

APPLICATION NO: 24/00286/FUL **CASE OFFICER:** Reece Black

WARD: Whitefield **PARISH:**

LOCATION: 13 Deerbolt Crescent, Kirkby Park, Kirkby

PROPOSAL: RETROSPECTIVE APPLICATION TO INCREASE THE HEIGHT OF THE EAVES AND RIDGELINE, WITH THE INSTALLATION OF 2 REAR DORMERS TO CREATE AN ADDITIONAL FLOOR OF LIVING ACCOMMODATION (RETROSPECTIVE APPLICATION)

Site Description

The application site is located at 13 Deerbolt Crescent, Kirkby Park and is situated within a Primarily Residential Area in the Development Plan. The application property is a detached dwellinghouse which is a combination of brick and white render facing on its front, side and rear elevations and features white UPVC openings and grey, interlocking roof tiles.

The property has been extended in height by the increase of the eaves and ridgeline with two rear dormers to create additional internal floor space. The footprint and layout of the dwelling is a 'T' shape, and this is reflected within the roof design which comprises of gable-ended triangles. The rear facing slope of the dual-pitched roof contains two flat roof projecting dormer extensions. There are a total of 6.no rooflights.

Contained within the rear curtilage of the site is a detached outbuilding (garage) adjacent the rear and side elevations of the dwelling at the end of the driveway to the side. This is enclosed by a brick wall and fence panels. A low brick wall bounds the front curtilage of the application site.

The front elevation of the dwelling is situated circa 6.2m from the public highway and is eastern facing. The application property occupies a prominent position in the street in terms of being sited closest to the highway in the building row and is located close within the inside of the curve of Deerbolt Crescent. The entrance to the property is taken from the north facing side elevation.

To the south is a detached, two-storey dwellinghouse and to the north is a detached bungalow. The bungalows in the street scene are elongated and the most prominent house type.

The character and appearance of the street scene comprises a mix of housing types in terms of bungalow and detached two-storey dwellings which are faced in a range of materials including brick, render and cladding. The most cohesive feature are the gable pitched roofs.

Proposal

The application seeks permission for the increase in height of the eaves and ridgeline with the installation of two rear dormers to create an additional floor of living accommodation.

The application is retrospective for the retention of the works completed and has been submitted to regularise unauthorised development, following a deviation from previously approved plans; under 20/00397/FUL permission was granted for the 'erection of a first-floor extension with rear dormer and a single storey rear extension together with the addition of a new front porch'.

The cardinal difference has been the increase of height to the eaves from the original dwelling and previously approved plans.

The eaves of the original dwelling, as shown from the submitted plans for the previous application measured at roughly 2.24m and measure on the plans for the current application as 3.34m.

Although the description of development references the increase in height of the ridgeline, this is considered from the original dwelling (to an increase of roughly 0.8m) but there would be no change or further increase in height of the ridgeline of the dwelling from what was approved for 20/00397/FUL. The submitted plans show that the ridgeline would measure at a maximum height of 5.5m.

The pitch of the roof of the original dwelling was 34° and the pitch of the roof currently built is 27° which shows the roof has seen a reduction in the pitch to accommodate the raised eaves.

The retrospective application and development erected on site includes 2.no rear dormers in contrast to the singular flat roof 'box' style dormer approved under the previous application.

The application has seen a minor amendment in that the rooflights have been revised to accurately reflect the completed works.

It was noted after completing the site visit that the internal floor layout of the first-floor does not fully reflect the plans submitted. The bedroom which fronts the highway contains an en-suite. The two back rooms which contain the dormers provide a gym and an office / study space.

Consultations

None required.

Representations

This application has been publicised by letters sent to 8 neighbours. No representations have been received.

