

<u>APPLICATION NO:</u>	22/00765/FUL	<u>CASE OFFICER:</u>	Reece Black
<u>WARD:</u>	Swanside	<u>PARISH:</u>	
<u>LOCATION:</u>	5 Bradfield Road, Roby, Knowsley		
<u>PROPOSAL:</u>	ERECTION OF DETACHED GARAGE / STORAGE BUILDING AND CONVERSION OF GARAGE TO HABITABLE ROOM		

Site Description

The application site is located at 5 Bradfield Road, Roby and is situated in an area allocated as Housing Development in the development plan. The application property is a detached dwellinghouse, is brick facing on its front, side and rear elevations and has a brown, flat tiled roof.

The application site is located at the end of a cul-de-sac. The property benefits from a garage at the front of the property and a detached outbuilding (summer room) to the side and rear of the dwelling. There is an existing detached light weight shed to the West of the application property and is located adjacent to the high brick-built boundary wall that screens the rear garden of 76 Holly Bank Avenue.

The application site features existing hardstanding to the front of the existing garage and soft landscaping, sited at the front of the house which includes shrubbery. The application property fronts a grass verge area and a group of mature trees, which are adjacent to palisade fencing together with brick pillars.

The site has been identified as being a former landfill site.

Proposal

The application seeks permission for the erection of a detached garage/storage building and the conversion of the existing garage to form a habitable room.

The proposed detached garage would be sited just off the front elevation of the dwelling and adjacent the boundary wall that divides the front garden of the application site and the rear garden area of 76 Holly Bank Avenue. This would also see the removal of the existing shed.

The proposed detached outbuilding would have a width of 6.65m and would have a depth of 4.04m. It would be served by a hipped roof and would measure at a height of 2.36m at the eaves and the highest point of the roof would measure at a height of 3.17m. This proposed development would feature bi-folding doors on its front elevation and a window installed on the side elevation.

The proposed internal garage conversion would see the existing garage space converted into habitable room(s) / additional living space. This would see the removal of the main front garage door of the existing garage.

The plans for the proposed development have been amended to show a reduction in the pitch of the roof and to lower the height of the proposed outbuilding. As well as a relocation of where the proposed outbuilding would be sited and the incorporation of additional parking spaces within the curtilage of the dwelling.

Consultations

Arboricultural Officer – Objection removed following amended plans.

Highway Authority – Objection removed subject to suggested Conditions applied.

Environmental Health – No objections received.

Representations

This application has been publicised by letters sent to 8 neighbours. There have been 4 representations in total. 3 have objected to the proposed development and there is 1 letter of support.

3 of which are objections and have been received from No's 12, 14 and 16 Bradfield Road. The representations all object to similar themes and issues and can be summarised as concerns in regard to visual amenity, highway safety, tree protection; more detailed comments are as follows:

- Concerns over whether the land in question is owned by the application property. This is due to the fact that when Redrow first built phase 2 of this estate (planning application 16/00353/REM). The plot in question's site boundary was different to the site boundaries indicated in this application and on previous applications. Not confident the land belongs to No.5.
- Concerns over the impact that the proposed outbuilding would have on the existing open green space. Could pose a significant negative impact, as the shed that is currently there does now (which is consequently erected not within number 5's site boundary) and the proposed building is larger.
- Despite the mitigations that have been outlined in this application, doubts that these are sufficient to protect the tree that is in the immediate vicinity of the proposed detached garage. It is a very well-established evergreen tree that provides both environmental and aesthetic benefit.
- Extreme concerns about damage to the adjacent trees, with particular concern about T1. It would alter the immediate environment. It helps reduce noise and blocks buildings. There is no guarantee that the works will not do irreparable damage even with the suggested provisions.
- The proposed detached garage is not in keeping with the local design codes of the surrounding estate, especially as the doors are not traditional garage doors, not the same specification across the estate and therefore not consistent with the aesthetics.
- Concerns raised regarding the large, transparent by-fold doors are appropriate for a storage facility and this would be in my direct line of vision.
- The existing shed is already a blot on the landscape. The proposed building is quite large and almost 4 times as big as the existing shed. This would have a major visual impact and reduce the visual aesthetic of the immediate surroundings.
- This address already has excessive vehicles parked outside (on the road) daily which make it difficult for cars to manoeuvre and turn around (it is the end of a cul-de-sac) on what is already a very narrow road and near impossible for emergency vehicles.

