations. Furthermore, whilst the proposed first-floor side extension would alter the outlook from the bedroom window, the existing outlook is currently dominated by the side elevation of the application site, and it is considered that the proposed development would not significantly harm the outlook to the extent that it would cause significant harm to the amenity. The LPA acknowledges that the first-floor side extension would have an impact on the habitable window of No.79. The New Residential Development SPD outlines that there should be an interface distance of 12m between a habitable window and a side elevation. At present, the interface

distance between this window and the existing side elevation is 6.1m. The proposed side extension would see this interface distance further reduced to 3.1m. This new interface distance is considered to be acceptable in this instance. As the existing interface distance already falls significantly below the 12m guidance, it is considered that the proximity of the neighbouring habitable window and the impact that the proposed first-floor side extension would have is not enough to warrant a refusal of the application in this instance. Additionally, it is not uncommon to find two-storey side extensions within the wider locality which impact these side elevation bedroom windows. Examples of such side extensions can be found to the southwest of the site at 64 Bowring Park Avenue (approved under planning permission 22/00446/FUL) and to the north of the site at 75 Bowring Park Avenue (approved under planning permission 07/00795/FUL).

There would be no impact on the amenity of the attached neighbouring dwelling 83 Bowring Park Avenue, as the extension would be located to the opposite side.

The extension would be finished in render, which would match the wider dwellinghouse once the new render finish is applied to the whole of the existing dwelling. The extension would also have a hipped tiled roof. Therefore, as the materials and roof design would match that of 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 additional window within the front elevation does not raise any overlooking concerns as it would not provide any additional views not already available from the front of the dwelling. Additionally, as this window would serve a bathroom, a condition will be included to ensure that this window has obscure glazing installed, to protect privacy.

In summary, the first-floor 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 H8 and guidance provided by the Householder Development SPD.

Part two-storey / part single storey rear extension

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 SPD also advises that two-storey extensions with a projection of up to 3.0m will normally be acceptable, should not come within 7.0m from the rear boundary and should normally have a pitched roof.

The two-storey aspect of the extension would have a projection of 3.0m beyond the existing rear elevation of the dwelling, would have a width of 5.8m, would be set in from the shared boundary with the attached neighbouring dwelling by 3.3m, would be set in from the shared boundary with the detached neighbouring dwelling by 0.2m and would be set away from the shared rear boundary by 29.9m. As such, as the projection and set in distance from the rear shared boundary would comply with the SPD's guidance, the two-storey part of the rear extension is considered to be acceptable in this instance.

The single storey aspect of the extension would project 2.5m beyond the existing rear elevation (of the existing rear extension), would be set in 4.7m and then would project a further 2.8m adjacent to the boundary with No.79, and would have a total width of 9.0m. As the single storey aspect would have a total projection of 4.8m, this would cause the 45-degree principle to be applied, as the projection would exceed the SPD's guidance by 0.8m.

Considering the impact on the attached neighbouring dwelling 83 Bowring Park Avenue, whilst the single storey part of the rear extension would project 2.5m beyond the original rear wall of the host property, the single storey part of the extension closest to the shared boundary with No.83 would project 4.0m beyond the original rear elevation of No.83. As such, this 4.0m project complies with the SPD's guidance.

Whilst the total projection of the single storey part of the extension beyond the original rear elevation of No.83 would be 6.8m and would slightly breach the 45-degree principle, this breach is considered to be minimal and given that the largest part of the extension would be set in from the shared boundary by 4.7m, this set in mitigates any impact on the amenity of the neighbouring dwelling. With regards to the two-storey part of the extension, the extension would project 3.6m beyond the rear elevation of No.83 (due to shaping of the rear elevation of the application site) and would be set in from the shared boundary by 3.3m. The two-storey part of the extension would not breach the 45-degree principle and is considered to be acceptable in this instance.

Considering any impact on the detached neighbouring dwelling 79 Bowring Park Avenue, the single storey part of the extension would project 2.8m beyond No.79's single storey rear extension and would be set in from the shared boundary by 0.2m. As such, the single storey part of the extension would comply with the SPD's guidance in terms of its projection and would have no greater impact on the amenity of No.79 than the existing rear extension which projects 3.9m beyond the rear elevation of No.79. With regards to the two-storey part of the extension, the extension would project 2.6m beyond the rear elevation of No.79 and would comply with the SPD in regard to its projection.

The SPD also advises that two-storey rear extensions should not come within 7.0m from the rear boundary. The proposed extension would be set away from the rear shared boundary by 29.9m and therefore complies with the SPD's guidance. Whilst the New Residential Development SPD advises that development should retain 22 metre interface distances between existing rear principal elevations and proposed principal elevations for two-storey properties, given that there is no neighbouring properties to the rear of the application site, this guidance is not relevant in this instance.

The two-storey part of the extension would have a hipped tiled roof, and the single storey part of the extension would have a flat roof with two roof lanterns installed. The SPD advises that two-storey rear extensions should normally have a pitched roof, however, as the two-storey part of the extensions roof would match that of the wider dwelling's existing roof-profile, the proposed roof is considered to be acceptable. The flat roof design to the single storey part of the extension raises no concerns, as flat roof rear extensions are a common feature on modern dwellinghouses within the wider locality. As such, the proposed roof-profiles are considered to be acceptable and would not impact the visual amenity.

The extension would be finished in render, which would match the wider dwellinghouse once the new render finish is applied to the whole of the existing

dwelling. Therefore, as the materials would match that of 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 bi-fold doors within the rear elevation and one window within the rear elevation and one window within the side elevation (side of No.83) of the single storey part of the extension raise no overlooking concerns due to their ground floor siting and boundary treatments. Whilst two windows would be installed within the rear elevation of the two-storey part of the extension, they would not create any additional views not already available from the rear of the existing dwelling.