Planning History

APP. NO: 20/00397/FUL

PROPOSAL: ERECTION OF A FIRST FLOOR EXTENSION WITH REAR DORMER AND A SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION TOGETHER WITH THE ADDITION OF A NEW FRONT PORCH

DECISION: GRANTED
DECISION DATE: 5 October 2020

APP. NO: 24/00012/UNAUTH
PROPOSAL: Enforcement Enquiry
DECISION: PLANNING APPLICATION RECOMMENDED
DECISION DATE: N/A

Despite the previously approved Planning Permission, the side / rear extension and front porch elements of the proposal were not erected. The development which has occurred relates to roof alterations, increase in height of the eaves and installation of 2.no rear dormers.

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.

Regarding the adopted Development Plan policies, the proposed application has regard to policies CS2 and CS19 of the adopted Local Plan Core Strategy (2016) and saved policies H5 and H8 of the Unitary Development Plan (2006), together with the Householder Development SPD (2016).

These policies and guidance require that new development demonstrates a high standard of design, which does not adversely affect the character of the property or street scene; maintains a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants; avoiding overlooking and overshadowing, as well as an unacceptable overbearing impact; and that adequate parking and garden space would remain for use by residents of the extended property.

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

NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY FRAMEWORK (NPPF)

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 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

Core Strategy CS19 requires development to provide quality design and accessibility in new development and requires development proposals to respond to and integrate positively with the characteristics of the immediate surroundings, complement and enhance existing green infrastructure and features of local importance whilst seeking to maintain a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupiers to avoid unacceptable impacts on existing and future residents.

Saved Policy H5 in the Replacement Unitary Development Plan states that proposals for development within Primarily Residential Areas will be permitted provided that:

1. The Primarily Residential Areas are indicated on the Proposals Map
2. New development within the Primarily Residential Areas (or proposals for the change of use or redevelopment of existing buildings) which is for uses appropriate to a residential area will be permitted provided that the development (either by itself or in conjunction with other developments) would not:
 - a) Have an unacceptable impact on the amenity occupiers by reason of noise, disturbance, overlooking, visual intrusion, smells, fumes, on-street parking or other causes; or,
 - b) Adversely affect the character or street scene of the area.

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 (7.7) 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 also stipulates that there is a great scope to extend dwellings by adding rear dormers under Permitted Development. Dormers installed through this option would have to comply with the relevant criteria to be eligible for Permitted Development.

Design

The existing dwelling is a combination of brick and rendered facing, the lower section is brick faced and the upper section is render facing; except for the rear elevation which is render facing in its entirety. The materials employed would be considered an acceptable design. The character of the area comprises of a range of external facing materials, and it would not be considered that the materials applied would have any adverse impact on the character of the area; the materials selected for the fenestration would also be in keeping. Therefore, the development would feature acceptable materials and would be served by pitched roofs.

6.5 of the Householder Development SPD states that when considering the roof of an extension the main dwelling and similar nearby dwellings should be a guide. The application property would retain the two dual-pitched roofs previously employed. This would remain consistent with the street scene. As outlined, the pitch of the roof has been reduced to create a shallower roof pitch, however it is not a significant contrast and largely retains the dual-pitched previous design of the original dwelling.

The most notable amendments to the roof would be the dormer extensions. These, however, would be confined to the rear elevation and not have a detrimental impact to the character or the street scene.

The proposal would not be considered to result in a disproportionate addition to the original dwellinghouse and would feature an appropriate scale. Although enlarged and increased in its height, it is considered that through sensitive changes to the roofscape it has not severely detracted from the character of the original building and roofscape. The increase in eaves height is acceptable.

The development has seen the increase of the roof ridge by 0.8m. Although this does not fully comply with 7.7 of the Householder Development SPD, this was accepted during the determination of the previous application (20/00397/FUL), which is a material consideration for the determination of the current application and holds great weight. In the interest of consistency, this will remain supported. The justification made previously was that the surrounding area comprises a mixture of single storey and two-storey dwellings with a variety of roof designs. The lack of uniform character within the surrounding area (by means of house type and roofscape) it would be considered that the raising of the ridge height would not have significant impacts on visual amenity of the area and would be supported in that instance. As stated, this will remain in this instance as the height of the increased ridgeline has been unaltered from the previously approved Planning Permission.

