
<u>APPLICATION NO:</u>	23/02707/FUL	<u>CASE OFFICER:</u>	Mark Quinn
<u>WARD:</u>	Shevington	<u>PARISH:</u>	
<u>LOCATION:</u>	Land Adjacent To, 35 Haweswater Close, Tower Hill		
<u>PROPOSAL:</u>	ERECTION OF 4NO SEMI-DETACHED DWELLINGS WITH ASSOCIATED WORKS		

Site Description

The application site relates to a grassed amenity area containing 4 mature trees located between Haweswater Way and Bank Lane, Tower Hill, Kirkby. The site is bounded by Bank Lane to the north and Haweswater Close and residential dwellings to the south. Residential development and a landscaped verge is located to the west and a landscaped verge is located to the east along the boundary with Bank Lane.

Proposal

It is proposed to erect 4 semi- detached dwellings with associated car parking and boundary treatments.

Consultations

Highway Authority - Raise Objections due to inadequate and inappropriately sited car parking , inadequate turning head, boundary treatments abutting the carriageway, pedestrian visibility spays required & front gardens encroach onto the adopted highway.

Environmental Health - No objections in principle subject to planning conditions relating to contaminated land (site investigation) , construction management plan and noise mitigation measures.

Merseyside Fire And Rescue Authority - No objections in principle.

Arboriculture (KMBC) – Raise objections due to the loss of trees and amenity area.

United Utilities – Raise an objection due to the proximity of the development to a raw water main and hydrant. Further information is requested.

Representations

This application has been publicised by letters sent to 32 neighbours.

There have been 7 letters of objection (2 from the same dwelling). This also includes a petition signed by 25 residents. The representations are summarised as follows:-

- Loss of a view from dwellings on Haweswater Way
- Loss of trees and amenity area
- Dwellings would block ease of access to footpaths, road crossings and bus stops.
- The area is too small for houses
- Increased traffic during construction would increase danger for children
- Detrimental impact on the general appearance of the area.
- Adversely effect nearby house prices.
- Squeezing four houses on this area suggests greed rather than need by the applicant.

- Road is too narrow for extra traffic, refuse wagons are frequently unable to gain access all the existing dwellings. Fire engines and ambulances have also had problems with access due to parked cars.
- Adding additional vehicles to this already crowded street would hamper manoeuvrability for existing residents.
- Children will be forced to play in the road.
- The proposed layout with the back gardens onto the close will not fit with the current area and would totally ruin the look.
- Lack of greenspace in this part of Kirkby that are easily seen by the public.
- Street would be turned into a building site bringing all the dirt and dust that comes with it.

The loss of a view and impact on houses prices are not material consideration relevant to the determination of this application. The other matters raised are covered within the report.

Planning History

APP. NO: 09/00485/FUL

PROPOSAL: ERECTION OF 4NO. SEMI-DETACHED DWELLINGS TOGETHER WITH ASSOCIATED WORKS.

DECISION: PER

DECISION DATE: 16 December 2009

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

CS2 - Development Principles

CS7 - Transport Networks

CS19 - Design Quality and Accessibility in New Development

SAVED POLICIES - KNOWSLEY REPLACEMENT UNITARY DEVELOPMENT PLAN (ADOPTED JUNE 2006)

H5 – Development within Primarily Residential Areas

ENV2 - Noise and Vibration
ENV5 - Contaminated Land
DQ4 - Trees and Development

Supplementary Planning Documents

Design Quality in New Development (January 2016)
New Residential Development (September 2018)
Ensuring a Choice of Travel (September 2010)
Householder Development (June 2016)

National Planning Policy Framework 2023.

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.

Assessment

Principle of Development

The application site is allocated as a Primarily Residential Area on the Knowsley Local Plan Policies Map. The principle of residential development is therefore considered to be acceptable. However any proposal for new development would need to be assessed against saved UDP policy H5 which states :-

“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 of neighbouring 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.”

Whilst planning permission has previously been granted for the erection of 4 dwellings on this site. This permission dates back to 2009 which pre dates the Knowsley Local Plan which was only adopted in 2016. The Local Plan includes policies on design and highway safety.

