

APPLICATION NO: 24/00220/FUL **CASE OFFICER:** Reece Black

WARD: Whitefield **PARISH:**

LOCATION: 16 Deerbolt Crescent, Kirkby Park, Kirkby

PROPOSAL: ERECTION OF FIRST-FLOOR EXTENSION AND RAISED EAVES AND RIDGELINE OF EXISTING DWELLING, TOGETHER WITH THE ERECTION OF SINGLE STOREY SIDE (INFILL) EXTENSION AND INSTALLATION OF 3. NO SIDE DORMER EXTENSIONS AND 1. NO FRONT DORMER EXTENSION

Site Description

The application site is located at 16 Deerbolt Crescent, Kirkby Park and is situated within a Primarily Residential Area in the Development Plan. The application property is a detached bungalow which is brick facing on its front, side and rear elevations and contains white and brown UPVC openings and a gable roof (with concrete tiles).

Contained within the curtilage of the site is a detached outbuilding (garage) located behind the rear and side elevations of the property at the end of the existing paved hard standing which runs to the side of the dwelling; this is sited approximately 33m from the public highway. A low brick wall together with metal railings bounds the property to the front curtilage of the site.

The front elevation of the dwelling is located approximately 7.2m from the public highway and is north/north-eastern facing. The application property holds a prominent view in the street scene in terms of its distance from the public highway. The entrance is set-back and located within an alcoved-section and is north facing. The overall footprint of the bungalow is 'L'-shaped. The side elevations contain several windows which face the adjacent residential properties.

To the east is a detached, two-storey dwellinghouse and to the west is a detached bungalow, similar to that of the application property. The bungalows in the street scene are elongated and the most prominent house type. To the south of the site is a railway line.

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 erection of a first-floor extension and raised eaves and ridgeline of existing dwelling, together with the erection of a single storey side (infill) extension and the installation of 3. no side dormer extensions and 1. No front dormer extension.

The proposed first-floor extension would involve raising the ridgeline height by 3.02m to give a maximum height of 7.02m. The height of the eaves would be raised by 0.64m to give a height of 3.54m. This would create an additional storey and see the provision of 5 bedrooms, 1 bathroom, 1 en-suite and associated walk-in wardrobe / storage.

The works would see the rooflines design comprise overall of two dual-pitched roofs which would see the north facing front elevation of the property overall faced by a gable-ended triangle, with the cheek facing the highway. The rear section of the bungalow would see a dual-pitched with the gable walls facing the east and west of the property. These roof pitches would be approximately 45°.

The proposed ground floor side infill extension, to an area of approximately 12sqm, would see the alcoved-section removed and the west facing side elevation wall would sit flush.

As part of the proposal, four dormers would be installed, the northern facing elevation would contain one on the front facing roof slope, the eastern facing elevation two and the western elevation one.

*It was requested the applicant provide a planning statement to outline whether there were any extenuating, personal circumstances to the number of bedrooms included within the submitted plans. As stated, the proposal would introduce 5 additional bedrooms (8 cumulative) to the property. The applicant provided a response, in which they stated, that the reasoning for the proposal (and number of bedrooms) was in hopes of expanding their family and the require the additional space for home offices.

Consultations

Network Rail – No objections raised.

Highway Authority – Objection raised (subject to amendments that would make the proposed development acceptable).

Representations

This application has been publicised by letters sent to 4 neighbours. No representations have been received.

Planning History

PREAPP advice was provided to the applicant regarding the property (16 Deerbolt Crescent) in February 2024, which related to an extension and the conversion of the bungalow to a house. The reference was 23/00047/PREAPP.

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 with the proposal and discussing those with the applicant. However, the issues are so fundamental to the proposal that it has not been possible to negotiate a satisfactory way forward and due to the harm which has been clearly identified within the reason for the refusal, approval has not been possible.

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.