1 Letter of support was received from 76 Holly Bank Avenue. The land that is indicated for where the proposed outbuilding would be sited is divided into two parts of land, part is within the ownership of the application property and part is within the ownership of no.76. No.76 have not raised any objection to the proposal.

Planning History

APP. NO: 20/00786/CLU
PROPOSAL: CERTIFICATE OF LAWFUL DEVELOPMENT FOR A
PROPOSED SINGLE STOREY DETACHED OUTBUILDING TO
FORM A SUMMER ROOM AND STORAGE ROOM
DECISION: WITHDRAWN
DECISION DATE: 15 February 2021

APP. NO: 21/00118/FUL
PROPOSAL: ERECTION OF A SINGLE STOREY DETACHED
OUTBUILDING
DECISION: GRANTED
DECISION DATE: 30 April 2021

Under 13/00382/FUL Permitted Development Rights have been removed from the application site. Condition 22 states that Notwithstanding the provisions of Classes A, D, E and F of Part 1 of the Schedule to the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or any Order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification) there shall be no extensions to the dwellings, garages or car ports within the curtilages of the dwellings or buildings erected within the curtilages of the dwellings unless planning permission has been granted by the Local Planning Authority.

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.

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

CS2 - Development Principles
CS19 - Design Quality and Accessibility in New Development
H5 - Development within Primarily Residential Areas

H8 - Extensions and Alterations to Residential Properties DQ4 – Trees and Development

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 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 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 and alterations 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

Design

The existing dwelling is brick facing, with white UPVC windows and doors. The proposed development would also be brick facing and include materials which are in keeping with those found at the application property.

The grey garage door on the property would be replaced by fenestration. The width of the proposed replacement fenestration would be slightly set in either side in contrast to the width of the previous garage door. This has been secured via revisions to the plans and this has been sought to ensure that the design and

arrangement of the proposed windows would respond positively to the existing dwelling and foster a positive and cohesive front elevation. There would be brick infilling at the sides.

The proposed detached outbuilding would be faced with matching brickwork to emulate that of the existing dwelling. The proposed outbuilding would feature bi-folding doors on the front elevation that would front the grassed verge, as well as a window to the side elevation that faces the highway. The proposed dwelling would have a hipped roof, which would be an appropriate choice of design and be in-keeping with the character of the street scene and other outbuildings associated with the residential dwellings.

The proposal would be considered as having an acceptable design and would be in accord with the Householder Development SPD and Saved Policy H5 and H8.

Residential Amenity

The proposed outbuilding would be located just forward of the front building line of the dwelling, sited adjacent the front and side elevations of the property. It would be erected adjacent of the brick boundary wall that encloses the private rear garden area of 76 Holly Bank Avenue.

The area where the proposed outbuilding would be erected is considered to benefit from landscaping such as a bricked boundary wall, trees, and shrubbery, which would be considered to be the dominant character. The grass bank and overall amenity view from nearby dwellings would largely remain as existing and would not be considered to suffer significant harm to amenity views as a result of the proposal.

The Householder Development SPD states that garages, sheds and other detached buildings should normally be behind the building line or be well screened by hedging or similar landscape treatment. It also states that detached garages or extensions should not be built where they would obstruct views for motorists or pedestrians or otherwise compromise the safety of highway users.

The application property is located at the end of a cul-de-sac and fronts one of the turning heads. Given where the application property is sited, there is no clear building line of dwellings, and the proposed outbuilding is sited in a location that would not be considered to interfere or disrupt any established building lines of properties or garages associated with the dwellings of Bradfield Road, or have an impact on the residential amenities and views.