Supplementary Planning Documents covering design , new residential development and car parking have also been adopted since 2009.

In addition, the National Planning Policy Framework is now a material consideration which provides guidance on design. This is covered in further detail below.

Circumstances on the land surrounding the site have also changed since 2009 with the erection of new dwellings to the west of the application site in Purbeck Road. In particular the impact on the amenity of the occupiers of 28 Purbeck Road would now be a material

consideration.

Residential Amenity

Relevant planning policies and guidance are Local Plan Policy CS19 and Saved UDP policy H5,

part 2a of Local Plan Policy CS19 which states *“To maintain a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings, development proposals will be required to:*

a) Avoid unacceptable impacts on existing residents, business occupiers, and future occupiers;”

Saved UDP policy H5 states *“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 of neighbouring occupiers by reason of noise, disturbance, overlooking, visual intrusion, smells, fumes, on-street parking or other causes;”

Key expectation B.5 part g in the New Residential Development SPD states *“ Proposals for new residential development should provide adequate amenity for existing occupiers having regard to any relevant spacing guidelines set out in the Householder Development SPD.”*

Whilst the proposal is not an extension to an existing dwelling the guidance in the Householder Development Supplementary Planning Document relating to impact on neighbouring occupiers would be relevant in this instance as this guidance could also be applied to the siting of new dwellings.

Paragraph 6.19 states *“Extensions must adequately protect your neighbours’ right to enjoy their own home. Extensions must not overshadow or have an overbearing effect on neighbouring dwelling to an unacceptable degree.”*

Paragraph 6.23 states *“Extensions need to comply with the 45 degree rule and should be designed so as not to cross the 45 degree line from a neighbour’s nearest habitable window. The 45 degree line is drawn in a horizontal plane and taken from the middle of the neighbour’s window. The rule is designed to protect the amenities of neighbouring dwellings from overshadowing or obstruction of outlook. It is principally applied to extensions that project beyond the building line either at the front or rear.*

The impacts on residential amenity to be considered would be on the occupiers of 28 Purbeck Road and the existing dwellings to the rear of the site in Haweswater Close.

The separation distance between the rear elevation of the proposed dwellings and the front elevation of the existing dwellings in Haweswater Way would be 23.5m which exceeds the 22m separation distance as set out in Appendix 4 of the Council’s New Residential Development, Supplementary Planning Document. It is therefore not considered that the siting of the dwellings would be detrimental to the occupiers of the existing dwellings in Haweswater Close.

The proposed dwellings would be sited on the same angle and running parallel to the existing dwellings at 29-35 Haweswater Close. The dwellings would be set forward of the existing dwellings to the west of the site in Purbeck Road (and in particular the closest

dwelling at 28 Purbeck Road). The proposed dwellings would be set forward from the front elevation of 28 Purbeck Road by over 10m. The closest proposed dwelling to the western boundary (plot 1) would be set in by 1.72m. The majority of plot 1 would fall within a 45 degree angle drawn from the closest habitable room window in the front elevation of 28 Purbeck Road. A 1.8m timber fence is also proposed to the western boundary of plot 1 which would also project over 10m forward of the front elevation of 28 Purbeck Road.

It is considered that the siting of plot 1 and associated boundary treatment would due to its siting, proximity and massing be detrimental to the amenity of the occupier of 28 Purbeck Road. This would be contrary to Local Plan Policy CS19 and Saved UDP policy H5 and guidance in the New Residential Development and Householder Development Supplementary Planning Documents.

Street Scene/ Character of Area

Relevant planning policies and guidance are Local Plan Policy CS19, Saved UDP policy H5 NPPF paragraphs 131, 135 and 139 and Key Expectation B1 in the Council's New Residential Development – Supplementary Planning Document.

Policy CS19 states “ *To enhance the local distinctiveness, identity and accessibility of places, new development within Knowsley will be expected to:*

a) Respond to and integrate positive characteristics of immediate surroundings, including local materials, scale, mass, form, layout, alignment and density of the existing built environment;”

Saved UDP policy H5 states “*New development within the Primarily Residential Areas 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:*

b) Adversely affect the character or street scene of the area.”