Context

23/00047/PREAPP (16 Deerbolt Crescent)

The earlier PREAPP request sought to ascertain whether the principle of development proposed would be acceptable; the works outline comprised a ground floor extension with the addition of a first-floor extension and loft. The ground floor extension would provide a new staircase which would lead to the above extension, which would comprise 5 additional bedrooms, storage area, family bathroom and en-suite. The drawings submitted in support of this application outlined that a total of no. windows on the side elevations, which would each serve habitable rooms.

In summary, the advice provided informed the applicant that the proposed infill extension would be acceptable. Although, regarding the rest of the proposal, it was asserted (on the assumption that any proposal for this nature would be a comparable scale to the neighbouring detached property at No.18) the predominant issue would be harm to residential amenity, caused by the proposal having an overbearing effect to adjacent neighbouring properties. This harm to residential amenity was accentuated by the indication to include windows on the side elevations (reference was made that this is contrary to the Householder Development SPD, which advises against side facing windows where they would result in overlooking or an overbearing effect to neighbouring residents and cause

harm to amenity and privacy. *The advice stipulated that 'the provision of a new first floor extension that would overlook neighbouring properties at the side would therefore not be supported'.*

The above was caveated which stated that due to the lack of uniform house types and roofscapes found within the street scene, the Local Planning Authority (LPA) would be open to the possibility of raising the ridge height of the application property to some degree to accommodate more limited internal works. The applicant was advised that *'the Local Planning Authority would be willing to consider an increase in height of the roof but would unlikely support the addition of a first-floor bedroom and conversion to dwelling house due to the potential impact on neighbouring occupiers as currently proposed'.*

The PREAPP response provided advised that a *'dual aspect roof and within this a dormer window to the rear of the property could be installed which would allow for useable internal space to provide at least 2no. bedrooms together with 1.no bedroom at the front elevation.'*

The response also commented further on the information submitted at PREAPP stage and the impact on specific neighbouring properties from the proposed development. The most harmful would relate to the impact on No.14 (a detached bungalow) with the proposed side windows on the first-floor overlooking the dwelling at the side, whilst also reducing the level of outlook from the existing windows at the side elevation of No.14 and would suffer an overbearing impact due to the proposal.

The conclusion of the PREAPP response summarised that *the increase of height as proposed would likely result in a disproportionate addition to the dwelling house and would result in an overbearing affect to residential amenity of neighbouring occupiers.* It was the advice that the proposal would be reduced to encompass works with the existing roof space.

Although the PREAPP response indicated the scope for works, this was combined with the guidance that these should be limited and reduced in scale to reduce its visually dominant and disproportionate massing. Amongst other elements of the proposal which would not likely be supported by the LPA i.e. side facing windows and dormers, the submitted plans appear to not have incorporated the suggestions provided to increase the likelihood that the LPA would be more supportive to the proposed development.

20/00397/FUL (13 Deerbolt Crescent)

During the submission of the initial PREAPP for this current application, the applicant presented photographs of development to the neighbouring property at 13 Deerbolt Crescent, with a view that this would establish a principle of development. The property (No.13) is situated to the north-east from the application property and is located just beyond the corner of Deerbolt Crescent.

The property of 13 was previously a bungalow. Planning Permission was granted on 29th September 2020 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. Although, the development has deviated from the approved plans notably in which it was considered unlawful development and subsequently would not establish a principle of development. After Planning Enforcement had investigated this breach, a retrospective application was submitted and is currently under consideration.

The Planning Permission which was granted for No.13 was approved outlined that the proposed first-floor extension would involve raising the roof ridge by 0.8m to give a maximum height of 5.5m (from 4.7m). The plans have deviated from what was approved by increasing the eaves from circa 2.3m to 3.4m and reducing the pitch of the roof to a

shallower design. The height of the ridgeline has not increased from the increase that was allowed under the original approved permission. The ridgeline of the current retrospective application under consideration measures at a height of 5.5m.

