

APPLICATION NO: 24/00638/FUL **CASE OFFICER:** Reece Black

WARD: Roby **PARISH:**

LOCATION: 7 Silverstone Drive, Roby, Knowsley

PROPOSAL: ERECTION OF A FIRST-FLOOR SIDE EXTENSION
TOGETHER WITH A LOFT CONVERSION AND REAR
DORMER EXTENSION.

Site Description

The application site is located at 7 Silverstone Drive, Roby and is situated within an area that is designated as a Primarily Residential Area in the Development Plan. The application property is a detached dwellinghouse and is a combination of brick (with white render facing to its front), side and rear elevations, together with mahogany UPVC openings and grey, flat, interlocking roof tiles.

The property benefits from an integral garage which is part of the original dwelling. To the furthest part of the rear garden is a detached outbuilding; the rear garden comprises patio and grassed sections.

The front elevation of the property is west facing. The front garden comprises of brick paving to provide off-street parking for the property which can accommodate up to 2 no. vehicles within the curtilage. There is a small section of vegetation and grassed section also within the front garden area and this section is enclosed by hedgerow. As existing, bins are stored within the front garden area.

The street scene comprises largely of other detached residential properties, with some variety to the house types. The application site is encircled by other residential properties.

Proposal

The proposal seeks permission for the erection of a first-floor side extension together with a loft conversion and rear dormer extension.

The proposed first-floor side extension would project 2.66m and have a depth of 7.74m. This would sit on top of the existing side garage (ground floor). This would be served by a dual-pitched roof, which would measure 5m at the eaves and 7.8m.

The proposed rear dormer extension would be flat roof in design and would project out by 2.6m, contain a width of 8.2m and a height of 1.8m. The rear elevation would contain 2 no. windows.

Consultations

None required.

Representations

This application has been publicised by letters sent to 7 neighbours. No representations have been received.

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.

The site is identified as a site allocated for housing development in the adopted Unitary Development Plan. As such, a domestic extension to the existing residential property is considered acceptable in principle, subject to compliance with local planning policy and guidance.

KNOWSLEY LOCAL PLAN: CORE STRATEGY

CS2 - Development Principles

CS19 - Design Quality and Accessibility in New Development

SAVED POLICIES - KNOWSLEY REPLACEMENT UNITARY DEVELOPMENT PLAN (ADOPTED JUNE 2006)

H5 - Development within Primarily Residential Areas

H8 - Extensions and Alterations to Residential Properties

In addition, the Householder Development SPD (2016) is a material consideration for the purposes of this planning application and provides additional guidance in relation to householder development and design within Knowsley Borough.

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

Saved Policy H8 in the Replacement Unitary Development Plan states that proposals for extensions to dwellings will be permitted provided that:

- a) The proposals would not (due to their scale and massing) result in a disproportionate addition to the original dwelling
- b) The design and materials used would reflect those used on the original dwelling
- c) The proposal would not adversely affect the amenity or privacy of occupiers of adjacent dwellings
- d) The proposal would not create potential hazards for highway users by obstructing visibility for pedestrians or drivers of motor vehicles; and
- e) Adequate parking and garden space would remain in use by the residents of the extended property

The Householder Development SPD states that two storey side extensions (and provision of first floors over existing single storey side extensions) should be designed to avoid having an overbearing effect or causing unacceptable loss of light or privacy for neighbours. It also states 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 Householder Development SPD states that roof alterations and dormer extensions should ensure that care is exercised to ensure that their design is in keeping with the dwelling and that they do not overlook neighbouring dwellings. Dormers should not be so large as to dominate the roof slope resulting in a dwelling which appears unbalanced.

Design

The proposed development would have an acceptable scale. The proposed first-floor extension would be sited above the existing garage, with a set-back from the immediately adjoining wall. The proposal would not result in a potential or actual terracing effect given that the existing space between No.5 would be retained in line with the SPD guidance which stipulates that for the consideration of two-storey side extensions (including first-floor side extensions above existing ground floor side extensions) that a minimum of 1m distance from the party boundary should be retained. The amendments secured show that the ridge of the proposal would be set lower than the existing ridgeline of the original dwellinghouse, which presents the proposal in a subordinate massing and would emulate the dual-pitched roof.

The proposed roof alterations and loft conversion would not appear unduly dominant or enlarged on the roofscape with appropriate set-backs and set-ins. The amended application would have a set-back of 0.75m from the rear elevation and despite a 0.25m shortfall, this would be considered acceptable due to the fact the original submission had no set-back, the difference of 0.25m would not result in a significantly harmful design to warrant a refusal and would be acceptable on this

occasion. The SPD advises that dormers should be set-in from the roof edges by at least 0.5m and the revised plans show that the dormer cheeks would be set in by 0.6m and therefore is in accord with the guidance. Despite the 0.25m shortfall in set-back, the dormer overall would be set below the existing ridgeline of the original dwelling and has seen suitable amendments to comply with policy, which it is considered that in line with the guidance of the 7.7 of the SPD, that the amended design would ensure a sensitive and appropriate approach which conserves the character of the original building and roofscape. Consequently, the dormer would be a suitable addition to the roofscape and would not appear overly domineering.