The proposal is also considered to be contrary to paragraphs 131 & 135 in the NPPF which state

“The creation of high quality, beautiful and sustainable buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve. Good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, creates better places in which to live and work and helps make development acceptable to communities.”

“Planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments:

a) will function well and add to the overall quality of the area, not just for the short term but over the lifetime of the development;

b) are visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping;

c) are sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting, while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation or change (such as increased densities);

d) establish or maintain a strong sense of place, using the arrangement of streets, spaces, building types and materials to create attractive, welcoming and distinctive places to live, work and visit;

NPPF Paragraph 139 would also be relevant to this proposal which states “ *Development that is not well designed should be refused, especially where it fails to reflect local design*

policies and government guidance on design, taking into account any local design guidance and supplementary planning documents such as design guides and codes.”

Key Expectation B1 in the Councils New Residential Development Supplementary Planning Document states “ *New residential development will be expected to:*

a) Respond to and integrate positive characteristics of immediate surroundings, including local materials, scale, mass, form, layout, alignment and density of the existing built environment.”

Key Expectation A.1 in the Council’s Design Quality in New Development SPD states “*The design of all new development should:*

a) Integrated effectively with existing development”

This application relates to a prominent site on the southern side of Bank Lane opposite to the junction with Shevington Lane

The character of Bank Lane comprises wide landscaped verges to both sides with dwellings set back beyond the landscaped verges. These verges are in the main open areas with the exception of the development to the west (Purbeck Road) where the landscaped area is enclosed by a low hedge.

The proposed development would result in the frontages to the proposed dwellings being enclosed with low boundary walls with infill timber panels and picket fences to divide the plots at the front.

This form of enclosure to the site frontage along Bank Lane, would create an incongruous feature in the street scene which is not present elsewhere along Bank Lane which would be detrimental to both the street scene and the character of the surrounding area.

The position of the proposed dwellings would jar with the existing dwellings to the west, creating a very uncomfortable relationship and would be completely out of context with any of the existing building lines in the immediate area and would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area. As such the proposal is considered to be contrary to Local Plan policy CS19, saved UDP policy H5 and relevant guidance in NPPF (2023), New Residential Development SPD and Design Quality in New Development SPD.

Design of Dwellings/ Boundary treatments

The relevant planning policy is Local Plan Policy CS19. Policy CS19 states “ *To enhance the local distinctiveness, identity and accessibility of places, new development within Knowsley will be expected to:*

a) Respond to and integrate positive characteristics of immediate surroundings, including local materials, scale, mass, form, layout, alignment and density of the existing built environment;”

Saved UDP policy H5 states “*New development within the Primarily Residential Areas 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:*

b) Adversely affect the character or street scene of the area.”

Paragraphs 131, 135 and 139 in the NPPF as set out above are relevant to design of the dwellings.

Paragraph 3.38 in the New Residential Development SPD states “

Natural Surveillance – the presence of people can discourage crime and anti-social behaviour. Buildings should be designed so that entrances and windows front onto the public realm, courtyards and parking areas to help create an environment that feels safer and reduces the potential for crime.



Key Expectation B.9 part e) in the New Residential Development SPD states

Where residential curtilages adjoin public spaces (i.e. public footpaths, cycle ways, public open space, etc), use of walls and/or railings will be required to provide robust and durable boundary treatments. Fencing in such locations will not be supported.

Notwithstanding the matters raised in the “Street Scene/Character of Area” section of the report the individual dwellings are of a similar design to the contemporary residential development to the west at Purbeck Close. Features include small dormer features to the front elevation and velux windows to the rear, timber porch canopies, “Juliet” style railings to the rear elevation and contrasting brickwork above and below the windows on the front elevation.