It is considered that given its siting and the presence of landscape treatment to soften its visual impact this would be appropriate and would largely be in accord with the Householder Development SPD. The proposed outbuilding would not appear significantly incongruous with the local character of the street scene given there are also a prolific number of accompanying detached garages and outbuildings to dwellings on this estate.

The proposed development would be considered as having an appropriate footprint and would be sited in an appropriate location in relation to other dwellings to soften its visual impact and cause minimal harm to local amenities. The proposal is considered as not causing significant adverse harm to the amenities of residents and would be in accord with Saved Policy H5 and H8 of the Replacement UDP and the Householder Development SPD.

76 Holly Bank Avenue

No.76 is a detached dwelling which is situated to the West of the application property. The rear elevation of no.76 faces the gable wall of the application site at an interface distance of approximately 12m.

The proposed development would be erected 0.50m away from the boundary wall that encloses the rear garden of no.76. The outbuilding would feature bi-folding doors on its front elevation that occupies the same view as the front elevation of the application property.

The proposed outbuilding based on its siting, scale and footprint would not result in any decline in privacy or significant loss of outlook from the occupants of no.76. The proposed developments plans were amended to reduce the pitch of the roof 17.5 degrees and to lower the gutter level by 1 brick course (0.075m). These changes saw the total height of the outbuilding reduced by 0.6m. There is also sufficient boundary separation between the rear garden of no.76 and the front garden area of the application site in the form of a 2.3m high brick wall. The total height of the amended proposed outbuilding is 3.13m and therefore the structure would only protrude 0.836m above the boundary wall.

Given the size and scale of the outbuilding, only the roof and top section would be readily visible to the occupants of no.76. This would not appear to be incongruous and are characteristic of the estate. It is considered that the proposed outbuilding would have an appropriate design and be an acceptable addition to the house and would not appear unduly dominant or overbearing, or interfere with the privacy of the occupants of no.76.

The proposed outbuilding would encroach on land within the ownership of 76 Holly Bank Avenue. The original application was submitted with Certificate A and various objections have been in relation to the fact that the land affected is not within the ownership of the application property. No objections were received by no.76 and instead a letter of support was received. The application was made invalid following this, however, subsequently the correct Certificate (B) was received, and notice was served on the occupants of no.76, who then submitted their letter of support.

Therefore, matters involving land ownership have been addressed and brought to the attention of relevant parties. It is not considered a material planning consideration and down to civil matters between the occupants of no.76 and the application property.

Overall, both the proposed outbuilding and garage conversion to form habitable room is considered to be in accord with Saved Policy H5, H8 and the Householder Development SPD and not considered to cause any significant harm to the amenities or privacy of the occupants of no.76.

12 Bradfield Road

No.12 is a detached dwelling which is situated to the East of the application property. The front elevation of no.12 faces the gable wall of the application property and has an interface distance of approximately 19.6m. No.12 benefits from a detached garage to the side of the property.

The proposed outbuilding would be erected and located adjacent the front and side elevations of the dwelling and would have an approximate interface distance of 32m

to the front elevation of no.12; this subsequently would not be considered to have a detrimental impact on residential amenity.

The occupants of no.12. raised objections to the proposal over concerns regarding the ownership status of the land that is indicated for where the proposed development would be sited. This has been addressed already in the report.

The neighbour has also objected to the proposal due to concerns over a loss of green space, the overall impact on existing trees as a result of development and the impact to visual amenities for no.12.

The proposed outbuilding would be erected on land shared between the ownership of the application site and the adjacent property of no.76 and would not be constructed on the open green space where the adjacent trees and green space opposite the front elevation of the application property. The proposed development would not be considered to impact on any of the open green space, which is considered public space. The proposal would be constructed adjacent this area, but not on it. The proposed development would be effectively softened by these landscaping features, which would remain the prominent view. It would not be considered to detrimentally impact the openness of the adjacent public green space.

