

Knowsley Council
Regeneration and Economic Development Directorate.
Delegated Planning Report

<u>APPLICATION NO:</u>	22/00690/FUL	<u>CASE OFFICER:</u>	Reece Black
<u>WARD:</u>	Shevington	<u>PARISH:</u>	
<u>LOCATION:</u>	33 Beattock Close, Tower Hill, Kirkby		
<u>PROPOSAL:</u>	ERECTION OF FIRST FLOOR SIDE AND REAR EXTENSION AND REAR DORMER LOFT CONVERSION		

Site Description

The application site is located at 33 Beattock Close, Tower Hill, Kirkby, and is situated in an area that is allocated as a Primarily Residential Area in the development plan. The application site is a semi-detached dwelling house, and is red brick facing on its front, side and rear elevations. Along with black UPVC doors and windows, and flat, brown, interlocking tiles on the roof. The property benefits from a single storey front to side extension with a canopy roof to front elevation and a store at the side of the extension.

The dwelling house is situated on a corner plot where the highway of Beattock Close intersects onto Melrose Road. The application property holds a prominent position in the street scene, as it is located at the intersection of a highway, is encircled by several dwelling houses which consist of mostly other semi-detached dwellings and a row of terrace houses to the rear of the application site. The building line of these are set back considerably from the highway and therefore, the visibility of the rear and side elevation of the application site is enhanced and prominently displayed from the public highway.

Proposal

The application seeks permission for the erection of a first-floor side extension, to be sited on top of an existing single storey side extension, which would form a two-storey side extension to the original dwelling. As well as a loft conversion and rear dormer.

The first-floor extension would project out 3.95m from the existing side and measure a length of 4.74m, before it would dog leg in by 1.04m and then continue the side elevation by a further length of 3.5m, which would have a projection of 3.05m from the existing side elevation. The overall proposed side elevation would measure at a length of 8.24m. The proposed first-floor extension would feature a dual pitched roof; the eaves for this roof would measure at a height of 5.49m and the highest point of the roof would measure at a height of 7.57m.

The loft conversion measurements would have a width of 5.12m and a length of 4.81m. The rear dormer measurements would have a projection, from the ridge line of the roof, of 3.91m. The height would be 2.18m and the length of the dormer extension would be 4.67m across the rear elevation. The dormer would also consist of 2 windows on the rear elevation.

Previously submitted plans included a larger dormer and the front wall projection of the proposed first-floor has been amended and set in more to accord with The Householder Development SPD.

Consultations

None Required

Representations

This application has been publicised by letters sent to 7 neighbours. No representations have been received.

Planning History

- 04/01349/FUL - ERECTION OF SINGLE STOREY EXTENSION TO FRONT AND SIDE OF DWELLING WITH CANOPY ROOF TO FRONT ELEVATION – GRANTED – 23.02.2005

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.

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.

KNOWSLEY LOCAL PLAN: CORE STRATEGY SAVED POLICIES - KNOWSLEY REPLACEMENT UNITARY DEVELOPMENT PLAN (ADOPTED JUNE 2006)

CS19 - Design Quality and Accessibility in New Development

CS2 - Development Principles

H5 - Development within Primarily Residential Areas

H8 - Extensions and Alterations to Residential Properties

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

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 that two storey side extensions (and provision of first floors over existing single storey side extensions) should be designed to avoid having an overbearing effect or causing unacceptable loss of light or privacy for neighbours. It also states proposed developments should avoid creating a terracing effect, either by themselves or in conjunction with similar extensions which may exist or potentially be proposed for adjacent properties in the future.

The Householder Development SPD states that particular attention should be paid to the design of extensions on corner plots. This is because they can encroach over the building line on either highway frontage, and therefore be particularly prominent in the street scene and sometimes create undesirable 'pinch points' in the entrance to side roads.

The Householder Development SPD 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. It also states that there is a great scope to extend dwellings by adding rear dormers under permitted development. This is where it is appropriate and would meet the criteria in order to be classified as benefitting from permitted development.

Design

The Householder Development SPD and Saved Policy H8 in the Replacement Unitary Development Plan state that the design and materials used would reflect those used on the original dwelling. The submitted plans show that these policy requirements accord with the Householder Development SPD and Saved Policy H8.

The Householder Development SPD contains general design guidance (Section 6) as well as specific design guidance (Section 7) which applications are encouraged to follow as this guidance reflects what is contained in national planning policy and policies within the Knowsley Local Plan Core Strategy, adopted January 2016.

It states that the overall scale of the development should not look out of place in the

street scene or other immediate environment. It also states that extensions should normally be subordinate to the original dwelling. The overall scale of the proposed development is deemed too excessive by virtue of its form and mass and would result in an extension that would dominate the street scene and would look out of place and incongruous in the street scene. The application site is situated with several dwelling houses on all sides of the property. In comparison to these, the proposed development would contrast significantly to the scale of the nearby dwelling houses and would appear overly large and domineering in the street scene. The existing property with the addition of the the proposed development, would create an appearance of an unbalanced dwelling, especially when observed with the paired, semi-detached dwelling. The proposed development would not offer a sensitive contrast that respects the existing.