The main issues with regard to design relate to the gable elevation of plot 4 and the proposed boundary treatments. Given the proposed siting of the dwellings the gable elevation of plot 4 would be very prominent in the street scene with a grassed amenity area and landscaped highway verges located directly to the east of this plot and consequently the proposed appearance with 3 small narrow windows would be unacceptable. This plot should have a dual fronted elevation given the prominence of the gable within the street scene. The design of this elevation would therefore be detrimental to the street scene and thus contrary to Local Plan policy CS19, guidance in NPPF and the Council’s New Residential Development SPD.

Notwithstanding the issues raised in the “Street Scene/ Character of the area” section above the boundary treatments proposed to the plot boundaries are considered to be unacceptable and contrary to advice in B.9 part e of the New Residential Development SPD.

Hit and miss timber fence panels and hit and miss picket fences are proposed to the front and side of the dwelling plots which is unacceptable (brick walls and railings would be a more appropriate boundary treatment in these locations). High timber fences are proposed to the rear site boundaries (adjacent to footways) which are unacceptable (brick walls would be more appropriate). Brick walls and railings provide more secure boundary treatments and are more attractive in the street scene in prominent locations such as adjacent to the footway and public areas.

In conclusion the design of the dwellings and boundary treatments are considered to be detrimental to the street scene and character of the area contrary to Local Plan Policy CS19, Saved UDP Policy H5 and the relevant paragraphs in NPPF and the New Residential Development SPD.

Car Parking and Highway Safety

Relevant policies would be Local Plan Policy CS7 , Saved UDP policy H5 , Paragraphs 114 & 115 in the NPPF (2023) and Ensuring a Choice of Travel SPD.

Local Plan policy CS7 part 2d states *“New development will be required to be:
d) In compliance with adopted cycle, car, disabled and service vehicle parking standards for different types and scales of new development;”*

Saved UDP policy H5 states *““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 of neighbouring occupiers by reason of noise, disturbance, overlooking, visual intrusion, smells, fumes, on-street parking or other causes;”

Paragraph 114 (part b) in the NPPF states *“In assessing sites that may be allocated for development in plans, or specific applications for development, it should be ensured that:
b) safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all users;*

NPPF Paragraph 115 states *“Development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety”*

Paragraph 4.3 in the Council's Ensuring a Choice of Travel SPD states that *“The Council's current parking standards are set out in Appendix A. All developers should have regard to these standards. These standards will be used by the Council to assess the adequacy of parking provision within any development proposal.”*

Paragraphs 4.11 - 4.12 state *“As well as considering the number of parking spaces which should be provided, it is essential to pay attention to the location and design of cycle and car parking facilities to ensure good levels of safety, security, amenity and convenience for all visitors to the site as well as the protection of amenity for surrounding land uses.*

Car and cycle parking should be in an accessible and secure location with natural surveillance, for example, close to the building entrance. Safety and Security can be improved by following the principles of ‘Secure by Design’

The car parking standards set out in Appendix A of the SPD are maximum standards and require 2 spaces for a 2 or 3 bed dwelling and 3 spaces for a 4 bed dwelling.

Paragraph 3.24 in the New residential development SPD states *“Residential layouts should also ensure that sufficient space is allowed for convenient, secure and attractive parking in a manner which will realistically cater for the requirements of future users. This includes a requirement of direct visibility from habitable rooms to discourage opportunistic crime. However, access and parking for cars should not dominate the design of new development. Past housing developments in Knowsley illustrate that where plots are of a size sufficient to accommodate a car, the preference of residents will be for in-curtilage parking. Where*

inadequate parking has been provided at the outset, inappropriate parking on the highway generally occurs and has also resulted in the piecemeal hard surfacing of curtilages by occupiers, with significant cumulative harmful impacts on environmental character. New developments should be designed to ensure this is not necessary."

Paragraph 3.25 states *"The amount of parking to be provided will depend on the size and location of the dwellings. The table below shows the Council's maximum parking standards for new residential developments which are set within the Ensuring a Choice of Travel SPD. In circumstances where reduced parking levels are proposed, appropriate justification will be required."*

The site is proposed to be accessed from the rear via Haweswater Close which has a 4.5m carriageway width which is below the current minimum width (5.5m) for a residential cul de sac. The car parking is proposed to be sited either at the side of the dwellings or to the west of the turning head. Two parking spaces are proposed for plots 2, 3 & 4 and three parking spaces proposed for plot 1.