It is acknowledged that the works completed at No.13 are a departure from the approved Planning Permission and although there are areas of similarities, it would not be considered that this sets a clear precedent or principle of development. The proposed development at No.13 is yet to be determined, however, it is deemed that the proposals, despite their similarities, are not like for like in comparison. No.13 has increased the roof ridgeline by approximately 0.8m, this is a significant contrast to the roughly 3m increase which is outlined within the application for No.16.

Consideration of current application (24/00220/FUL)

Design

The existing dwelling is brick facing on all elevations and comprises white and brown UPVC with concrete roof tiles. The Application Form states that all materials for the proposal would be to match the existing dwelling. This would accord with the Householder Development SPD and Saved Policy H8.

The proposed development overall would be considered to result in a disproportionate addition to the original dwellinghouse, which would be an overbearing and unduly dominant feature, given the scale of development.

Although as outlined, the street scene is comprised of both detached bungalows and two-storey dwellings (the most cohesive design element found in the locality are the pitched roofs) it is considered that the proposal would be a notably enlarged structure. The design of the dormers in particular has a critical impact on its overall appearance and visual amenity, whilst also resulting in adverse harm to the residential amenities of nearby, adjacent occupants.

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 currently is a gable ended property with a pitched roof.

The existing eaves of the dwelling measure at a height of approximately 2.91m, the ridgeline measures to a height of 4.07m and the roof pitch of the existing house is circa 17.5° – this would be a sharp contrast to the proposed development. Consequently, the proposal (and the increase of height as proposed) would be considered to result in a disproportionate addition to the dwelling house.

6.7 of the Householder Development SPD states that the ratio of solid to void on an elevation (i.e how much of an elevation is covered by windows or openings) is also a key consideration when designing an extension. For example, an extension that is blank walling would look out of place if it were directly alongside the large principal windows of a dwelling. The proposed development would prominently display this issue on its front (northern) elevation as it fails to include any fenestration details which prevent this wall displaying a poor design given its blank facing (notwithstanding the existing ground floor window) and would result in a bleak, harmful front elevation. This would have a particularly harmful impact on the street scene given its proximity to the highway and the height of the proposal would accentuate this harm.

The proposed works would increase the form and massing of the dwelling and result in larger proportions, which would lead to the proposal appearing more visually dominant and

detract from the character of the original dwelling significantly. Given that the dwelling is one of the closest properties to the highway in the building row, this would have a prominent, harmful impact on the street scene. This would contravene with section 7.7 as the proposed development would not be considered to be in keeping with the dwelling (or avoid overlooking neighbouring dwellings). This section of the SPD furthers other relevant policy guidance such as requiring attention be given to design to ensure a sensitive and appropriate approach which conserves the character of the original building and roofscape.

The proposed development would be a substantial contrast to the original dwelling, which would not be considered a sensitive change as it would result in a disproportionate and insubordinate addition and wouldn't conserve or be in keeping with the original roof design, given that the pitch would change from the shallower 17.5° to the much steeper 45° and would appear harmful to the building line.

The plots of these properties are built to footprints which occupy almost the full width (with stepped-storeys at the edges from various extensions which largely step down the closer they are to the boundary) the proposal would be an enlarged and domineering structure, with little relief in the space around and would result in a cramped appearance; the scale of the development would not be considered to be accommodated. It is recognised that there is a variation of house types, layouts etc in the locality, however for the reasons given above, it is not the view that the proposal would be a sensitive, appropriate or proportionate form of development and would appear incongruous and have an adverse impact on the wider character of the area.

7.7's guidance for roof alterations also prescribes that raising the ridge height to create sufficient internal space e.g for a loft conversion will generally be unacceptable. The proposal would significantly raise the ridgeline. The Officer's report for the original permission (20/00397/FUL) of No.13, stated that the proposed loft conversion would involve raising the roof ridge by 0.8m (and therefore contrary to Section 7.7 of the Householder Development SPD) it was justified that the property was a single storey property detached dwelling and the surrounding vernacular comprised single storey and two-storey dwellings with a range of roof designs and the lack of uniformity would ensure that this proposal would not appear discordant in the street scene.

