

<u>APPLICATION NO:</u>	26/00384/FUL	<u>CASE OFFICER:</u>	Louise Robinson
<u>WARD:</u>	Whitefield	<u>PARISH:</u>	N/A
<u>LOCATION:</u>	29 Melling Way, Kirkby Park, Kirkby, Knowsley, L32 1TN		
<u>PROPOSAL:</u>	ERECTION OF SINGLE STOREY WRAP AROUND EXTENSION TO THE FRONT, SIDE AND REAR (FOLLOWING DEMOLITION OF ATTACHED GARAGE AND REAR EXTENSION)		

Site Description

The application site comprises a single storey semi-detached one-bed bungalow located on Melling Way, Kirkby. The dwelling is characterised by a mixture of brick and render to all elevations and has a gable tiled roof. The property currently benefits from a garage extension and a conservatory to the side and a small extension to the rear / side.

There is off-street parking available to the front for one vehicle.

No. 31 sits higher than the application site by approximately 750mm.

The surrounding area is primarily residential with semi-detached bungalows to the north and south, and semi-detached two-storey dwellings to the east of the site. To the west of the site is Millbrook Millenium Green.

Proposal

Planning permission is sought for the erection of a single storey 'wrap-around' extension to the front, side and rear of the dwelling, following the demolition of the existing garage, conservatory and rear extension.

SINGLE STOREY FRONT EXTENSION

The front extension would have a width of 8.5m and would project beyond the existing front elevation by 3.6m (adjacent to 31 Melling Way) and 0.9m (adjacent to 27 Melling Way). The extension would have a pitched tiled roof with an eaves height of 2.5m and a ridge height of 4.7m.

The extension would have a render finish and would have a door and glazing and one window within the front elevation and one window within the side elevation (adjacent to 27 Melling Way).

SINGLE STOREY SIDE EXTENSION

The side extension would have a length of 9.8m and widths of 5.5m at its widest point and 2.8m at its shortest point. The extension would have a pitched tiled roof with an eaves height of 2.5m and a ridge height of 4.7m.

The extension would have a render finish and would have one window and door within

the side elevation and one window within the rear elevation.

SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION

The rear extension would have a width of 11.8m and would project beyond the existing rear elevation by 3.0m. The extension would have a dual-pitched tiled roof with an eaves height of 2.5m and a ridge height of 4.7m.

The extension would have a render finish and would have one set of double doors and two windows within the rear elevation.

OTHER ALTERATIONS

Two roof-flights would be installed within the rear roof-plane of the existing dwelling.

Consultations

None required.

Representations

This application has been publicised by letters sent to 4 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

Pre-Application Advice was issued to the applicant in June 2026 regarding the submitted proposal.

Relevant Policy

Paragraphs 11 and 12 of the December 2024 National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) have been superseded by the August 2026 NPPF. The presumption in favour of sustainable development is now set out in Policies S3 to S5 of the NPPF (2026).

Paragraph S3 of the NPPF (2026): 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.

Paragraph S4 of the NPPF (2026): Principle of Development within settlements states:

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

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 Development within Primarily Residential Areas

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

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 front extension would have a width of 8.5m and would project beyond the existing front elevation by 3.6m (adjacent to 31 Melling Way) and 0.9m (adjacent to 27 Melling Way).

Considering the impact on the detached neighbouring dwelling 31 Melling Way, the front extension would not project beyond the main front elevation of No.31, due to a change in orientation between the properties. No.31's side extension has been designed in a staggered nature, with a habitable window within the front elevation being set-back from the main front elevation by 3.4m. When applying the 45-degree rule from this window, there would be a minor encroachment of the 45-degree rule. However, given that there is a change of site land levels between the host dwelling and No.31, the change in orientation of the dwellings and the minor encroachment of the 45-degree rule, this helps to ease the impact on the affected habitable window. Additionally, as the change in land levels and orientation of the dwellings helps to mitigate any impacts on the neighbouring window, the proposed front extension would have is not enough to warrant a refusal of the application.

Considering any impact on the attached neighbouring dwelling 27 Melling Way, the front extension would project 0.9m beyond the front elevation of No.27. The extension would not exceed the 45-degree rule and would not impact the neighbouring dwellings nearest habitable window. As such, the extension is considered to be acceptable.

The extension would have a pitched tiled roof and would have a render finish. As the materials and rood design would match that of the existing dwelling, 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 door and glazing and one window within the front elevation raise no overlooking concerns as they would not create any additional views not already available from the front of the dwellinghouse. The proposed window within the side elevation raises no overlooking concerns, as this window would not create any additional views not already available towards No.27.

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 of the Replacement UDP, Policy CS19 of the Core Strategy and guidance provided by the Householder Development SPD.