The application has been supported by a Tree Survey, including an Arboricultural Impact Assessment (AIA) and an Arboricultural Method Statement. This has been reviewed by the Council's Arboricultural Officer and any queries have been raised and addressed. The submitted Tree Survey was scrutinised and amended. The Council's Officer believed the Root Protection Area (RPA) for Tree 1 (T1) was drawn inaccurately. This was amended to reflect a more accurate impression of T1 to factor in the adjacent palisade fence. This informed the subsequent amendments to the proposed outbuilding.

Following the review of the Tree Survey, recommendations have been made to ensure protection of any near trees and these have been secured by planning Conditions. These measures include protective tree fencing and ground sheets to protect the RPA of the established trees. The submitted Tree Survey was made an approved document in Schedule 1 to ensure that the recommendations suggested would be followed during the construction of the proposals.

The proposals have been revised to ensure that the proposed outbuilding would be sited in an area to have a minimal impact on the trees, particularly T1 outlined in the Tree Survey, which in the previously submitted plans, was considered vulnerable to damage. Amendments to the plans and a review from the Arboricultural Officer now consider the siting of the proposal acceptable. The proposed outbuilding was relocated to be sited out of the amended RPA of T1. The amended plans were to the satisfaction of the Arboricultural Officer, who withdrew the objection to the proposal.

Therefore, it is considered that the proposed development would not cause any significant harm to the established nearby trees, any unacceptable impacts have been reviewed and amended to safeguard the retention of the nearby trees, which provide amenity value to the residential area.

Regarding the issues surrounding visual amenity, this has been considered and addressed when completing the assessment of this application. The proposed development would be sited in an area that does not hold a prominent location in the street scene and any impact to the visual amenity would be softened by the nearby landscaping and shrubbery. There is also sufficient interface distance between the

no.12 and the proposed development to ensure that residential amenity is protected. Although, no.12 fronts and looks toward where the proposed development would be sited, it would not be considered to be close enough to the property of no.12 to cause unacceptable harm on the property's amenities and privacy.

Given that the application site is situated at the end of a cul-de-sac, the orientation and siting of the proposed development, it is not considered, on this occasion, that bi-folding doors in oppose to a garage door would result in a significantly harmful impact on the character of the area or street scene.

Overall, it is considered that the proposed development would not result in any detrimental adverse impact to the amenities or privacy to the occupants of no.12. Given that the property is within a Primarily Residential Area, a domestic outbuilding would be acceptable in principle. The proposed development would be in accord with Saved Policy H5 and H8 and the Householder Development SPD.

No.14 Bradfield Road

No.14 is a detached dwelling and is situated to the North-East of the application site and is orientated so that the front elevation faces the adjacent turn head in the cul-de-sac.

The neighbour has objected to the proposal. The representations of both no.12 and no.14 Bradfield Road are identical and have been submitted by both properties but raise the same concerns.

These issues have been addressed under no.12 Bradfield Road. Specifically, in the context of no.14, but relevant also to no.12, it is considered that the proposed development would not result in any significant adverse impact on the amenities or privacy of the occupants of no.14 and would be in accord with Saved Policies H5 and H8 and the Householder Development SPD.

16 Bradfield Road

No.16 is a detached dwelling that is situated North-East from the application site. It is sited adjacent to no.14 and sit in the same building line as no.14. The interface distance between the application property and no.16 is approximately 37.5m.

The neighbour has objected to the proposal due to various concerns; most echo the objections of no's 12 and 14. No.16 has objected over concerns that the proposed outbuilding would result in critical damage to the adjacent trees, with particular reference to T1. The objection also raises concerns about the reliability of the Tree Survey and whether the root protection plan would be sufficiently robust enough to prevent significant harm to the identified trees. As stated previously, the Tree Survey and the consultation response received from the Arboriculturist are deemed adequate, following the necessary amendments and subsequent revised plans that have considered any impact on the nearby trees. The recommendations are standard for applications similar to this. The relevant concerns that the arboriculturist had with the original submission has been discussed, and the Council has worked positively with the applicant to amend the plans to mitigate and avoid any unacceptable impact on the adjacent trees.