It is subsequently acknowledged that this policy guidance has been relaxed on this occasion, as the scale of the increase was not deemed to result in any unacceptable impact. However, it is not considered that a precedent has been set as it is considered that the proposed development for No.16 would contravene the policy guidance to a much greater extent in which it would not be comparable to the increase that has occurred at No.13. The scale of which the ridge would be raised at the application property would be to the detriment of the original bungalow itself and the wider character of the area with its domineering massing. Therefore, it would not be considered acceptable to allow the relaxation of the policy guidance of Section 7.7 for this proposal on this occasion. Each application will be assessed on their own individual merits, but as outlined, the works completed at No.13 and the proposed development at No.16 are not identical to the extent that a principle of development is established, nor would this sufficiently override other considerations.

Other design elements contained within the proposal are considered to be harmful, both to the original dwelling and wider character of the area. This includes the 4no. of dormers within the proposal. The Householder Development SPD outlines more specific guidance for dormers within section 7.7, which is listed below:

- *Front dormers should be avoided unless they are characteristic of the building or locality. Where front dormers are proposed, particular attention needs to be given to design.* Although only one dormer to the front elevation has been included and would

be set back to the bottom of the 'L-shape', it would not be considered a suitable enough justification to allow the relaxation of the guidance to permit this dormer to the front of the dwelling. This is on the basis that front dormers are not characteristic to the building or the locality, the design of these dormers does not appear to demonstrate any specific consideration to design to justify this being acceptable.

- *A dormer should normally be set back at least 1m from the main elevation if 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 properties.* The dormers feature a setback of circa 0.12m from the main elevations that they relate to. This distance is considered to be insufficient to ensure that the dormers do not have an overbearing effect on the street scene or to nearby properties. The closest side dormers would be sited roughly 1.34m away from the front elevation, which would result in the dormers being readily viewable from the street scene and at public vantage points; given that these would be deemed to feature a design which would be overbearing and also uncharacteristic, with a prominent view within the locality, it would result in adverse harm by design to the character of the area.
- *Dormers on side elevations are normally not acceptable if they overlook adjacent dwellings.* These dormers would result in overlooking, particularly into the private rear amenity garden adjacent the rear elevation of No.18. This will be discussed further within the residential amenity section of the report.
- *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 openings on the dormers outlined are the same width and height of the to the windows on the storeys below and subsequently, contributes to the level of harm caused by the dormers. 6.9 of the Householder Development SPD asserts that the layout of openings should also relate to the existing house. Irregularly spaced and shape openings on an extension will detract from the formal character of a house that has regularly spaced and proportioned windows. It is accepted that the original dwelling does not display a strict pattern with the layout and arrangement of fenestration, however, the windows which would serve the first floor would not respond positively or cohesively to the windows of the existing dwelling, as they are misaligned. The fenestration included would accentuate the harm caused and would not comply with the guidance for 6.9 or 7.7 of the Householder Development SPD.

Furthermore, the NPPF (Paragraph 139) stipulates that development that is not well designed should be refused, especially where it fails to reflect local design policies and government guidance on design, taking into account any local design guidance and supplementary planning documents which use visual tools such as design guides and codes. Therefore, the proposal would be considered to contravene with the NPPF and would not suitably incorporate local design policies (given the extent of conflict with the Householder Development SPD). This contravention with the NPPF should hold great weight during the determination of the application.

