

<u>APPLICATION NO:</u>	26/00040/FUL	<u>CASE OFFICER:</u>	Reece Black
<u>WARD:</u>	Roby	<u>PARISH:</u>	
<u>LOCATION:</u>	11 Grange Close, Roby, Knowsley		
<u>PROPOSAL:</u>	LOFT CONVERSION WITH DORMER EXTENSION TO THE REAR AND 1 NO. ROOFLIGHT TO FRONT		

Site Description

The application site is located at 11 Grange Close, Roby and is situated within an area designated as a Primarily Residential Area in the Development Plan. The application property is a detached dwellinghouse, served by a dual-pitched roof.

The property is located at the end of cul-de-sac of Grange Close, which is a private road, which meets Church Road. The property benefits from 2 no. outbuildings within the curtilage. The plot of the site is rectangular in shape. To the west, north and east of the site lie residential dwellings and immediately to the south is a railway line and Roby Train Station.

Proposal

The proposal seeks permission for the erection of a loft conversion with rear dormer extension and the installation of 1 no. rooflight to the front roof slope.

The proposed rear dormer extension would be flat roof in design and would project from the rear roof slope by 2.8m, with a width of 7.15m and a height of 2.5m. The rear elevation of the dormer would contain 3 no. windows. The dormer would be set-back 0.6m from the rear elevation of the dwelling and 1.05m from the side elevations of the dwelling.

The proposed Velux rooflight, installed to the front roof slope would project 0.12m above the existing roof slope.

The application has seen amendments to increase the set-back and set-in of the proposed rear dormer. As the revised proposal has no greater material impact than originally submitted, it was not considered necessary for any further neighbour notification or publicity.

Consultations

Highway Authority: – No objections.

Representations

This application has been publicised by letters sent to 5 neighbours. It has also been advertised by way of site notice. No representations have been received.

Planning History

APP. NO: 16/00326/FUL
PROPOSAL: ERECTION OF 1NO TWO STOREY 4 BED DWELLING WITH ASSOCIATED ACCESS AND PARKING
DECISION: GRANTED
DECISION DATE: 15 July 2016

APP. NO: 20/00616/FUL
PROPOSAL: CONVERSION OF GARAGE TO HABITABLE ROOM
DECISION: GRANTED
DECISION DATE: 6 January 2021

Under 16/00326/FUL the application property had permitted development rights withdrawn via condition. Condition 12 of the Decision Notice states *Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or any Order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification)*

- (i) *no extensions shall be carried out to the dwelling*
- (ii) *no garages or carports shall be erected within the curtilage of the dwelling*
- (iii) *no vehicle standing space shall be provided within the curtilage of the dwelling*
- (iv) *no buildings, gates, wall fences or other structures shall be erected within the curtilage of the dwelling*
- (v) *no dormer windows shall be added to the dwellings*

other than those expressly authorised by this permission or pursuant to condition 9 of this planning permission, unless planning permission for such development has been granted by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To protect the residential and visual amenities of the area, safeguard the character of the area and adjacent residential development scheme, and to comply with the National Planning Policy Framework; Policies CS2 and CS19 of the Knowsley Local Plan Core Strategy adopted January 2016 and saved Policy H5 of the Knowsley Replacement Unitary Development Plan, adopted June 2006.

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

DQ3 – Gateway Sites and Corridors

SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DEVELOPMENT (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 identifying matters of concern within the application (as originally submitted) and negotiating with the applicant, acceptable amendments to the proposal to address those concerns. As a result, the Local Planning Authority has been able to grant planning permission for an acceptable proposal, in accordance with the presumption in favour of sustainable development, as set out within the National Planning Policy Framework.

Assessment

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

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

Saved Policy DQ3 (Gateway sites and Corridors) in the Replacement Unitary Development Plan states that *new development proposals which are within or adjacent to, or visible from, identified road and rail routes within Knowsley should seek to ensure the visual appearance of the route.* All passenger rail lines are

explicitly referenced within this policy.