Following this, the arboriculturist has removed the objection and it is now considered that the proposal would not have a detrimental impact on T1. Therefore, it is

considered that the provisions outlined would be sufficient to safeguard the identified trees most at risk to significant harm as a result of construction. The recommendations and amendments would be sufficient to ensure that the trees should not suffer any severe harm.

The neighbour has also objected to the proposal due to its impact on visual amenities, stipulating that it would result in having a worsening and undesirable impact on the immediate surroundings and that the form and massing of the proposed structure would be excessively large, given that the proposed development is significantly bigger than the existing shed. The proposed detached garage is notably larger than the existing lightweight shed previously located at the application site, however, it is considered that the proposed outbuilding due to its design, external materials, location, and scale it would not appear obtrusive from the view of no.16.

Given the orientation of no.16 and the area where the proposed detached garage would be erected, this would not be readily visible to the occupants of no.16. Furthermore, it is not considered that the proposed development would result in a significantly harmful impact on visual amenities to the immediate surroundings, given that the proposed development would not be incongruous to the character of the area and through its design is largely cohesive to the rest of detached outbuildings found on the residential estate.

In addition, the proposed garage would not have any significant impact on the adjacent public open green space or associated vegetation, this is reinforced further by the recommendations of the Tree Survey report. The proposed development is not considered to be incongruous with the character of the local area, is an appropriate addition for a domestic dwelling and would not be readily visible to the occupants of no.16. The presence of the trees and other shrubbery would be considered the dominant feature of the landscaping, and this would remain the case after the erection of the proposed development. The vegetation would soften the visual impact when viewed and the impact of the increase in size from the existing shed to proposed outbuilding would also soften over time. It is not considered that the proposed development would have a significantly harmful impact to the immediate surroundings or character of the local area.

Overall, the proposed development would be considered to be in accord with Saved policy H5, H8 and the Householder Development SPD and would not be considered to cause an unacceptable impact to the amenities and privacy of the occupants of no.16.

Highways

The current parking provisions for the application site include a driveway formed with hardstanding sited in front of the existing garage door which is of an adequate size to accommodate two parking spaces within the curtilage of the dwelling. There is also a turn head located adjacent to the dwelling.

Given concerns raised over parking and the loss of the parking space located within the internal garage space, the Highway Authority raised an objection to the proposals. The objection was raised and through positive discussions with the applicant, an additional parking space was incorporated into the proposal. This would be sited at an appropriate location and has been indicated on the plan to be constructed with porous materials.

Following this additional parking space within the curtilage of the boundary, the Highway Authority removed their objection.

From a previous application as well as this one, issues regarding parking had been raised on both occasions. This would increase the parking for the application property, within the curtilage of the dwelling, would prevent the turn head being used as overspill parking spaces and would alleviate some of the parking pressures. The amended plans and the inclusion of the replacement parking space would also mean that any existing or historic parking issues would not be exacerbated as a result of the proposed development.

Overall, there would be sufficient parking provided within the curtilage of the boundary and it is considered that the proposal would not result in worsened parking provisions or other related highway issues within the cul-de-sac. The proposal is not considered to have any adverse impacts to highway safety and would be considered acceptable.

Trees

There are a cluster of trees located adjacent where the proposed development would be sited. They are sited on the grass bank opposite the front elevation of the application property and no's 14 and 16.

The proposed development would not result in the removal of any trees, but the original Arboriculture Impact Assessment outlined that it could have the potential to cause negative impacts on the existing trees at the application site, through root loss or damage, if not managed in accordance with the relevant recommendations and conditions, in particular for Tree 1 in the Survey.

An objection was received from the Arboricultural Officer in relation to concerns that the proposed development was sited too close within the RPA of T1, and that this would cause structural damage and could eventually result in the tree felling because of the proposal, posing threat to life. Issues were also raised by the Arboricultural Officer, who did not agree with the sketch of the RPA in the Arboricultural Impact Assessment due to the adjacent palisade fencing present.