In summary, whilst it is accepted that the general character of the area comprises a diverse array of house types with a lack of strict uniformity, it is considered that the proposed development would not provide high-quality design or respond and integrate positively with the characteristics of the immediate surroundings. Due to the form, scale and massing of the proposal, it would result in a disproportionate addition to the dwelling, which would not elevate the character of the house, appear discordant in the street scene (as it would not

reflect the wider vernacular of the area) and the cumulative harm would be emphasised from the dormers. The proposed development would consequently be considered to result in a harmful design and largely contravenes CS19, Saved Policy H5 and H8 and the Householder Development SPD.

Residential Amenity

CS19, Saved Policy H5 and H8 all make reference to safeguarding residential amenities and privacy of neighbouring occupants from unacceptable proposals. These are furthered by the Householder Development SPD's guidance, listed below:

- 6.19 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.
- 6.20 Windows in extensions should not directly overlook adjacent property in close proximity and should not allow overlooking into neighbours' dwellings.

18 Deerbolt Crescent

No.18 is the neighbouring detached property to the east of the application site, is a two-storey dwelling and is situated roughly 3m away from the application property at its closest. The two side elevations of these properties face each other. The front elevation of No.18 is set further behind No.16 circa 4m. No.18 has been extended at the side of the property and provides a porch entrance to its rear elevation.

No.18 features three windows on the side elevation of the side extension and one window on the first-floor side elevation (this is obscurely glazed and assumed to serve a bathroom.) The rooms that these windows serve would not be habitable rooms or would be considered to suffer an unacceptable loss of light; the porch door contains a window within and is oriented towards the south-facing garden, which would still facilitate a level of light coming into this area.

The east-facing proposed side elevation contains several windows. The dormer window which would serve bedroom 5 would be sited forward of the front elevation of No.18, given that the dormers closest to the front elevation are set in roughly 1.3m – sited roughly above existing ground floor side elevation and given the proximity could facilitate overlooking and would instil a 'perception of overlooking'. Furthermore, the window to the gable triangle of the dual-pitched roof would contain 1.no window which would be positioned with a direct view into the private rear garden space of No.18, close to the rear elevation of the property.

These windows on the proposed side elevation discussed would have the most salient, detrimental impact on the residential amenities and privacy of the occupants of No.18 by way of appearing visually intrusive, as effects of overlooking and loss of privacy would be noted by the occupants. The proposed development would subsequently conflict with 6.19, 6.20 and 7.7 of the Householder Development SPD as well as, CS19, Saved Policies H5 and H8.

14 Deerbolt Crescent

No.14 is the detached bungalow situated to the west of the application property and is sited roughly 4.2m at their closest (the proposed single storey side (infill) extension would be erected circa 8m away.) These two properties are roughly uniform to one another in their arrangement and building lines. No.14 benefits from a single storey side and rear extension adjacent the party boundary shared with No.16, with a rear conservatory adjacent to the

other party boundary away from No.16. The immediately adjacent extensions to No.16 serve a garage.

No.14 contains 5 windows on the side elevation of the property orientated to the gable wall of No.16. Only one window is obscurely glazed (assumed also to serve a bathroom). It is not known with certainty what windows these rooms serve. On the assumption that these would roughly reflect the existing layout of No.16 it would be assumed that the windows closer to the front elevation would serve bedrooms and the ones closer to the rear elevation would serve a kitchen.

Although overlooking would not be considered the prominent harm to No.14 as the proposed development would not contain windows to the middle and rear end of the side elevation, issues pertaining to residential amenity would still be considered to arise because of the proposal.

The erection of the first-floor extension would result in a prominent, enlarged addition to the dwelling house. This in turn would detrimentally reduce the levels of existing outlook from the existing windows to the side elevation and No.14 and would be deemed to have an overbearing effect on residential amenity. This harm was identified in the PREAPP response.

Given that 4. no of the windows on the side elevation are not obscurely glazed the level of harm to residential amenity would be considered severe and unacceptable. This level of harm is accentuated given the height of the proposal and the proximity of these properties to one another, with little space from the curtilage of the boundaries to reduce the prominence. Moreover, the height of the proposal and the close proximity of these properties would likely be considered to cause a significant amount of overshadowing to the side elevation of No.14.

