

APPLICATION NO: 26/00195/FUL

CASE OFFICER: Kate Pickles

WARD: Whitefield

PARISH:

LOCATION: 15 Alder Crescent, Kirkby Park, Kirkby, Knowsley, L32 0SB

PROPOSAL: ERECTION OF SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION TOGETHER WITH
CONVERSION OF EXISTING GARAGE AND PORCH TO HABITABLE SPACE.

Site description

The application property is a two-storey, semi-detached dwellinghouse set within a rectangular plot fronting on to Alder Crescent. The wider area is characterised by semi-detached and detached residential properties with Urban Greenspace to the North and east of the site.

Proposal

Permission is sought for the erection of a single storey rear extension together with conversion of existing garage and porch to habitable space. The proposed extension would project 3m from the rear elevation of the host dwelling, would be 8m in width and would be 2.3m in height with an eaves height of 3.7m. The porch and garage would serve as a utility room and bathroom, and the rear extension would serve as an enlarged kitchen and dining area.

Consultations

None required.

Representations

This application was publicised by letters sent to 7 neighbours. No representations have been received as a result of this publicity.

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that accord with an up-to-date development plan without delay; or where the development plan is absent, silent or out of date planning permission should be granted unless the application of policies in the NPPF that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a clear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

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, scale and residential amenity

The Householder Developer SPD advises that extensions should not have an overbearing effect on neighbouring dwellings or lead to overshadowing. The proposed rear extension complies with this guidance as the scale of the development is considered modest. The proposal would project 3m beyond the rear elevation of the main dwelling, would be 8m in width and 3.7m in height with an eaves height of 2.3m. Alongside the modest scale, the existing rear developments at No.17 and No.13 mitigate overshadowing concerns as a similar pattern of development is already in place and no significant additional loss of light or outlook would result. Given the limited projection, single storey height and comparable scale to neighbouring extensions, the proposed rear extension is not considered to give rise to any overbearing impact. The proposal is therefore considered acceptable in terms of the impact on residential amenity and scale.

The Householder Developer SPD advises that extensions should be designed to avoid the loss of privacy of neighbouring properties. The proposed rear extension complies with this guidance, the glass paned doors to the rear raise no privacy concerns as an interface distance of 21.5m would be retained between the proposed extension and the adjacent rear elevation. When considered alongside the ground floor siting of the openings, existing boundary treatments and no new viewpoints created beyond those already available from the rear elevation, the proposal is considered acceptable in terms of the impact on privacy. The porch and garage conversion also raise no privacy concerns as the windows proposed would replace existing front elevation windows and would therefore have a negligible impact on the privacy of neighbouring properties. The proposal is therefore considered acceptable in terms of the impact on residential amenity with regards to privacy.

The proposed garage conversion and porch also comply with the Householder Developer SPD guidance. The garage would be converted and extended to form the wrap around porch. The original open porch with a roof canopy would be enclosed to form a built-up porch extension attached to the garage and connecting to the existing roof. This means that the garage and porch would not project further than the existing roof canopy. As such, the converted garage and porch are not considered to have an overbearing effect on neighbouring properties because the development remains within the established building line and footprint of the existing structure.

The Householder developer SPD also advises that extensions should be constructed in materials that match those of the existing dwelling. The proposal complies with this guidance through the use of brick, render, roof tiles and UPVC to match that of the main dwelling. The proposal is therefore considered acceptable in terms of design as visual coherence with the host dwelling would be maintained. The SPD also advises that

adequate space should be maintained around development to avoid a cramped appearance within the plot. The proposed rear extension complies with this guidance as the garden would be reduced from 12m to 9m in length. Therefore, over 50% of the existing garden space would be maintained aiding in the avoidance of a cramped appearance within the plot.

Neighbouring property No.17 has a similar garage and porch conversion as the one proposed meaning that the proposal would remain in keeping with the character of the area. Further, the proposed converted garage would be served by the existing mono-pitched roof that would connect to the proposed porch to form a hipped roof. This would echo the hipped roof of the main dwelling and would therefore maintain visual coherence. The proposed rear extension would have a pitched roof which is in keeping with the architecture of the wider area. The proposal is therefore considered acceptable in terms of the impact on the street scene and the character of the wider area.

Highway safety and parking

No additional bedrooms are proposed meaning that the demand for off street parking within the curtilage of the property does not increase. The conversion of the garage would lead to the loss of one parking space within the curtilage of the property. The loss of this parking space is considered acceptable as sufficient space remains to the front of the property for two car parking spaces. This remains within the parking requirements for a three-bedroom house outlined in the Householder Developer SPD. Therefore, the loss of the garage parking space is not considered to give rise to any highway safety concerns and the parking arrangements remain sufficient to serve the property.

Conclusion

The proposal is considered acceptable in terms of design, scale, residential amenity and highway safety 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 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

Knowsley Council
Regeneration and Economic Development Directorate.
Delegated Planning Report

- 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
24/04/2026			Proposed floor plans and elevations with Location Plan

Signed Case Officer: Kate Pickles

Signed Authorising Officer: Jo Sheridan

Date: 09/06/2026

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