The dwellings proposed are 4 bed dwellings. Therefore three car parking spaces per dwelling would be required. The nature of Haweswater Close, whereby the majority of existing households do not have driveways, means that in this instance the maximum parking provision set out in the SPD would be essential in order to avoid on street car parking. It is not considered that 3 car parking spaces per dwelling could be provided with the layout proposed.

Notwithstanding the number of spaces required some spaces indicated are of sub standard dimensions. Car parking spaces to plots 2 and 3 should have a minimum length of 11m (currently shown as 9.98m) and parking spaces to Plot 1 should have minimum dimensions of 7.5 width and 5.5m length (currently shown as 7.3m x 5.3m). The parking arrangements for plots 1 & 3 would result in vehicles traversing the footway for an extended distance which would be detrimental to pedestrian safety. In addition the car parking spaces for plot 1 suffer from a lack of passive surveillance from the dwelling to which they belong, which could lead to them being vulnerable to anti social behaviour /crime.

Highways have also raised a concern that the turning head arrangement may result in refuse vehicles overhanding the proposed footway when manoeuvring. Given that the turning head is currently on site and no reduction to its size is proposed it is not considered that this would amount to a reason for refusal.

Pedestrian intervisibility splays are required to the driveway access to plots 2 and 4, however should be proposal have been acceptable in other respects this amendment could have been secured by planning condition.

In two places (plot 4 and plot 2) boundary treatments are shown to abut the carriageway which is unacceptable however as above this amendment could be secured by a planning condition so it is not considered that the pedestrian visibility splays or position of boundary treatments would amount to a reason for refusal.

The front gardens are sown to encroach onto the adopted highway (footway/cycleway) along Bank Lane which would require amending to ensure the entire development is within the applicant's ownership.

Due to the shortfall in car parking , substandard car park dimensions, lack of natural surveillance for proposed parking for plot 1 and parking spaces to plots 1 and 3 resulting in pedestrian safety issues the proposal would result in on street car parking in the vicinity of Haweswater Way to the detriment of highway and pedestrian safety and would therefore be

contrary to Local Plan policy CS7, saved UDP policy H5 and the relevant paragraphs in NPPF , Ensuring a Choice of Travel SPD and New Residential Development SPD.

Loss of Trees

Saved UDP policy DQ4 states

“Development proposals affecting existing trees, woodlands and other vegetation, which make a positive contribution to amenity, should make provision for their retention. Applicants for planning permission will be required to provide a detailed survey of all existing trees on the site and the likely effects on them of the proposed development.”

The application site contains 4 mature trees however the application is not supported by a tree survey which would normally be required when trees are located within an application site. It is clear from the proposals that all 4 trees would be removed as a result of the development.

13 proposed trees are shown indicatively on the proposed site layout plan although no details of size or species of the replacement planting are provided. The Council's arboriculture officer has been consulted and considers that the loss of natural screening and green space would have a negative effect on the local community.

He states that *“These small areas of urban green spaces can support a wide range of plants insects and birds, acting as “wildlife corridors”, linking together larger parks, and providing access to rural areas on the outskirts of towns and cities. This facilitates the movement of animals, birds and insects between individual green spaces and prevents the isolation of local wildlife.”*

Due to the loss of the 4 mature trees and associated amenity green space the arboricultural officer has objected to the proposal. The proposed development is therefore considered to be contrary to Saved UDP policy DQ4.

Environmental Issues

Contaminated Land - The site is adjacent to a landfill site, therefore the standard contaminated land condition would be required to protect the proposed end users.

Construction Management Plan – To protect the amenity of surrounding residents the standard construction management plan condition would be required.

Noise – The A506 is a busy road running adjacent to the proposed development, a noise assessment would be required to determine if any noise mitigation measures are required within the proposed development and to protect the future occupiers. This could be secured by planning condition.