The occupants of No.14 would be considered to suffer severe harm to their amenities by the proposal appearing overbearing and unduly dominant, as well as the likely impact for the proposal to cause significant overshadowing to the rooms to the side elevation facing the application property. The proposed development would subsequently conflict with 6.19, 6.20 and 7.7 of the Householder Development SPD as well as, CS19, Saved Policies H5 and H8.

In summary, the proposed development would likely result in significant harm to the living conditions, residential amenity and privacy of adjacent occupants to an unacceptable degree and conflict with the discussed policies and guidance contained in the SPD. It is also important to acknowledge that the PREAPP advice advised against this as it stated that *the provision of a new first-floor extension that would overlook neighbouring properties at the side would therefore not be supported.*

Highways

The current parking provisions contained within the curtilage of the dwelling are provided by hardstanding to the front and side of the dwelling. The area to the front measures roughly 16m in area (2.3m in width x 7m in depth).

This continues to the side of the property which leads to the detached garage situated beyond the rear elevation, in the rear garden. This measures at 5m in width x 5.5m in depth. The internal dimensions meet the threshold to be considered a parking space, however, on this occasion, given the site context this would not be considered to be an accessible, practicable parking space and would be considered highly unlikely, given that it is set back approximately 33m from the public highway and with little room to manoeuvre adjacent the garage, that a vehicle would reverse the full extent of this driveway. For this reason, this would not be considered an in-curtilage parking space.

The Householder Development SPD (6.16) states that for dwellings which contain 4+ bedrooms, that they should make provision for 3 no parking spaces within the curtilage of the dwelling. It is considered that these are maximum standards, although, given the number of bedrooms outlined within the submitted plans, 3 no spaces on this occasion would be the expected level of in-curtilage parking to accommodate the level of bedrooms the proposed development would create – an increase of 5 to create 8 no bedrooms in total.

The proposed development has been reviewed by the Council's internal Highway Officer's following consultation. It was noted that due to the no. of bedrooms, 3 parking spaces would be required to satisfy the Council's parking standards. The existing driveway is designed as a triple length drive, which are not supported because vehicles cannot be accessed independently and due to impracticality, it creates an increase to on-street parking and/or vehicle movements across the footway.

Therefore, Highways submitted an objection (subject to amendments) to the proposed development. The consultation response stipulated that the proposal would require either a double or triple width driveway, in conjunction with an extension to, and/or separate dropped kerb and footway crossover. The response also stated that revised plan to show parking arrangements would be required for Highways to withdraw the objection to the proposal.

A recent planning appeal for the application (23/02718/FUL) for an erection of a two-storey side extension to side, single storey extension to rear, dormer loft conversion, which was dismissed (APP/3343942), did not consider the highway impact, from insufficient parking to be a reason for refusal. The proposed development would see the existing 4-bedroom property extended to provide 6-bedrooms with 2 no. parking spaces within the curtilage of the dwelling. It was acknowledged that the proposal would fail to provide the required level and instead an under provision of off-street parking, the development would result in an additional off-street parking space, which would improve the off-street parking provision for the site. This would form a material planning consideration for the determination of this application.

For the consideration of the application, it is acknowledged that the proposed development has not submitted any parking plan to address the shortfall of existing in-curtilage parking spaces which would reflect the increase in the no. of bedrooms. However, when considering the recent appeal decision and the fact that there is an extensive area within the front garden area to expand the existing hardstanding to provide a double or triple width driveway to accommodate a minimum of three vehicles, it is considered that this could be secured by a suitable Condition and on the planning balance, would not warrant a reason for refusal on this occasion. Therefore, this would ensure that the proposal would not result in an unacceptable highways impact.

