

<u>APPLICATION NO:</u>	25/00173/FUL	<u>CASE OFFICER:</u>	Reece Black
<u>WARD:</u>	Whitefield	<u>PARISH:</u>	
<u>LOCATION:</u>	16 Deerbolt Crescent, Kirkby Park, Kirkby		
<u>PROPOSAL:</u>	ERECTION OF FIRST-FLOOR EXTENSION TOGETHER WITH THE ERECTION OF SINGLE STOREY SIDE (INFILL) EXTENSION AND INSTALLATION OF 1. NO SIDE DORMER EXTENSION TO THE NORTHERN ELEVATION		

Site Description

The application site is located at 16 Deerbolt Crescent, Kirkby Park and is situated within a Primarily Residential Area in the Local Development Plan. The application property is a detached, single storey bungalow.

Contained within the curtilage of the site is a detached outbuilding (garage) located behind the rear and side elevations of the property, located at the end of the existing hardstanding which runs to the side of the dwelling and is located over 30m from the public highway. A low brick front boundary wall with metal railings encloses the site.

The front elevation of the dwelling is located 7.2m from the public highway and holds a prominent view in the street scene. The entrance to the property is set-back and located within an alcove section. The overall footprint of the dwelling is 'L'-shaped. The side elevations contain several windows which face the adjacent residential properties. Located to the east is a detached, two-storey dwelling and to 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.

Proposal

The proposal seeks permission for the erection of a first-floor extension together with the erection of a single storey side (infill) extension with the installation of 1 no. side dormer extension to the northern elevation.

The proposed first-floor extension would involve raising the ridgeline height by 2.5m to attain a total ridgeline height of 6.44m; the height of the eaves would be raised to a height of 2.55m. The proposal would not increase the existing footprint of the property. This would create an additional storey and see the provision of an additional 3 no. bedrooms.

The proposed works would see the roofscape comprise of two interconnecting dual-pitched roofs, in which the north facing front elevation of the property, faced with a gable-ended triangle, would front the highway. The rear elevation of the proposal would see a dual-pitched roof with its gable ends orientated to the east and west. These roof pitches would be 45°.

Further works within the proposal include a proposed ground floor side infill extension, would measure to a footprint of 1.7m in width and 5.7m in depth and cover

an area of 9.5sqm; this would see the ground floor alcove section removed and the west facing side elevation wall would sit flush. The proposal would also see the installation of a singular dormer window, located within the northern elevation. This would have a width of 2.6m, attain a height of 3m and project from the roofscape by 1.5m. This would be served by a pitched roof.

The proposed development would involve the hard-surfacing of the existing front garden area to provide spaces for 3.no off-street parking spaces.

Consultations

None required.

Representations

This application has been publicised by letters sent to 4 neighbours. It has also been advertised by site notice. No representations have been received.

Planning History

APP. NO: 24/00220/FUL

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.

DECISION: REFUSED

DECISION DATE: 5 September 2024

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

SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENTS (SPD)

Householder Development SPD (2016)

New Residential Development SPD (2018)

Article 35 Statement

The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by assessing the proposal against all material considerations, including planning policies and any representations that may have been received and subsequently determining to grant planning permission in accordance with the presumption in favour of sustainable development, as set out within the National Planning Policy Framework.

Assessment

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 (7.7) 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.*

The Householder Development SPD (7.3) stipulates that *single storey extensions should be designed so that they preserve the street scene, protect light and privacy of neighbours and provide sufficient parking spaces.*

DESIGN AND RESIDENTIAL AMENITY

Roof alterations (first-floor extension)

The Householder Development SPD outlines that *attention needs to be given to design to ensure a sensitive and appropriate approach which conserves the character of the original building and roofscape* and that *raising the ridge height to create sufficient internal space e.g. for a loft conversion will generally be unacceptable*.