The Householder Development SPD states that *roof alterations and dormer extensions should ensure that care is exercised to ensure that their design is in keeping with the dwelling and that they do not overlook neighbouring dwellings. Dormers should not be so large as to dominate the roof slope resulting in a dwelling which appears unbalanced.*

DESIGN AND RESIDENTIAL AMENITY

Rear dormer extension

The Householder Development SPD furthers that *a dormer extension must not project above the ridgeline of the dwelling and that 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 dwellings.*

The proposed roof alterations would have an acceptable scale and not appear unduly dominant or enlarged on the roofscape due to incorporating design breaks from the set-backs and set-ins. The proposed rear dormer would not fully comply with the set-back from the rear elevation, as it would be set-back 0.6m and therefore have a shortfall of 0.4m. On this occasion, it is considered that this shortfall would be acceptable given that the proposal has been reduced in its projection to more closely accord with the policy guidance. The proposed dormer would be sited to the rear and therefore not be readily visible from the street scene and at the rear, would still maintain a subordinate and proportionate addition to the dwelling. Furthermore, given it would be set-in by double the guidance of the SPD from the side elevations (at 1m each side) and would also be set 0.67m below the ridgeline of the main dwelling, it would further ensure the proposed dormer extension would be a subordinate addition which would not result in an enlarged dormer, detrimental to the design and visual amenities of the dwelling and wider area.

The SPD further outlines that *dormers should be faced in materials which match the original roof coverings. Flat roof dormers will not be acceptable on front elevations or any elevation clearly visible from a public vantage point and that 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 proposed rear dormer would be faced in matching roof tiles to positively integrate with the main roof of the original dwelling. As the materials would match that of the original roof (in oppose to cladding or brick facing etc, which would accentuate the bulk and scale of the proposal) it would further reduce its visual appearance and therefore further justifies as to why a degree of leniency can be applied to the 1m set-back policy guidance of the SPD.

The only public vantage point that the flat roof dormer would be readily visible from would be from the platforms of Roby Train Station. Saved Policy DQ3 is also relevant here as the accompanying guidance to DQ3 (11.23) outlines that *in order to protect and enhance the image of Knowsley and Merseyside as a whole it is considered important to maximise the visual appearance of these routes.* Whilst the proposed rear dormer would be served be flat roof in its design (which would conflict with the policy guidance) and would be readily visible from a public vantage point and gateway site / corridor (as defined by DQ3), further consideration has been given to its visual impact and appearance and to its degree of harm to visual amenities. It is

acknowledged, however, that the external walls and openings would be faced with matching materials to the roof and other openings to the property, and as outlined, the matching materials would significantly reduce the visual impact and prominence of the proposed dormer to the dwelling. Therefore, whilst the dormer would be readily visible from a public vantage point and from a passenger railway line, it would be considered that the use of matching materials must hold significant weight to justify that the proposed dormer extension would not result in any adverse harm to the visual amenities of the dwelling or wider area.

The proposed openings, whilst not noticeably smaller than the openings below, would be considered acceptable. This is because the openings of the proposed rear dormer as originally submitted were larger than the other openings to this elevation. The revised openings would present coherent and reflective of the storey below and, when considered in the context of this elevation would enhance its appearance in terms of proportions, layout and shape. The proposed openings would, therefore, be acceptable.

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

The New Residential Development SPD, Appedix 4: Interface Distances and Private Amenity, Criterion 1 outlines that *development should retain 22 metre interface distances between existing rear principal rear elevations and proposed principal elevations for two storey properties. Where proposed properties are higher than 2 storeys (including significant level changes), an extra 3 metres per floor should be added.*

The rear elevation of the property is orientated with a view of the rear elevation of the detached dwelling No.107 Springwell Avenue with an existing interface distance of 25m. For the consideration of assessing any impact from the proposed rear dormer, the existing 25m interface distance would be retained as the dormer would not surpass the existing rear elevation of the dwelling. The 25m interface distance would also be the minimum required distance as per the policy guidance (factoring in the additional 3m required to the 22m minimum, due to the additional storey because of the proposal). Therefore, the proposal would maintain its minimum required interface distance and ensure that residential amenities are protected and prevent any harm by way of outlook or loss of privacy.