The fenestration installed to the elevations of the proposal would be considered acceptable. Any openings inserted to the altered roofscape are rooflights and therefore have no significant harm to the design. The front elevation has seen the insertion of a window, which although smaller, does not detract or disrupt the existing front elevation and is of a suitable scale to the walling. The significant openings inserted are the rear dormer windows but are confined to the rear elevation and consequently have little visual impact. The fenestration installed (particularly to the principal elevation) would be deemed to ensure that the design is acceptable.

The SPD's guidance for roof alterations and dormer extensions (7.7) prescribes that care should be 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. Furthermore, the SPD outlines that a dormer extension must not project above the ridgeline of the dwelling. A dormer should normally be set back at least 1m from the main elevation it relates to, when measured on the horizontal line and 0.5m from the roof edge on either side, to prevent it having an overbearing effect on the street scene and adjoining dwelling.

The proposed dormer extensions do not project above the ridgeline of the dwelling. They fail to comply with the guidance on set-back as they are built in line with the rear elevation of the dwelling. While not strictly policy compliant, it would be considered that in this instance, they are not readily visible to the main street scene (with a limited view from further up Deerbolt Crescent) however, as they are smaller dormer extensions (and in a limited number with no excessive, proliferation of dormer clusters resulting in an adverse design) the impact is softened by the gaps and large expanse of roof, preventing them having an overbearing effect. Moreover, the property is detached, and the dormers comply with the set-in at the side edges, therefore they have no significantly harmful impact on the street scene, or other nearby dwellings. The dormer extensions appear as subordinate additions to the dwelling and feature openings which are notably smaller than the other fenestration on the rear elevation. Therefore, in this instance and on the planning balance, the rear dormers would be considered acceptable.

6.13 of the SPD states that where architectural quality can be demonstrated, extensions may be acceptable where they are designed to offer a sensitive contrast to the original building through their siting, form, massing, fenestration, materials and details. In such cases, simple and elegant design will be preferred, where the new development is clearly identifiable from, but an integral part of, the original building.

It is considered that the alterations would comply with this requirement. The rear dormers are sited in an acceptable place for a sensitive contrast and demonstrate an acceptable form and massing. The materials and fenestration are appropriate and further ensure the alterations would be deemed a sensitive contrast and acceptable architectural quality.

The design of the development does conflict with certain requirements of the Householder Development SPD. However, it is considered that either other material considerations justify a degree of leniency, or the level of harm caused would not be deemed to be unacceptable. The proposal would on balance be acceptable and would be considered to comply with Saved Policy H5 and H8 and not significantly contravene the Householder Development SPD.

Residential Amenity

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 effect on neighbouring dwelling to an unacceptable degree.

11 Deerbolt Crescent

No.11 is the is a detached two-storey dwellinghouse sited to the south from the application site at an approximate interface distance of 7.5m. The proposed works saw the removal of a previous side porch extension with large windows and the insertion of a new access door and a window, both have been obscurely glazed which would prevent any overlooking or loss of privacy between the two properties.

Two rooflights on the south facing roof slope have been inserted. These would serve the hallway landing and a bedroom. These rooflights would be small in size and retain an interface distance of circa 12m from the closest habitable windows of the rear elevation of No.11. This would accord with the minimum 12m principal to side elevation interface distance set out within Appendix 4 of the New Residential Development SPD, which due to a proliferation of habitable windows on the rear elevation of No.11 would be considered to form a principal elevation. Given that these are rooflights, installed at a suitable height to further prevent any direct overlooking to nearby properties and therefore this would be considered acceptable.

The development would not be considered to result in any overshadowing or appear overbearing. The proposal would be considered to comply with Saved Policy H5, H8 and the Householder Development SPD and would not be considered to result in any unacceptable impact to the amenities or privacy of the occupants of No.11.

15 Deerbolt Crescent

No.15 is the detached dwelling, situated to the north from the application site. The two gable walls of the properties face one another at an interface distance of roughly 4.3m at its closest point.