The proposed development would involve raising the ridgeline to the application property by 2.5m, which would conflict with the guidance for roof alterations, although the proposal relates to a single storey detached dwelling and the wider surrounding area consists of a mixture of single storey and two-storey dwellings with an array of house types and roofscapes. Therefore, in the absence of an established uniform roof design within the locality, it is considered that raising the ridgeline height of the application property would not cause significantly harmful impacts to the visual amenities in the street scene. Dual-pitched roofs are the most common roof design found in the locality. 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 proposal would retain the dual-pitched design employed at the property and the proposed roof design would not appear incongruous in the street scene and would be acceptable.

The proposed first-floor extension would not bring the footprint of the existing dwelling in any closer proximity to the detached dwelling of No.18, which is a two-storey, detached dwelling and would maintain the existing interface distance. Although the height would increase, it would be considered to have limited material impact. No.18 has previously been extended to the side elevation at ground floor and provides a porch entrance to the property, with an access door to the rear elevation of the side extension, this connects to the kitchen of No.18. Whilst there would be a degree of overshadowing and reduction of light available to the 3 no. contained within the side elevation of this extension, it would not be considered to result in an unacceptable obstruction of light entering the habitable room as these are not the main windows for the kitchen and largely allow light to the porch extension, which is not a habitable room and a transient space, therefore this impact would not be considered unacceptable. Other openings to the side extension are found on the front and rear elevations and the prominent kitchen window would still ensure that adequate and acceptable daylight and sunlight is received. The first-floor side elevation contains a small window to the middle of the gable wall, which is obscurely-glazed and therefore, any impacts from the proposed development would not result in any unacceptable amenity impacts to the living conditions of the occupants of No.18. Whilst the proposal would result in a degree of impact, this impact would be limited for the reasons above and would not be considered sufficient to warrant a refusal given the limited impacts.

No windows are proposed to the first-floor side elevation of the proposal and therefore no harm is identified by way of overlooking or visual intrusion. The proposed development would not breach the 45-degree rule when taken from the closest windows of habitable rooms to the front and rear elevations of No.18 and therefore, the impacts are considered acceptable.

The proposed first-floor extension would increase the scale and bulk when viewed from the side elevation of No.14. No.14 is a detached, single storey bungalow, akin to the application property, with several windows to the side elevation. The most

materially impacted rooms would be those within the gable triangle of No.14's side elevation, which is understood to serve a kitchen and bedroom. Although the proposed first-floor extension would result in a straight gable triangle erected to a higher scale, this would not be considered to result in any unacceptable loss of light as the side elevation of No.14 is set away from the party boundary by 4m and therefore, this would ensure that sunlight and daylight would be detrimentally comprised. The existing interface distance of 5m between the side elevation of the application property and No.14 would be retained and this would ensure that no unacceptable overshadowing or obstruction of light would occur as a result of the proposal. For the consideration of outlook, the proposed first-floor extension would present as more enlarged and domineering from the side elevation but given that the 5m interface distance would be retained, there would be no unacceptable impact by harm to outlook and would ensure that the proposal would not create a significantly harmful impact to outlook from these windows in contrast to the existing outlook. Any proposed openings are concentrated to the front and rear elevations and therefore this ensures that no actual or perceived overlooking would occur into the interior of No.14.

Front dormer window

The Householder Development SPD outlines that *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.*

The proposed first-floor extension contains a small, singular dormer window projection to its front elevation. This would be to a modest scale and would compliment the pitched roofs found on the application dwelling. Although the wider street scene does not comprise of front dormers, the design is sensitive, sympathetic and integrates well to not present as a harmful design. Furthermore, given it would be set-back from the street scene by a significant degree, its visual impact would be markedly mitigated and would not present as a harmful or incongruous element within the street scene. The dormer would not project above the increased ridgeline and positively integrates within the comprehensive proposed development. Therefore, no unacceptable harm is raised by the proposed dormer addition.

Single storey side (infill) extension

The proposed infill extension to the ground floor would square off the recessed and alcove-section to the existing elevation. The side elevation would contain a new main access into the dwelling and also a window to serve an office and this elevation is orientated to face the side elevation of No.14. The existing boundary treatment between these properties is a low-lying brick wall.