As discussed in the previous section, caution should be displayed in the design of extensions to ensure that those on a corner plot should not be built abutting the boundary line where it would become a prominent addition to the amenities of the area. In the context of where the application site is and due to the existing single storey side extension being sited abutting the boundary, it would not be of an appropriate design and would affect the openness of Beattock Close and the junction. The proposed development would look visually prominent in the street scene, impact the character of the local area by impacting the openness and contribute to a potential 'pinch point' should the opposite dwelling consider a similar extension. Furthermore, the proposed rear dormer would also become a prominent, insubordinate, and inappropriate addition to the existing dwelling, particularly given the context of the application site and the lack of screening due to the existing openness of that area. The rear dormer would not be considered good design and would be prominently visible from the highway to the rear, as well as pedestrians, highway users and residents. Therefore, the proposed development in its entirety would not be considered as an acceptable design.

Therefore, the proposed development would be contrary to the Householder Development SPD, as well as Policies CS2 and CS19 of the Knowsley Local Plan Core Strategy, adopted January 2016 and Saved Policy H5 and H8 of the Knowsley Replacement Unitary Development Plan, adopted June 2006.

The Householder SPD states that when considering the roof of an extension, the main building and similar nearby dwellings (if any) should be a guide. The design of the roof and the slope of the roof should echo that of the original dwelling, where appropriate. The Householder Development SPD places specific emphasis that on two storey extensions and developments which are visible from the highway, this should be a key factor when selecting the design. the proposed development would present a roof, which due to the dwelling's location, when observed would present a muddled roofline.

The roofline of the proposed development does not respond well to the existing dwelling or the similar, nearby dwellings. From the front elevation, the rooflines present a similar issue to the bulk of the first-floor it would serve and that the majority of roof is a continuation of the existing and does not present itself as a subordinate enough addition. This issue is exacerbated due to the fact that the application site is readily visible from the highway and the public vantage point to the rear of the dwelling (Beattock Close) and would be easily observed due to the prominent site it holds. A roof that for the most part, expands the existing roof, with little to highlight that the extension is subordinate, would appear as unsympathetic to the existing dwelling and character of the existing area. Therefore, the proposed development would be contrary to the Householder Development SPD, as well as Policies CS2 and CS19 of the Knowsley Local Plan Core Strategy, adopted January 2016 and Saved Policy H5 and H8 of the Knowsley Replacement Unitary Development Plan, adopted June 2006.

The Householder Development SPD states that for extensions on corner plots that sufficient distance should be retained to the side boundary to preserve the character of the surrounding area. Extensions should not be sited so close to the boundary that they would adversely impact on the street scene. The application property benefits from a previously constructed and existing single storey front to side extension with a canopy roof to front elevation and a store at the side of the extension. This is constructed with sections abutting at the boundary line or being sited close to the boundary line. Notwithstanding the previous application being granted, the proposed development's first floor side extension (and the result of a two-storey side extension as a result) would cause a harmful impact on the amenities of the street scene due to the form and mass of the proposal; along with the fact that it would be sited too close to the boundary and not in accordance with the Householder Development SPD.

The proposed development would exacerbate and adversely highlight the absence of sufficient distance between the dwelling and side boundary, which is where the existing single storey side extension is sited and would cause an adverse impact on the street scene. Were the adjacent neighbours of no.1 Beattock Close to erect a two-storey side extension up to similar distance from their gable wall up to their respective boundary. This could lead to the creation of a 'pinch point' for the entrance of the of Beattock Close. Which would cause a reduction in open space, local amenities and adversely impact the character of the street scene.

The Householder Development SPD also states that in the case of two-storey extensions, the presence of existing substantial hedging or fencing / walls, or substantial highway verges would be considered in assessing whether a relaxation to these guidelines can be made. It is noted that there is a fence that encloses the rear of the site and where the proposed development would be sited, however, given that the application site is significantly readily visible from the highway of Beattock Close and the application site is on a corner plot, which holds a prominent position in the street scene, it is considered this would not offset the harm caused to the character of the street scene by the proposed development.

The Householder Development SPD states that overall, irrespective of the distance remaining to the side boundary, the extension should be appropriate in scale to the dwelling. It is considered that the proposed development would be an inappropriate addition in scale to the original dwelling, nearby dwellings, as well as the character of the surrounding area. The Householder Development SPD also states that two-storey extensions should avoid blank gables, which the plans show a blank gable would be erected. This would cause significant harm to the amenities of the street scene and character of the area. The proposed development would not accord with the Householder Development SPD.

The Householder Development SPD states that for roof alterations and dormer extensions, attention needs to 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 not do this as the dormer extension would be an excessive and prominent adverse addition to the dwelling to be considered a sensitive and appropriate approach. The dormer extension would become the dominant feature on the roof. This contrasts heavily with the existing roof, as well as the wider street scene, as no nearby dwelling houses contain any rear dormers. This would be incongruous with the character of the area, would look visually jarring and would not be deemed as an appropriate design or offering a sensitive and appropriate contrast. Therefore, to erect a dormer this large would result in a roof alteration that would not compliment the application site or respond positively with the larger street scene.

