

<u>APPLICATION NO:</u>	25/00256/FUL	<u>CASE OFFICER:</u>	Reece Black
<u>WARD:</u>	Whitefield	<u>PARISH:</u>	
<u>LOCATION:</u>	1 Meadowbarn Close, Southdene, Kirkby, Knowsley		
<u>PROPOSAL:</u>	ERECTION OF 1 NO. SIDE DORMER TO ROOF		

Site Description

The application site is located at 1 Meadowbarn Close, Kirkby is located within a Primary Residential Area in the Development Plan. The application property is an end-terraced dwellinghouse. The property is fronted to the highway leading to a cul-de-sac. The plot contains the dwellinghouse and associated front and rear garden curtilage and is roughly rectangular in shape. The application site forms part of a modern housing estate.

The front garden area comprises of a combination of a shared driveway with the adjoining neighbour of No.2 Meadowbarn Close together with a grassed section to the edge of the plot enclosed by shrubbery.

The existing gable wall of the property fronts a building row of detached dwellinghouses to the north-west/north/northwest. There are other residential properties to the west and south of the application site.

Proposal

The proposal is for the erection of 1 No. side dormer to roof.

The proposed dormer extension would be a flat roofed extension, located to the gable wall of the property, which would be 8.3m wide, with 0.3m set-in end to both edges from the pitched roof. The proposed dormer would attain a height of 2.2m with a projection of 2.3m. The dormer would be set-back from the gable wall elevation by 0.1m.

Consultations

None required.

Representations

This application has been publicised by letters sent to 12 neighbours.

There have been 2 letters of objection, 2 letters of support and 0 letters of comment. The representations are summarised as follows:

Points of Objection:

Summarised as 'loss of light' and 'visual amenity'

- How close does the house need to be before the dormer will be directly

looking into the living room and bed of my house?

- I would like someone from the Council planning to visit so they could get a better understanding of how close the properties are together.
- It will be unsightly, affecting the aesthetics of the area.
- I am concerned that sunlight will be affected in the latter part of the day.
- No's 22 & 24 will be directly affected, not currently being overlooking, this extension will sit directly above the back gardens, directly overlooking the back gardens of the properties, affecting privacy and ultimately affecting the price of properties.

Points of Support:

Two letters of support have been submitted, although no comments have been provided. It appears that the letters of support have come from the applicant and another resident at the application property.

Planning History

APP. NO: 00/00759/KMBC1

PROPOSAL: OUTLINE APPLICATION FOR PROPOSED RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT

DECISION: GRANTED

DECISION DATE: 23 February 2001

APP. NO: 02/00096/REM

PROPOSAL: APPROVAL OF RESERVED MATTERS FOR THE ERECTION OF 15 MEWS AND 60 DETACHED PROPERTIES TOGETHER WITH ACCESS, MEANS OF ENCLOSURE AND ASSOCIATED LANDSCAPING WORKS

DECISION: GRANTED

DECISION DATE: 22 March 2002

The planning permission granted for (02/00096/REM) included a condition (condition 10) which withdrew Permitted Development Rights (PDR) for select plots, however, the application property is not one listed as recorded having PDR withdrawn and the Local Planning Authority does not hold any record of the application property having had Permitted Development Rights withdrawn via any other mechanism.

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 (SPDs)

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 with the proposal and determining the application within a timely manner, clearly setting out the reason for refusal, allowing the applicant the opportunity to consider the harm caused and whether or not it can be remedied by a revision to the proposal. The Local Planning Authority is willing to meet with the applicant to discuss the best course of action and is also willing to provide pre-application advice in respect of any future application for a revised development.

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 (7.7 Roof Alterations and Dormer Extensions) stipulates 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.