Moreover, when considering the relationship between the rear elevation of the application property and No.107 Springwell Avenue it is acknowledged that the application property is oriented at a slightly oblique angle, which would further prevent any direct overlooking into the rooms within the rear elevation of No.107. Therefore, it is considered that no unacceptable impacts to amenities and privacy would occur as a result of the proposed development.

No other dwellings in the locality are considered to suffer any adverse residential amenity or privacy impacts because of the proposed development. The rear dormer would not facilitate any significantly greater views into the rear gardens of the adjacent (No.9 Grange Close) or opposite (No.s 109 & 107 Springwell Avenue) properties in contrast to which are already available from the first-floor rear elevation.

Velux window

The installation of the Velux window would be centralised to the front roof slope. This would be a minor alteration and a small detail which would not significantly alter the design of the dwelling or appear harmful to the street scene. Therefore, no design visual amenity concerns are raised.

HIGHWAYS

The Householder Development SPD states that *for properties which have 4+ no. bedrooms these should have 3 no. parking spaces.*

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

The application property at present contains 4 no. bedrooms; the proposed development would introduce 2 no. bedrooms and result in the property containing a total of 6 no. bedrooms. The application property previously benefitted from an integral garage, which was converted to form a habitable room under 20/00616/FUL, which resulted in the loss of an in-curtilage parking space, however, to ameliorate any potential impact and increase parking capacity for the property, the front/side grassed area was modified to allow the expansion of the hardstanding to accommodate more vehicles.

The existing parking provisions include hardstanding to the front of the dwelling. The agent has provided a proposed site plan which shows the area immediately in front of the dwelling could accommodate 5 no. vehicles, this is in excess of the maximum amount of in-plot parking set out in the Householder Development SPD. It is not likely that this arrangement would always be used due to a lack of any space to manoeuvre vehicles independently for access and egress, and therefore it is expected that some car parking would overspill and take place within the street.

Whilst it is anticipated that a level of on-street parking would occur, it would not be expected to be a significant increase to the detriment of highway safety or amenity of neighbouring properties. It was also noted during the Officers' site visit and as evidenced from Google Earth satellite imagery that there is small degree of on-street parking which already takes place.

Therefore, it is considered that on the basis of the existing level of parking provision within the plot (which complies with the maximum 3 no. parking spaces requested) by increasing its capacity for in-plot parking with the previous application (20/00616/FUL) and the fact that the highway condition of Grange Close would be able to accommodate with a moderate uplift of any increase of parking demand without detrimentally compromising highway safety or the amenity of local residents, the proposal would not result in any unacceptable impact to highway safety.

This view is supported by the Local Highway Authority (LHA) who raise no objection to the proposal. The Highways Officer has outlined that the proposal is acceptable as submitted and is not expected to have any adverse impact on the safety or operation of the highway network.

The Highways consultation also recommended an informative pertaining to 'damage

to the highway' from works during construction, however, given the scale of the proposal, it would not be considered necessary to include such an informative.

Conclusion

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

Recommendation

That planning permission be granted subject to the following condition(s):-

- 1) The development must be begun not later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date of this permission.

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

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

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt.

- 3) Notwithstanding the materials otherwise agreed for the external walls of the rear dormer extension hereby permitted, the materials to be used on the external surfaces of the extensions hereby permitted shall match those of the existing building in type, size, colour and texture.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity and to comply with Saved Policy H8 of the Knowsley Replacement Unitary Development Plan, adopted in June 2006, Policy CS19 of the Knowsley Local Plan Core Strategy, adopted January 2016, and the National Planning Policy Framework.

SCHEDULE 1

Date Received	Ref. No	Version	Drawing/Document Title
03/02/2026		-	LOCATION PLAN
03/02/2026		REV A	SITE PLAN
09/02/2026	ABF-1186-XX-ZZ-DR-A-010	REV B	PROPOSED FLOOR AND ROOF PLANS
09/02/2026		REV B	ABF-1186-XX-ZZ-DR-A-011

Signed Case Officer¹: Reece Black

Signed Authorising Officer²: Jo Sheridan

Date: 17/03/2026

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