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. This reinforces the view that on this occasion, given the opportunity to resolve the issues raised on highway concerns by means of expanding the highway, extending the dropped kerb and removal of the front boundary wall etc, highway safety would not be considered an unacceptable, sufficient reason for refusal given the above considerations.

Other Considerations

Permitted Development Rights Considerations

Regard for Permitted Development Rights and the consideration of a fallback position has been incorporated both at the PREAPP stage and during the determination of this

application and what development would otherwise be allowed under Permitted Development.

The Local Planning Authority does not hold any record that Permitted Development Rights have been withdrawn from the application property.

Under Class AA of the General Permitted Development Order (2015) the erection of 1no. additional floor for bungalows is allowed. Although, for this development, it is assessed and determined under an application for 'Prior Approval' and consultation sent to neighbours.

The PREAPP response outlined that the proposed development would fail to accord with the full criteria i.e. the proposal includes windows to the side elevations, would present a significantly different roof pitch (of the principal part of the dwellinghouse following the development) which would not be the same as the roof pitch of the existing dwellinghouse and would likely impact the amenity of neighbouring occupants (issues concerning overlooking, loss of privacy and the loss of light). For the consideration of the applicant, the full details of the requirements of the Prior Approval and criteria were included within the response given to the original enquiry.

Overall, not only would the proposed development fail to comply with the full list of criteria and conditions outlined within Class AA in order to be Permitted Development, but it would also not be deemed a marginal contradiction and would be considered to have adverse impacts on neighbouring occupants. For these reasons, it is not considered that an appropriate fallback position could be argued in support of the application.

Conclusion

In conclusion, the proposed development is considered to result in a harmful, insubordinate addition to the dwelling, which is detrimental to the visual amenity and character of the locality. The proposal does not accord with local plan and its relevant policies or guidance contained within the Householder Development SPD. The design would be unsympathetic and a harsh contrast and would detract from the established vernacular. The proposal would be considered to also have an unacceptable impact on residential amenity to nearby occupants. The proposed development significantly contravenes with national and local policies. The proposed development seemingly has not sufficiently incorporated the advice provided to the earlier PREAPP enquiry which identified issues that could have been amended to increase the likelihood that Council Officers would have supported the proposal. Failing to amend this issues, it is subsequently recommended that the application be refused.

Recommendation

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

- 1) The proposed development would be detrimental to the visual amenity and character of the local area. It would result in an insubordinate and unsympathetic addition, that would be out of scale to the original dwelling and would cause adverse harm to the vernacular of the area. The proposal would display dormers, which particularly would appear incongruous and out of character with the wider area. The overall design would appear severely prominent and out of place in the street scene. The proposal is contrary to the NPPF, Saved Policies H5 & H8 of the Knowsley Replacement Unitary Development Plan, adopted June 2006, as well as Policies CS2 and CS19 of the Knowsley Local Plan Core Strategy, adopted January 2016 and the Householder Development SPD.

- 2) The proposed development would result in an unacceptable impact to residential amenities, privacy and the general living conditions of adjacent neighbours. The proposal would pose severe harm pertaining to residential amenity issues such as overlooking, the perception of overlooking, loss of privacy, appearing unduly dominant and overbearing, unacceptable loss of light. The extent of the level of harm on residential amenities caused by the proposal could not be justified. The proposal is contrary to Saved Policies H5 & H8 of the Knowsley Replacement Unitary Development Plan, adopted June 2006, as well as Policies CS2 and CS19 of the Knowsley Local Plan Core Strategy, adopted January 2016 and the Householder Development SPD.

SCHEDULE 1

Date Received	Ref. No	Version	Drawing/Document Title
29/04/2024	-	-	LOCATION PLAN
29/04/2024	1051/24	-	EXISTING FLOOR PLANS AND ELEVATIONS
29/04/2024	1052/24	-	PROPOSED FLOOR PLANS AND ELEVATIONS

Signed Case Officer¹:

Reece Black

Signed Authorising Officer²:

K Foster

Date:

5 September 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