The Householder Development SPD furthers that the following (relevant) general guidelines apply:

- *Attention needs to be given to design to ensure a sensitive and appropriate approach which conserves the character of the original building and roofscape.*
- *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 (including the roof boundary line of terraced properties and semi-detached properties), to prevent it having an overbearing effect on the street scene and adjoining dwellings.*
- *A number of smaller dormers, as appropriate to the scale of the building, may be more successful than one large dormer, but conversely a simple roofline or roof slope must not be cluttered by a proliferation of dormers.*
- *Dormers on side elevations are normally not acceptable if they overlook adjacent dwellings.*
- *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.*
- *The openings on dormers should generally be noticeably smaller than the windows on the storeys below.*

The New Residential Development SPD (Appendix 4):Interface distances and private amenity states that *principal elevation to gable should be a minimum of 12 metres.*

DESIGN AND RESIDENTIAL AMENITY

The proposed dormer extension would extend the full-width (excluding the 0.3m set-ins at either end). The dormer would 2.2m in height and 2.3m in projection, served by a flat roof.

The gable wall of the application property is located facing the rear elevations and rear gardens of the properties to the north-west/north/north-east (No's 20, 22 & 24 Whinberry Drive). No 22 Whinberry Drive would be considered the property most saliently affected by the proposed development given the interface distance between the rear elevation of No.22 Whinberry and the existing gable wall of the application property is 10.5m.

The proposed dormer extension would be deemed to have an adverse impact on residential amenities and privacy by virtue of the visual impact of the dormer. The proposed extension would be considered to result in overlooking and the 'perception of overlooking' to the occupants of the properties the gable wall is oriented towards.

The Householder Development SPD stipulates that *extensions must adequately protect your neighbours right to enjoy their own home. Extensions must not overshadow or have an overbearing effect on neighbouring dwellings to an unacceptable degree.* As outlined, the New Residential Development SPD outlines that interface distances for principal elevation to gable should be a minimum of 12m and separation distances to rear habitable windows should be at least 22m .

As identified, the existing interface distance between the gable wall of the application property and the rear elevations of the properties to the north are already less than these figures (with interface distances of 10.5m) and consequently it would be deemed that the introduction of the proposed dormer extension, at a higher storey, would result in enhanced levels of overlooking into the rear elevations and rear gardens of the adjacent properties. It is because of this exacerbated level of harms to residential amenity by virtue of overlooking, visual intrusion and lack of privacy that the proposal could not be supported.

Moreover, due to the full-width form and massing of the proposal with its direct and concentrated views at an insufficient interface distance, this would result in actual and perceived levels of overlooking. The proposed development would be considered to adversely affect residential amenities and privacy by harming the living conditions of the occupants of the properties to the north and detrimentally impacting on the enjoyment of the rear garden areas to these properties due to actual or perceived overlooking.

The proposal would be considered to result in significant adverse impact to amenities and privacy and the proposal conflicts with Saved Policies H5 and H8 of Knowsley Replacement UDP and both the guidance of the Householder Development SPD and the New Residential Development SPD.

The proposed dormer extension would be deemed a discordant feature in context to the original dwellinghouse, as the proposal fails to conserve the original building. It is considered that the dormer would present as overly dominant in relation to the dwelling, this is demonstrated through its conflict with the set-back of 0.1m from the elevation it relates to, which conflicts with the SPD guidance by a shortfall of 0.9m. This conflict is significant, and its effect means the proposed dormer extension presents as overbearing to the street scene and the neighbouring properties of No.22 & 24 Whinberry Drive.

Whilst the application property benefits from a slight set-back within the street scene, the proposed side dormer would still be a readily visible feature of the application property, particularly with views taken along public vantage points from the highway of Meadowbarn Close, with the harmful design accentuated due features such as the proposed flat roof, which further conflicts with the guidance of the SPD and its full width design, which contributes to the its enlarged form and bulk; the proposed dormer extension would be deemed to dominate the roof slope, which would result in an unsymmetrical design.