United Utilities

United Utilities have confirmed that a raw water main crosses the site. They have raised concerns regarding the proximity of the proposed development to the water main. The proposed boundary wall/fence and new planting appears to be located directly above the raw water main which is not acceptable to United Utilities and therefore it would be questionable over whether it could be implemented were planning permission to be granted. An existing water hydrant is also located within the site boundary, UU say that this must be considered in the proposed layout and appropriate protection provided both during and after construction. UU have requested that a detailed site layout which overlays the proven

location of the water main should be required prior to the determination of the application. Whilst this remains a material consideration it is a private matter and is not considered to warrant a reason for refusal.

Conclusion

The proposed development is considered to be unacceptable due to the following : -

- The proposal would have a detrimental impact on the occupier of 28 Purbeck Road
- The enclosure of the site frontage would form an incongruous feature in the street scene.
- The siting of the dwellings would jar with the existing dwellings to the west creating an uncomfortable relationship and the consequent loss of the four mature trees would detrimental to the street scene and character of the area.
- The design of the gable elevation to plot 4 and the proposed boundary treatments would be unacceptable and detrimental to the street scene.
- The shortfall in car parking, substandard car park spaces, lack of natural surveillance to some car park spaces and the car parking to plots 1 & 3 resulting in pedestrian safety issues would lead to a adverse impact on highway safety.

The proposal would therefore be contrary to the relevant Local Plan, saved UDP policies and guidance in NPPF , New Residential Development Supplementary Planning Document and Ensuring a Choice of travel Supplementary Planning Document.

Recommendation

That Planning Permission be refused for the following reasons :

1. The proposed position of plot 1 and associated boundary treatment would due to its siting, close proximity to 28 Purbeck Road , massing and over bearing impact be detrimental to the amenity of the occupier of 28 Purbeck Road. This would be contrary to Knowsley Local Plan Policy CS19 (adopted January 2016) Knowsley Replacement Unitary Development Plan Saved Policy H5 (June 2006) and guidance in the New Residential Development (September 2018) and Householder Development (June 2016) Supplementary Planning Documents.
2. The proposed development would result in the frontage of the site adjacent to Bank Lane being enclosed with boundary treatments thereby creating an incongruous feature in the street scene. In addition the proposed development would jar with the existing dwellings to the west, creating a very uncomfortable relationship and would be completely out of context with any of the existing building lines in the immediate area. The proposal would also result in the loss of 4 mature trees. As such the proposal would be detrimental to the street scene and amenity & character of the surrounding area and would be contrary to Knowsley Local Plan Policy CS19 (adopted January 2016) Saved Knowsley Replacement Unitary Development Plan Policies H5 & DQ4 (June 2006) and guidance in the New Residential Development (September 2018) and Design Quality in New Development (January 2016) Supplementary Planning Documents and paragraphs 131, 135 and 139 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2023.
3. The proposed design of the gable elevation to plot 4 together with the proposed boundary treatments would due to their overall design in prominent positions and proposed materials would be detrimental to the street scene and the character of the area . As such the proposal would be contrary to Knowsley Local Plan Policy CS19 (adopted January 2016) Saved Knowsley Replacement Unitary Development Plan

Policy H5 (June 2006) and guidance in the New Residential Development Supplementary Planning Document (September 2018) and paragraphs 131, 135 and 139 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2023.

4. The proposed development due to the shortfall in car parking spaces , substandard car park space dimensions, lack of natural surveillance for proposed parking for plot 1 and parking spaces to plots 1 and 3 resulting in pedestrian safety issues would be detrimental to highway safety contrary to Knowsley Local Plan Policy CS7, Saved Knowsley Replacement Unitary Development Plan Policy H5 (June 2006) and guidance in paragraphs 114 & 115 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2023 and Ensuring a Choice of Travel (September 2010) Supplementary Planning Document.

Signed Case Officer¹:

Mark Quinn

**Signed Authorising
Officer²:**

Alan Kilroe

Date:

10 January 2024

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