The existing dwelling is a combination of brick and white render facing with mahogany UPVC openings and tiled roofing. The submitted plans show that the proposed development would emulate the design and materials of the original dwellinghouse. The proposed dormer is noted to be faced with wood effect UPVC anthracite cladding to its elevations, although the timber is a contrast to the materials employed for the original roof covering, it is considered that the colour selection of anthracite would significantly contrast to the original roof to raise concerns from the materials and design. It is considered that the materials proposed for the dormer would be acceptable.

In line with the guidance which advises the openings on dormers should generally be noticeably smaller than the windows on the storeys below but should echo the general proportions and shape of the openings below. The scheme has been amended to incorporate this guidance, and the amended window details achieve this policy guidance.

As existing, bins are stored within the front garden area, adjacent the front boundary wall of the dwelling. The proposal would not fully remove access to the rear of the property and therefore, bins could still be stored and moved from the rear garden to the front of the property externally. This would accord with 6.25 of the Householder Development SPD.

Overall, the proposed extensions and alterations would have an acceptable design and scale to the existing dwelling. The proposal would be deemed to broadly accord with Policies CS2 and CS19, of the Local Plan and Saved Policies H5 and H8 of the Replacement Unitary Development Plan together with the Householder Development SPD.

Residential Amenity

6.19 of the Householder Development SPD states that extensions must adequately protect your neighbours' right to enjoy their own home. Extensions must not overshadow or have an overbearing impact on neighbouring dwellings to an unacceptable degree.

No's 41 & 43 Oulton Lane

These two properties are sited to the east of the application site; the rear elevations of these properties face one another at an interface distance of 23m and the rear gardens of these properties meet the rear garden of the application site.

The proposed dormer extension would not be considered to result in any unacceptable overlooking into the rear gardens of these properties and an acceptable interface distance (minimum 20m) would be retained.

5 Silverstone Drive

No.5 is a detached dwelling to the north of the application site where the two gable walls face one another. The gable wall of No.5 contains no windows.

The proposed development would not be considered to cause any severe adverse harm as the first-floor side extension would not be readily visible from the occupants of No.5 as it would not project beyond the existing elevations of the property. The dormer projection would not have any adverse impact on amenities.

9 Silverstone Drive

No.9 is a detached dwelling to the south of the application site where the two gable walls face one another.

The proposal would not be deemed to raise any adverse harm as the first-floor side extension would not be readily visible from the occupants of No.9 as it would not project beyond the existing elevations of the property. The dormer extension would not have any adverse impact on amenities.

Overall, it would not be considered that the proposed development would result in any unacceptable impact to the residential amenities or privacy of the occupants of No's 5 and 9. The proposed development would comply with Saved Policy H5 and H8 and the Householder Development SPD.

No other dwellings in the locality are considered to suffer any adverse impact.

Highways

The front garden of the property comprises block paving slabs to provide hardstanding which could accommodate up to 2 no. vehicles within the curtilage of the dwelling.

The proposed development would see an additional bedroom introduced to the property which would result in a total of 4 no. bedrooms. The Householder Development SPD states that for properties which have 4+ no. bedrooms these should have 3 no. parking spaces.

The National Planning Policy Framework (Paragraph 116) stipulates that development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network, following mitigation, would be severe, taking into account all reasonable future scenarios.

Although the parking accommodations would have a shortfall of 1 no. space it would not be considered that this would result in an unacceptable impact which would warrant a refusal, in accord with the NPPF. Moreover, these parking requirements are maximum standards. As observed during the site visit and from Google Maps Street View data it is acknowledged that some on-street parking occurs and therefore this could accommodate any increased demand. Notwithstanding this, the proposal would not remove any existing in-curtilage parking provision would still retain 2 no. parking spaces.

Therefore, the proposal would not be considered to warrant a sufficient reason for

refusal or considered to cause any significant highway safety issues and consequently would be acceptable on highways grounds.

Conclusion

The proposal would be acceptable in terms of design, residential amenity, highways the proposal also complies with relevant Core Strategy, Replacement UDP policies and guidance in the NPPF, and is therefore recommended for approval subject to conditions.

Recommendation

That Planning Permission be granted subject to the following condition(s):-

- 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) Notwithstanding the materials otherwise agreed for the external walls of the rear dormer extension hereby permitted, 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
08/01/2025	-	-	LOCATION PLAN
25/03/2025	SD-01	REV A	PROPOSED FLOOR PLANS AND ELEVATIONS
26/11/2024	-	-	APPLICATION FORM

Signed Case Officer¹: Reece Black

Signed Authorising Officer²: Jo Sheridan

Date: 02/04/2025

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