Although the height of the dwelling has been increased, which would inevitably result in a partial increase in overshadowing, it is considered that the closest part of No.15 to the application property is a porch entrance and would not be considered to result in an unacceptable impact from overshadowing (as this is not classed as a habitable room). Just under 8m would be retained otherwise between the other window on the south side facing elevation of No.15 and this distance and the fact the proposed works are not significantly great alterations in height, it would be considered that no unacceptable overshadowing would occur.

Two windows on the north facing roof slope have been installed, these serve the upstairs landing and bathroom, which are not considered habitable rooms. Moreover, these are small in size and do not directly overlook any windows at No.15.

The development would not be considered to result in any overshadowing or appear overbearing. The proposal would be considered to comply with Saved Policy H5, H8 and the Householder Development SPD and would not be considered to result in any unacceptable impact to the amenities or privacy of the occupants of No.15.

2 Deerbolt Crescent

No.2 is the detached dwelling situated to the west of the application site. The two rear elevations of the properties face one another at an interface distance of circa 23m.

Approximately 9.5m would be retained between the rear dormer and the rear curtilage of the boundary shared with No.2. The distance of circa 23m would be retained between the rear elevations of the properties. This would comply with the New Residential Development SPD's 20m offset required for rear-to-rear elevations.

The development would not be considered to result in any overshadowing or appear overbearing. The proposal would be considered to comply with Saved Policy H5, H8 and the Householder Development SPD and would not be considered to result in any unacceptable impact to the amenities or privacy of the occupants of No.2.

No other residential properties in the locality are considered to suffer any adverse harm to

amenities or privacy as a result of the retrospective development.

Highways

The current parking provisions contained within the curtilage of the dwelling are provided by hardstanding and driveway to the side of the dwelling. The detached garage would meet the internal dimensions (5m in width x 5.5m in depth) to be considered a parking space within the dwelling and would provide an in-curtilage parking space. This garage would also be considered practically accessible.

Notwithstanding the discrepancies between the submitted general arrangement and layout of the first-floor, the site visit demonstrated that the back rooms could support bedrooms. Therefore, it is considered that the proposed development could provide up to 6 bedrooms and will therefore be assessed on its highways impact with this in mind.

The Householder Development SPD (6.16) states that dwellings which contain 4+ bedrooms, that they should make provision for 3 no parking spaces within the curtilage of the dwelling.

Although the driveway is of a triple-length design, which usually is not supported as spaces cannot be independently accessed can lead to an increase in off-street parking, it would be considered that on this occasion the layout would be acceptable. The layout for the parking under the previous application was accepted under 20/00297/FUL for the property to increase the no. of bedrooms from 3 to 5.

The works completed have included the hard surfacing and improved access to the side of the dwelling and hardstanding. 2 spaces are provided within the curtilage of the dwelling (3 if the garage is included). It is considered that an acceptable level of parking would remain in use, with any additional parking required being accommodated from on-street parking. The proposed development has not seen the loss of any existing in-curtilage parking spaces, and unlike 20/00297/FUL (where the side protrusion would have restricted access to the rear garage) the works undertaken as part of this retrospective application would not.

Furthermore, as stipulated within the NPPF (paragraph 115) 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.

Therefore, it is considered on balance, the proposal would retain the maximum number of in-curtilage parking spaces, which was considered acceptable to serve 5 bedrooms. From the site visit and from Google Maps Street View (across multiple dates) on-street parking would not adversely affect highway safety. Overall, the proposal would not be deemed to result in any unacceptable Highways impact sufficient to warrant a refusal.

Conclusion

The proposal would be acceptable in terms of design, residential amenity and highways. The proposal also complies with the 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 hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans and documents listed in Schedule 1.

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt.

- 2) 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 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
29/05/2024		-	LOCATION PLAN
30/07/2024	DWG No. 002	-	EXISTING PLANS
30/09/2024	DWG No. 001	-	AS-BUILT PLANS

Signed Case Officer¹: Reece Black

Signed Authorising Officer²: K Foster

Date: 3 October 2024

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