There are already window openings on this elevation albeit this application would bring them around 2m closer to the boundary with the neighbouring property an interface distance of 9.3m would remain between the two properties. The proposed extension would not lead to poor outlook or overshadowing but would marginally increase the intervisibility between the two properties. In order to minimise and mitigate any harm a condition is attached which requires the applicant to either erect a 1.8m high fence or introduce a hedge along the boundary. Subject to this condition the proposal would not result in any unacceptable impact to amenities and privacy and sufficiently mitigate any material change. The combination of the interface distance and the conditioned boundary treatment would ensure that the proposed development would be acceptable.

Materials

The existing dwelling is brick facing with white and brown UPVC openings and tiled roofing. A standard planning condition would be included to ensure that the proposed development would emulate the external facing materials of the original dwelling and ensure that it positively integrates to the original dwelling.

HIGHWAYS

The submitted plans show that the front garden would be capable of accommodating 3 no. vehicles and therefore adequate parking would be provided. The plans show also that the front boundary wall would be removed. Further precise details shall be further secured by way of condition to ensure that the parking is provided. This would be considered necessary given the number of bedrooms the property would contain.

The proposed development would result in the dwelling having 6 no. bedrooms. The Householder Development SPD requires that 3 no. parking spaces be provided within the curtilage and given the number of bedrooms created, this would be expected to be complied with. The proposed front garden could accommodate the required 3 no. parking spaces at a width of 9m and depth of 5.5m.

The proposed development would not be considered to raise any unacceptable highway safety concerns or cause any adverse increase in off-street parking.

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 must be begun not later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date of this permission.

Reason: In order to comply with the requirements of Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).

- 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans and documents listed in Schedule 1.

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt.

- 3) The materials to be used on the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match those of the existing building in type, size, colour and texture. For the avoidance of doubt this will include any brick detailing of the existing dwellinghouse being carried over and emulated to the external elevations of the proposed development, hereby permitted.

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.

- 4) The 'Office' identified on plan 1053/24 shall not be used until a 1.8m high fence or a hedge has been erected/planted along the boundary with number 14 Deerbolt Crescent. Precise details of the means of enclosure shall first be submitted to and agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority and once it has been installed it shall be retained thereafter.

Reason: To protect the privacy of the occupants of the adjacent residential property (No.14 Deerbolt Crescent) and to comply with Policies CS2 and CS19 of the Knowsley Local Plan Core Strategy, adopted January 2016 Saved Policies H8, and DQ2 of the Knowsley Replacement Unitary Development Plan, adopted June 2006.

- 5) Notwithstanding the parking arrangement indicated within the submitted and approved drawing, 'Parking Arrangement' Dwg. No. 1054/24, no part of the development hereby permitted shall be occupied until an area of hardstanding (in addition to the existing within the curtilage of the dwelling) has been laid out in full accordance with this condition.

The hardstanding shall be laid out so that the total area of accessible hardstanding shall measure a minimum of 9 metres in width by 5 metres in depth, is provided, both the existing brick front boundary wall shall be partially demolished, and the existing dropped kerb shall be extended to the width of a minimum of 5.7 metres, to allow access to the hardstanding.

The car parking area shall be made of porous materials, or provision shall be made to direct run-off water from the hard surface to a permeable or porous area or surface within the curtilage of the dwelling. The parking, together with the driveway retained shall remain for parking purposes at all times thereafter.

Reason: To ensure that adequate off-street parking is available in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (2023), Policies CS2, CS7 and CS19 of the Knowsley Local Plan: Core Strategy, adopted January 2016, saved Policies H5 and H8 of the Knowsley Replacement Unitary Development Plan, adopted June 2006, Ensuring a Choice of Travel SPD (2010) and Householder Development SPD (2016).

SCHEDULE 1

Date Received	Ref. No	Version	Drawing/Document Title
04/04/2025	1054/24	-	PARKING ARRANGEMENT

17/03/2025	-	-	BLOCK PLAN AND SITE PLAN
17/03/2025	1053/24	-	PROPOSED PLANS & ELEVATIONS

Signed Case Officer¹:

Reece Black

**Signed Authorising
Officer²:**

Date:

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