The Householder Development SPD states that 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. From the submitted plans, the dormer is set back at approximately 0.16m from the rear elevation and set in at approximately 0.12 and 0.21m in from the roof edges, and therefore would not accord with the policy guidance. The Householder Development SPD also states that flat roof dormers will not be acceptable on front elevations or any elevation clearly visible from a public vantage point. As outlined previously, the rear of the application property would be readily visible from the highway of Beattock Close, including any pedestrians or highway users and residents situated on this highway. Therefore, the proposed development would be in direct contradiction of the Householder Development SPD and would not have an acceptable design.

If the proposed development were approved, it would result in a heavily contrasting and unbalanced nature between the application property and its adjoining neighbour that would not foster cohesion or harmony, it would have a negative impact on the overall character of the semi-detached properties, and a wider impact on the street scene. Therefore, it would not be in accord with the Householder development SPD and would not be considered as having an acceptable design.

Amenity

The proposed development would cause issues to the amenities of the street scene and character of the area, largely due to the scale and massing of the proposed development. Although, there would be no specific issues of overlooking between neighbours, significant overshadowing, or prominent examples of detrimental impact to amenities between neighbours. It is deemed that the proposed development overall would have a detrimental impact to the street scene and character of the local area

The Householder Development SPD states for extensions on corner plots, that reduced distances may be accepted if:

- Open corner plots are not a feature of the area
- The site does not hold a prominent position in the street scene (for example, if it is at the end of a cul-de-sac); or
- The site is well screened and so the extension would not have a significant effect on the street scene.

It is observed that common features of the local area include corner plots, with some of the dwellings building close to the boundary line. As well as a meandering, cul-de-sac type highways, meaning there are not strict building lines, that sit in uniform for the local area as a whole. It is recognised that this would generally allow relaxations of some of the guidance, however it is considered that the site does hold a prominent position in the street scene and that the site is not well screened so the extension would have a significant effect on the street scene. On this basis, and other factors, it would not be appropriate to relax the guidance on the reduced distances for the development on corner plots. The proposed development by nature, where it would be sited and the impact it would give on the immediate character and amenities of the area mean it would not be supported. The proposed space the development would cover would generally be deemed not an appropriate allocated space, for the creation of a two-storey side extension, which cannot be effectively screened. Therefore, the

proposed development would result in an adverse impact to the amenity of the street scene and character of the local area as well as not accord with the Householder Development SPD.

No.33 Melrose Road

No 33 is the attached dwelling to the application site. The front and rear building line of no.33 sit in line with the application property. The property benefits from a porch at the front elevation as well as a single storey side extension on its side elevation. The proposed development would largely not protrude beyond the existing front and rear elevations, with the no sections of the proposed development being readily visible from no.33. It is deemed this would not cause any significant harm to the privacy to the occupants of no.33. Furthermore, it would not result in any overshadowing or obstruction. The proposed development would not cause a significant impact on the amenities and privacy to the occupants of the Householder Development SPD.

Highways

The application site utilises the front garden to provide off-street parking. By the dimensions outlined in the Householder Development SPD which states that for parking in the front of the property it will require dimensions of 3m x 5m. This would provide a maximum of up to two spaces for the property, which is the existing provision. However, for the full area to be used, the front boundary fencing would have to be removed. The proposed development would see the bedrooms increase from 3 to 4, there is also a room on the plans which is labelled as a wardrobe that would have the sufficient dimensions to also be classed and occupied as a bedroom, which could result in any future occupants utilising this as a fifth bedroom. The Householder Development SPD states that for dwellings that contain 4+ bedrooms, 3 off-road parking spaces would be required. If the property does not already contain these spaces, it would be expected it would create these.

There is not the sufficient space at the front of the property to create a third additional off-street parking space, that would satisfy the dimensions outlined in the Householder Development SPD. There would be adequate room to the rear of the property for the creation of hard standing which would satisfy the dimensions of the Householder Development SPD and this could be secured through a condition were permission to be granted.

Conclusion

The proposal would not be acceptable in terms of design, residential amenity and highways. The proposal also does not comply with the Relevant Core Strategy, Replacement UDP policies and guidance in the NPPF and is therefore recommended for refusal.

Recommendation

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

The proposed development, because of its location, scale and massing, will be out of character with the character of the area and result in a prominent extension to the existing dwelling that is overly dominant in the streetscene along Melrose Drive and Beattock Close. The existing property is semi-detached, and the proposals will result in a significantly unbalanced appearance of the dwellings to the detriment of the character of the area. 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
01/11/2022	2270-02-03-002	REV 5	PROPOSED FLOOR PLANS AND ELEVATIONS
06/12/2022	2270-02-02-002	-	LOCATION PLAN
06/12/2022	2270-02-03-003	-	PROPOSED OTHER SIDE ELEVATION
07/11/2022	2270-02-02-001	-	BLOCK PLAN

Signed Case Officer: Reece Black

Signed Authorising Officer: Alan Kilroe

Date: 14/3/23

¹ Reece Black

² Alan Kilroe

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

Appendix 1 – Site Photographs







