

APPLICATION NO: 26/00090/FUL

CASE OFFICER: Kate Pickles

WARD: St Gabriels

PARISH:

LOCATION: 12 Kipling Avenue, Huyton, Knowsley, L36 0TZ

PROPOSAL: ERECTION OF SINGLE STOREY FRONT PORCH EXTENSION

Site description

The application property is a two-storey, mid-terraced dwellinghouse set within a rectangular plot fronting on to Kipling Avenue. The property is situated within a Primarily Residential Area in the Local Plan Policies Map. The surrounding area is characterised by terraced and semi-detached housing, with Sovereign Industrial Park located to the east. The front driveway comprises a mix of concrete flags and grass, enclosed by wood panel fencing.

Proposal

Permission is sought for the erection of a single storey front extension that would project 2m from the front elevation of the existing property, be 3.3m in width and 3.4m in height with an eaves height of 2.5m. The porch would be served by a mono pitched roof which would extend close to the boundary with the attached neighbouring property No. 14. One door and one window are proposed to the front elevation.

Consultations

None required.

Representations

This application was publicised by letters sent to 8 neighbours. Two representations, one in support and one objecting to the proposal have been received as a result of this publicity.

The representations will be addressed in the Assessment section of this report.

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that accord with an up-to-date development plan without delay; or where the development plan is absent, silent or out of date, planning permission should normally be granted unless the application of policies in the NPPF that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides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

Policy 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

The Householder Development SPD states that “*extensions must not overshadow or have an overbearing effect on neighbouring dwellings.*” The Householder Development SPD also states that extensions should not unacceptably obstruct the outlook of neighbouring dwellings or detract from their privacy.

The proposed front extension would feature an offset roof design, with one side forming an open canopy and the other side enclosing a built element beneath. The open canopy section of the roof would be offset by 0.2m from the shared boundary with No.14 and is considered to have minimal impact on residential amenity as the open nature of the roof and lack of built form does not give rise to any loss of residential amenity or loss of outlook or light and as such, the impact on No14 is considered acceptable.

The proposed extension would be set off the shared boundary with No. 10 by approximately 0.1m. An objection has been received raising concerns about an overbearing impact on No. 10 Kipling Avenue. While the proposal would not comply with the 45-degree rule in relation to the window of No. 10 located close to the shared boundary, the impact is considered acceptable. The affected room benefits from an additional window to the rear elevation. As such, it is considered that any reduction in light arising from the proposed extension would not result in a significant or unacceptable loss of residential amenity, given the availability of the second window that would warrant the refusal of the proposal.

The Householder Development SPD advises that proposed front extensions should consider the building line but small porches of satisfactory design in materials projecting beyond the building line will usually be permitted. While the proposed front extension would project beyond the established building line, its modest projection of 2m from the front elevation and the use of matching materials means it would not appear overly dominant and would be in keeping with the character of the existing dwelling and area.

Highways

The Householder Development SPD stipulates that the size and projection of front extensions and porches that may be permitted depends on the type of dwelling and degree of set back from the highway. Given that 10.3m would remain between the highway and the completed development, it is considered that the property is able to support the scale of the development without resulting in an adverse impact on the wider street scene through overspill on to the highway.

The driveway to the front of the dwelling would be reduced from 10.2m in length to 8.2m in length and would remain 6.7m in width. This would be acceptable from a highway

safety perspective as the dimensions surpass the minimum required for two driveway parking spaces. Given this, the parking availability would be retained and the demand for any additional parking would not increase as the proposal does not involve the introduction of any additional bedrooms.

Conclusion

The proposal would be acceptable in terms of design, residential amenity and highway safety and is therefore 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.

Schedule 1

Date received	Drawing. No	Revision	Drawing/Document Title
27/03/2026	PL_01	B	Existing&Proposed_Plans_Elevations
27/03/2026	PL_02	B	Existing&Proposed_Plans

Knowsley Council
Regeneration and Economic Development Directorate.
Delegated Planning Report

Signed Case Officer: Kate Pickles

Signed Authorising Officer: Jo Sheridan

Date: 18/05/2026

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

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