In summary, the proposed part two-storey / part single storey rear extension is considered to be acceptable in terms of any impacts on the residential amenity and visual amenity of the host property and the surrounding area and complies with Policy CS19 of the Core Strategy, Policies H8 of the Replacement Knowsley UDP, and guidance provided by the Householder Development SPD.

Single storey front extension

The Householder Development SPD advises that front extensions and porches can be particularly prominent in the street scene and should be carefully designed to retain the character of residential areas. It also advises that the style, design, materials and scale of front extensions and porches should respect the character of the surrounding area.

The proposed front extension would have a width of 5.8m and would project 0.5m beyond the existing front elevation.

The proposed front extension would project 0.6m beyond the front elevations of 79 and 83 Bowring Park Avenue and would sit 0.2m away from the shared boundary with No.79 and 3.3m away from the shared boundary with No.83. As such, the front extension would not breach the 45-degree rule and is considered to be acceptable.

The extension would be finished in render to match the wider dwellinghouse and proposed extensions and would have a pitched tiled roof. Whilst the roof-profile of the existing dwellinghouse is a hipped roof, the roof to the existing porch is a pitched tiled roof, therefore, the proposed roof-profile would not look visually different to that of existing. As the materials and roof design would match that of the existing dwellinghouse, the extension would not have a negative impact on the amenity of the street-scene and is considered to be acceptable in visual terms.

In summary, the single storey front 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 H8 and guidance provided by the Householder Development SPD.

Part-conversion of garage into habitable room

The part-conversion of the garage would continue to be served by a garage door, similar to that of existing.

The Householder Development SPD advises that the internal dimensions of a garage to contribute towards the car parking provision are 5.5m x 2.75m. The part-conversion would see the internal dimensions of the garage be reduced to 4.1m x 2.7m, and as such the garage would no longer contribute towards the parking provision of the

dwelling. The loss of this space does not raise any concerns, as three parking spaces for the newly created four-bedroom property would still be available on the driveway and the vehicle crossover. As such, the garage conversion is considered to be acceptable.

Other alterations

The new render finish to be applied to the existing dwelling raises no concerns, as rendered dwellings are a common feature within the wider locality.

HIGHWAYS

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

The Householder Development SPD advises that sufficient car parking should be retained or provided when erecting a first-floor side extension and a single storey front extension. 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 3.0m.

At present, the application site benefits from a driveway to the side of the property for one vehicle. Drawing No. A100 (REV A) indicates that the driveway would be extended to the front of the property to allow for two vehicles to park within the curtilage. The space available to the front of the dwelling measures 6.0m x 9.3m, which could allow up to three vehicles to park on the driveway, if the applicant wishes to extend the driveway across the entirety of the front of the dwelling. However, it is also noted that there is a tree situated on the grass verge adjacent to the application site, which may make it difficult for three vehicles to park 'side-by-side' on a proposed driveway.

In the instance that the driveway could only accommodate two parking spaces measuring 5.0m x 3.0m each, the displaced vehicle could be parked on the vehicle cross-over, which is common within the locality.

As such, the proposal does not raise any highways safety concerns and is considered to be acceptable in this instance.

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 extensions hereby approved 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.

- 4) No part of the development hereby permitted shall be used or occupied until the proposed first-floor window within the front elevation of the proposed two-storey side extension as indicated on Drawing No. A103 (REV B) has been glazed with obscure glass to level 4/5. The obscurely glazed window shall be retained thereafter.

Reason: In order to safeguard the residential amenities enjoyed by the occupants of neighbouring properties and to ensure the development complies with Policies CS2 and CS19 of the Knowsley Local Plan Core Strategy and Saved Policy H8 of the Knowsley Replacement Unitary Development Plan, adopted in June 2006, and the National Planning Policy Framework.

- 5) The parking provision shown within the curtilage of the dwelling on the approved plans shall be made of porous materials, or provision shall be made to direct run off water from the hard surface to a permeable or porous area or surface within the curtilage of the dwellinghouse. The driveway must provide parking for two vehicles at minimum with each space measuring 5.0m x 3.0m. The parking provision shall be retained as such thereafter.

Reason: In the interests of highway and pedestrian safety, to reduce surface water run-off and to ensure the development complies with Policies CS19 and CS24 of the Knowsley Local Plan: Core Strategy, adopted January 2016.

SCHEDULE 1

Date Received	Ref. No	Version	Drawing/Document Title
02.07.2026	A103	REV B	PROPOSED FLOOR PLANS
02.07.2026	A104	REV B	PROPOSED ELEVATIONS
19.07.2026	A100	REV A	EXISTING AND PROPOSED SITE AND LOCATION PLANS

Signed Case Officer¹: Louise Robinson

Signed Authorising Officer²: Jo Sheridan

Date: 31/07/2026

Informatives

1. It is an offence to carry out any works within the public highway without the permission of the Highway Authority. This permission requires the construction, improvement or alteration of an access to the public highway. Under Section 184 of the Highways Act 1980, the Highway Authority must specify the works to be carried out. Only the Highway Authority or a contractor approved by the Highway Authority may carry out these works.

For the avoidance of doubt, the applicant is advised that the widening of the vehicular dropped kerb must be undertaken by Knowsley Council's approved contractor, Tarmac.

Contact details:

✉ Knowsley.highways@tarmac.com

☎ 0800 023 2334

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