SINGLE STOREY SIDE EXTENSION

The Householder Development SPD advises that side extensions should be designed so that they preserve the street scene, protect light and privacy of neighbours and provide sufficient parking spaces.

The proposed side extension would have a length of 9.8m and widths of 5.5m at its widest point and 2.8m at its shortest point.

Considering the impact on the detached neighbouring dwelling 31 Melling Way, the side extension would be situated next to the side elevation of No.31's side extension. There is one habitable window installed within the side elevation of No.31 which serves a kitchen (as per approved planning permission 21.00164/FUL). The side extension would be situated 2.6m away from this window, whereas the existing garage to the side of the host property is currently situated 0.8m away from this neighbouring window.

It is likely that the proposed side extension would have some impact on this window, as it is the only window which serves this habitable room. However, as No.31 is situated at a higher land level than the host dwelling and this window is currently dominated by the existing garage to the side of No.27, it is considered that the proposed extension would not significantly harm the outlook to the extent that it would cause significant harm to the amenity. Additionally, it is also noted that a further 1.8m distance would be created between the proposed extension and No.31's kitchen window, which would allow for some additional light to enter this window than existing. Furthermore, it is also uncommon to find main habitable windows within side elevations of dwellings. As such, it is considered that the proximity of the neighbouring habitable window and the impact that the proposed side extension would have is not enough to warrant a refusal of the application, and in this instance the side extension is considered to be acceptable.

There would be no impact on the attached neighbouring dwelling 27 Melling Way, as the extension would be located away from No.27.

The extension would have a pitched tiled roof and would have a render finish. As the materials and rood design would match that of the existing dwelling, 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 extension would have a door and window serving a bedroom within the side elevation and one window within the rear elevation. The window within the rear elevation raises no overlooking concerns as it would not create any views not already available from the rear of the dwelling. With regard to the window and door in the side elevation, whilst the Householder Development SPD advises that side windows serving main habitable rooms are rarely acceptable where they would overlook an adjoining dwelling, given that the host site is situated at a lower land level than the neighbouring dwelling (No.31), it is unlikely that with window and door would cause any overlooking and are considered to be acceptable.

In summary, the single storey 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 of the Replacement UDP, Policy CS19 of the Core Strategy and guidance provided by the Householder Development SPD.

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 also advises that single storey rear extensions located on or immediately adjacent to the part 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 rear extension would have a width of 11.8m and would project 3.0m beyond the existing rear elevation. As such, the single storey rear extension would comply with the SPD in terms of its projection.

Considering any impact on the attached neighbouring dwelling 27 Melling Way, the extension would project 3.0m beyond the rear elevation of No.27 and would sit 1.2m away from the shared boundary. As the projection would fall below the guidance provided by the SPD, the rear extension would not impact the amenity of No.27 and is considered to be acceptable.

Considering the impact on the detached neighbouring dwelling 31 Melling Way, the extension would be situated 1.5m – 2.2m away from the shared boundary with No.31 due to the shaping of the shared boundary. Additionally, the extension would not project beyond No.31's 'snooker room' rear extension (approved under planning reference 21/00164/FUL). As such, the proposed rear extension would not impact the amenity of No.27 and is considered to be acceptable.

The extension would have a dual pitched tiled roof and would have a render finish. As the materials and roof design would match that of the existing dwelling, 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 proposed doors and windows within the rear elevation raise no overlooking concerns due to their ground floor siting and boundary treatments.

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 H8 of the Replacement UDP, Policy CS19 of the Core Strategy and guidance provided by the Householder Development SPD.

HIGHWAYS

The dwelling would be increased from a one-bedroom property to a three-bedroom property. At present, the application site benefits from a driveway to the front of the property for one vehicle.

The Householder Development SPD advises that sufficient car parking should be retained or provided when erecting a single storey side and front extension. The Householder Development SPD advises that the parking provision of a three-bedroom property should provide two spaces within the curtilage and that car spaces provided on front driveways should have dimensions of 5.0m x 3.0m.

Drawing No.1 indicates that two 5.0m x 3.0m parking spaces would be provided to the front of the dwelling which would comply with the SPD's parking guidance for a three-bedroom dwelling.

As such, the proposal does not raise any highway 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 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
10.07.2026	-	-	LOCATION PLAN
10.07.2026	1	-	EXISTING AND PROPOSED SITE PLANS
10.07.2026	2	-	EXISTING AND PROPOSED FLOOR PLANS
10.07.2026	3	-	EXISTING AND PROPOSED FRONT AND REAR ELEVATIONS

10.07.2026	4	-	EXISTING AND PROPOSED LEFT-HAND SIDE AND RIGHT-HAND SIDE ELEVATIONS
------------	---	---	---

Signed Case Officer¹:

Louise Robinson

Signed Authorising Officer²:

Jo Sheridan

Date:

03/09/2026

Informatives

Not Applicable.

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