

<u>APPLICATION NO:</u>	24/00547/FUL	<u>CASE OFFICER:</u>	Lee Osborne
<u>WARD:</u>	Swanside	<u>PARISH:</u>	
<u>LOCATION:</u>	44 Holly Bank Avenue, Roby, Knowsley		
<u>PROPOSAL:</u>	ERECTION OF A SINGLE STOREY SIDE EXTENSION TOGETHER WITH LOFT CONVERSION WITH ERECTION OF SIDE DORMER EXTENSION		

Site Description

The application relates to a modern detached house and associated garden curtilage on Holly Bank Avenue within a housing estate. There is one half of a detached garage to the front of the property that belongs to the application house, with the other half belonging to the neighbouring house.

Proposal

The application seeks planning permission for a single storey extension at the side of the house and a flat roofed dormer roof extension. The single storey extension would be irregular in shape, accounting for the irregular boundary line. The extension would be 2.915m wide at the front and for a length of 2.7m where it would widen on an angle to a maximum width of 5.7m whereby it would then angle back and narrow at the rear to 2.465. The extension would be flat roofed with a parapet at the front and a lantern rooflight. The extension would be of matching brick. The extension would be a kitchen/diner extension, with a utility room at the front.

The dormer extension would be 8.5m wide, with 0.4m at either end to the edge of the pitched roof. The dormer would be 2.4m high and have a projection of 2.1m. The walls of the dormer would be tiled to match the existing.

Consultations

NA

Representations

This application has been publicised by letters sent to 5 neighbours. No representations have been received.

Planning History

12/00132/REM - RESERVED MATTERS APPLICATION (PHASE 1) FOR ERECTION OF 100 NO. DWELLINGS, LANDSCAPING, OPEN SPACE AND INTERNAL ROAD - APPEARANCE, LANDSCAPING, LAYOUT AND SCALE TO BE CONSIDERED. Granted: 30.05.2012.

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that accord with an up-to-date development plan without delay; or where the development plan is absent, silent or out of date planning permission should be granted unless the application of policies in the NPPF that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a clear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 (ADOPTED JUNE 2006)

H5 - Development within Primarily Residential Areas

H8 - Extensions and Alterations to Residential Properties

Article 35 Statement

The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by identifying matters of concern with the proposal and discussing those with the applicant. Unfortunately, it has not been possible to resolve those matters within the timescale allocated for the determination of this planning application. However, the Local Planning Authority has clearly set out, within its report, the steps necessary to remedy the harm identified within the reason(s) for refusal - which may lead to the submission of a more acceptable proposal in the future. The Local Planning Authority is willing to provide pre-application advice in respect of any future application for a revised development.

Assessment

The application is to extend a house within a housing estate and residential area and is therefore acceptable in principle.

Design and Visual Amenity Concerns

The design of the single storey extension is satisfactory and would not be detrimental to the appearance of the house. The extension would, for the most part, not be readily visible from public viewpoints as the double garage building would provide screening, and the flat roof would also minimise visual impact. The proposal would not impact on the outlook of the neighbouring dwelling as it would be adjacent the side

of that house, with a flat roof, with the houses here having no windows on the side other than a first floor en-suite window.

The dormer would extend across the full width other than 0.4m at either end. In addition the dormer would be 2.5m high and project 2.1m with a flat roof. The dormer would it is considered be overly dominant and would be out of character with the house. Due to the proposed internal layout the windows would be unbalanced, with singular en-suite and landing windows from the front to midway, at the rear would be a 3 pane window for the bedroom. The roof of the house slopes up from either side to the centre ridge, and the dormer would therefore extend down the house from front to back on one roof plane. The dormer would be visible from public vantage points and with the design, scale and mass of the dormer within the roof plane would unbalance the dwelling and be incongruous in the street scene to the detriment of the visual amenity of the area.

Whilst the single storey extension is acceptable the dormer extension conflicts with Policies CS2 and CS19 of the Core Strategy and Saved Policies H5 and H8 of the UDP.

In addition the adopted Householder Development SPD states that roof alterations and dormer extensions should be constructed with care 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. It is clear that the dormer design is not in keeping with the house and would dominate the roof slope unbalancing the building. The application therefore also conflicts with the Householder Development SPD.

Residential Amenity Considerations

The application is to extend a house in a residential area and raises no undue residential amenity concerns. There is no window on the neighbouring property, 46 Holly bank Avenue, and the extensions would not unduly impact on privacy with regard that property as only the rear garden would be overlooked by the dormer to a minor degree and the rear of the house does overlook already to a degree.

The dormer would, however, be considered to have an adverse impact on residential amenity by virtue of the visual impact of the dormer and unbalancing of the house and as such have a detrimental impact on the enjoyment of the rear garden area of the neighbouring property, and the same issues arise with the property to the rear, 8 Derwent Way.

As such the dormer extension conflicts with Policies CS2 and CS19 of the Core Strategy and Saved Policies H5 and H8 of the UDP, together with the Householder Development SPD.

Highways Considerations

NPPF para 111 states 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 would be severe. The proposal would have little or no more impact on the highway than currently exists. As such in terms of the NPPF the application is acceptable.

The house currently has 3 bedrooms, and the application would create a 4 bedroom house. There is driveway space for 2 cars and a garage. The proposal would not

create an unacceptable impact on highway safety or impact the road network to any significant degree. The application is therefore acceptable with regards highways considerations.

As such with regards highways issues the application complies with Policies CS2 and CS19 of the Core Strategy and Saved Policies H5 and H8 of the UDP.

Conclusion

The single storey element of the application is acceptable in terms of design and impacts. However the dormer is over dominant, out of character with the house, would create an unbalanced look to the dwelling, would be incongruous in the street scene and be detrimental to the visual amenity of the area. The application therefore conflicts with planning policies and is recommended for refusal.

Recommendation

That Planning Permission be refused for the following reason(s):-

- 1) The proposed dormer by virtue of its location, form, mass and scale would be overly dominant with regards the existing roof, out of character with the existing house, cause an imbalance to the appearance of the house and be incongruous in the street scene. The proposed development would be detrimental to the visual amenity and character of the local area, creating a discordant jarring feature on the house and within the street scene detrimental to the visual amenities of the residential area. The proposal is consequently contrary to Policies CS2 and CS19 of the Knowsley Local Plan Core Strategy adopted January 2016 and Saved Policies H5 and H8 of the Knowsley Replacement Unitary Development Plan adopted June 2006, together with the adopted Householder Development SPD.

Signed Case Officer¹: **Lee Osborne**

Signed Authorising Officer²: **K Foster**

Date: **6 December 2024**

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