Given the application property forms part of a terraced row of properties, its visual impact from an unbalanced and unsymmetrical appearance is further emphasised, to the detriment of the three terraced properties. The proposals discordance would be highlighted as the proposal would juxtapose the wider locality of the residential estate, which contain small, dormer projections, an integral characteristic feature throughout the estate. The proposed development would introduce a form of development, which would be to an overly enlarged scale, as there is a noticeable absence of any other enlarged, full-width dormer extensions or any flat roof dormer extensions within the wider locality and therefore the proposal would not positively integrate within the residential estate. It is for these reasons that the proposed development would be considered harmful by its design and appearance.

Due to the proposed internal layout shown within the loft floor plan, the windows proposed to be installed to the gable wall would present as unbalanced, with singular

en-suite and landing windows from the rear to middle of the gable wall and a bedroom window. The fenestration arrangement would be considered muddled and jarring in contrast to the existing elevation, contributing to an unbalanced design. The proposed development would contain an enlarged scale, form and massing which would not be a subordinate addition to the roofscape, result in an unbalanced and incongruous appearance, detrimental to the visual amenity of the area.

HIGHWAYS

The current property contains 3 no. bedrooms. The proposal would introduce an additional bedroom and increase this to 4 no. bedrooms. The existing parking at the property can accommodate 1 no. vehicles within the curtilage of the dwelling as the driveway is shared with No.2 Meadowbarn Close.

The Householder Development SPD requires that properties with 4+ no. bedrooms should provide 3 no. parking spaces within the curtilage of the dwelling. Given that these are maximum standards the Local Planning Authority would usually compromise on 2 no. spaces.

The NPPF (Paragraph 116) 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.

There is sufficient space within the front garden area to expand the existing hardstanding to replace the grass sectioned area to the front of the property, which would comply with the minimum dimensions of the SPD (5.7m x 5m for two side by side parking spaces to the front of the property). Therefore, given that this could be achieved by way of condition should the application be granted, it would not be considered that the proposed development would result in any unacceptable highway safety impacts or adversely affect the wider local highway network, it would not be considered to substantiate a reason for refusal on this occasion.

Conclusion

The proposed dormer is enlarged, unduly dominant and out of character with the dwellinghouse and would create an unbalanced appearance to the dwelling, which would be incongruous in the street scene and detrimental to the visual amenity of area. The application therefore conflicts with the aforementioned policies and is recommended for refusal.

Recommendation

That planning permission be refused for the following reason(s):-

- 1) The proposed dormer extension by virtue of its location, form, mass and scale would be overly dominant regarding the existing roof, out of character with the existing house and wider locality, cause an imbalance to the appearance of the house and be incongruous in the street scene. The proposed development would be detrimental to the visual amenity and character of the local area, creating a discordant jarring feature on the house and within the street scene, detrimental to the visual amenities of the residential area.

The proposal is consequently contrary to Policies CS2 and CS19 of the Knowsley Local Plan Core Strategy adopted January 2016 and Saved Policies H5 and H8 of the Knowsley Replacement Unitary Development Plan adopted June 2006, together with the adopted Householder Development SPD.

- 2) The proposed dormer extension by virtue of its location and design (form, mass and scale) and because of its relationship to the adjoining properties of No's 20, 22 and 24 Whinberry Drive, results in an extension which facilitates excessive levels of overlooking into the rear elevations and rear gardens of these properties, which would be detrimental to the amenities of adjoining residential occupants.

As such the proposal would be contrary to Policies CS2 and CS19 of the Knowsley Local Plan Core Strategy adopted January 2016 and Saved Policies H5 and H8 of the Knowsley Replacement Unitary Development Plan adopted June 2006, together with the adopted Householder Development SPD.

SCHEDULE 1

Date Received	Ref. No	Version	Drawing/Document Title
08/05/2025	01	-	EXISTING AND PROPOSED FLOOR PLANS AND ELEVATIONS
11/04/2025	-	-	LOCATION PLAN AND BLOCK PLAN

Signed Case Officer¹: Reece Black

Signed Authorising Officer²: Alan Kilroe

Date: 7 July 2025

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