As a result of the objection raised, the proposal was amended, and the proposed outbuilding relocated to ensure it was not within the RPA of T1. The RPA of T1 was also re-sketched to factor in the palisade fence. The amended RPA on the AIA and AMS, as well as the relocation of the proposed development to be outside of the revised RPA was completed to the satisfaction of the Arboricultural Officer, who has since removed the objection and no longer believes that the proposed development would cause any significant harm to the adjacent trees.

The most recently submitted Tree Survey has been made an approved document within Schedule 1 to ensure that its recommendations are adhered to during any construction. A standard condition of 5-days advance written notice to the Local Planning Authority for the erection of protective tree fencing has also been included to ensure this is followed and protect the adjacent trees from harm during development. This will remain in place and not taken down at any point before development has finished.

This is to be in accordance with the Unitary Development Plan, Chapter 11, Development Quality and the Built Environment which states that development proposals affecting existing trees, woodlands and other vegetation, which make a

positive contribution to amenity, should make provision for their retention.

Gas Protection Measures

The property is located on a former landfill site which was investigated and monitored under planning approval 09/00556/FUL. As part of the planning permission, earthworks were undertaken, and remediation measures were put into place to ensure that the site was suitable for residential use.

Environmental Health have reviewed the proposal submitted and have no objections, subject to suggested conditions being applied. This is addressed in Condition 5.

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.

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) Five working days written notice shall be given to the Local Planning Authority for the erection for tree protective fencing before commencement of the works hereby granted.

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and to comply with the application and to act in accordance with Saved Policy DQ4 of the Replacement UDP.

- 5) No part of the accommodation/development consented hereby shall be occupied until the parking provision shown on areas indicated on Drawing 373-104C has been provided to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority. The parking provision shall be hard surfaced, and shall not drain onto the highway.

Reason: In the interests of highway and pedestrian safety and to comply with Policy CS7 of the Core Strategy, adopted January 2016.

- 6) Prior to the works being undertaken an implementation plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority (LPA), setting out details in respect to the following matters:

o Gas/vapour protection membrane:

- i. What specific gas/vapour membrane will be used? The membrane specification must be at least equal to that already installed under the property.
- ii. How will it be installed and specifically how will the new membrane be integrated with the existing gas protection measures, including consideration of ventilation arrangements.
- iii. The name of the competent persons / company installing the membrane?
- iv. How the installation of the membrane will be validated?

o Cover system

- i. How material excavated for the foundations and other earthworks from beneath the existing patio and/or beneath the high visibility membrane will be removed and disposed of offsite and will not impact the clean cover system in place at this property.

The agreed implementation plan must be carried out by competent person.

2. Upon completion of the works, a validation statement must be submitted to the LPA. The statement shall demonstrate that works have been carried out in accordance with the agreed methodology detailed in Point 1 above.

3. Water suppression shall be used, as required, to ensure there are no dust emissions from the excavated materials whilst being moved or being stored on site.

Reason: In the interests of safety, to prevent pollution of the water environment and to comply with Saved Policy ENV5 of the Knowsley Replacement Unitary Development Plan, adopted June 2006.

SCHEDULE 1

Date Received	Ref. No	Version	Drawing/Document Title
03/08/2023	373-104	C	LOCATION PLAN AND PROPOSED SITE PLAN
03/08/2023	373-108	B	PROPOSED FLOOR PLAN - DETACHED GARAGE / STORE
03/08/2023	373-109	B	PROPOSED ELEVATIONS - DETACHED GARAGE / STORE
03/08/2023	373-105	E	PROPOSED FLOOR AND ROOF PLANS
17/05/2023	373-107	C	PROPOSED FRONT ELEVATION
10/12/2022	373-106	A	EXISTING AND PROPOSED FLOOR PLANS - GARAGE CONVERSION
10/10/2023	-	-	ARBORICULTURAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT AND ARBORICULTURAL METHOD STATEMENT

Signed Case Officer¹:

Reece Black

**Signed Authorising
Officer²:**

K Foster

Date:

10 October 2023

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