

<u>APPLICATION NO:</u>	26/00386/FUL	<u>CASE OFFICER:</u>	Reece Black
<u>WARD:</u>	Prescot North	<u>PARISH:</u>	Knowsley Parish Council
<u>LOCATION:</u>	5 Whitestone Close, Knowsley, Knowsley		
<u>PROPOSAL:</u>	ERECTION OF A PART TWO STOREY AND SINGLE STOREY EXTENSION TO SIDE AND REAR WITH CONSTRUCTION OF PITCHED ROOF TO FRONT ELEVATION		

Site Description

The application site is located to the northern side of Whitestone Close and is situated within a Primarily Residential Area in the Local Plan Policies Map. The application property is a two-storey, detached dwellinghouse. The property at present benefits from a front and side 'wrap-around' element, served by a flat roof and contains an integral garage. The front garden area is surfaced with paving slabs and a tarmac driveway to provide hardstanding; the existing parking provisions in-plot can accommodate a minimum of 2 no. vehicles. The front garden area is bound by soft-landscaping and shrubbery. The plot is an irregular shape in layout.

The site is located toward the head of the cul-de-sac. There are residential properties to the east, south and west and Knowsley Village Primary School is situated north.

Proposal

The proposal is for the erection of a part two-storey, part single storey extension to the side and rear together with the construction of a pitched roof to the front elevation.

The ground floor rear extension would have a depth of 2.9m and have a width of 5.7m. The ground floor rear extension would be served by a hipped roof, which would measure 2.6m at the eaves and 3.8m at the tallest point. The proposed first-floor rear extension would also project 2.9m and have a width of 3m. This element would be served by a hipped roof, which would measure 5m at the eaves and attain a maximum height of 6.4m at the ridgeline.

The proposed first-floor works would comprise of a first-floor side extension, which would have a width of 2.7m, with a depth of 7.5m. This element would be served by a dual-pitched roof, which would measure 5m at the eaves and 7.2m at the ridgeline; which would match the ridgeline of the original dwelling 7.2m.

A hipped roof would be erected above the existing ground floor front projection to replace the existing flat roof. The eaves height would remain the same (2.6m) and would attain a height of 3.8m at the tallest point.

The proposed development would also involve alterations to the front garden area and parking layout, which would include permeable paving to provide hardstanding for 2 no. parking spaces.

The application has been amended during the determination phase of the application and subsequently, originally notified neighbours were renotified that amended plans had been received.

Consultations

Knowsley Parish Council: – No comments received.

Representations

This application has been publicised by two rounds of neighbour letters sent to 7 neighbours.

Letters of objection have been submitted to both the original and amended plans. A total of 4 letters of objections have been received and no letters of support or neutral representation have been submitted. The letters of objection concentrate predominately on design and residential amenity concerns, which are summarised as follows:

Design and Residential Amenities:

- The proposal would worsen the existing relationship between properties and would result in loss of outlook from several properties.
- Infringes established right to light of 55 years standing - which exists independently of and cannot be extinguished by any planning permission.
- Severe loss of daylight and sunlight to habitable rooms – reference to SPD paragraphs 6.19, 7.2 and Core Strategy CS19 paragraph 9.6. The proposal causes permeant and unacceptable loss of daylight and sunlight to four principal habitable rooms, contrary to SPD paragraphs 6.19, 7.2 and 7.4, Saved UDP Policies H5(2)(a) and H8(c), and Core Strategy Policy CS19(2)(a).
- Casts approximately 50% of my rear garden and patio into permeant afternoon and evening shadow, adversely affecting outdoor amenity. The shadow cast will fall across our rear patio and garden from mid-afternoon onwards will take away the afternoon sun, which is the only direct sunlight a large part of our north facing garden receives, contrary to SPD paragraph 7.4, Saved UDP Policy H5(2)(a) and Core Strategy Policy CS19(2)(a).
- Protected species: bats and nesting birds have been noted to next in the guttering and eaves of number 5. No.5 has been vacant and undisturbed for several years and it is requested that the Council ensure that the appropriate surveys have been carried out before any decision is made.
- Drainage infrastructure.
- Comparison with the existing extension at No.6.
- A right to light assessment has been submitted on behalf of No.6 Whitestone Close to assess the impact of the proposal.
- The amended plans do not materially change or reduce the impact. The revised plans relocate the two-storey element approximately 3m westward from the boundary; the overall footprint remains entirely unchanged. This means the bulk, scale and mass of the overall development remain exactly the same. The protrusion of 3m beyond the applicants existing rear building line (making a total protrusion of 4.3m beyond my own rear building line) is identical from original to amended.
- The proposed site plan carries a scale notation of 1:100. At this scale, a bar labelled as 5m should measure exactly 5cm on the printed drawing. This

measures at 3.5cm, indicating the drawing has been printed at a reduced scale and the 1:100 notation is no longer correct. This matters directly in relation to the rear boundary distance. I understand the architect has stated to the planning officer that the minimum distance from the proposed development to the rear boundary is 6.9m. I have measured this independently on site at a maximum of 6.4m, a significant discrepancy from the architect's figure. I formally request that the Council takes its own independent site measurement of this distance before determining the application.

- Overlooking from relocated master bedroom window.
- Alternative options not pursued – It was discussed with the applicant's representative that an alternative could be pursued, specifically by extending upward above the existing flat roof garage at the front of the property.
- Loss of outlook to the east where my house faces – particularly to the sitting room, which is on the ground floor with a large full height window and the above two bedrooms which both face east. The existing outlook is currently open and spacious with views across the gardens of No's 5, 6, 7 and 8. The two-storey extension will sit directly to my properties line of sight, the open space I look across will be replaced entirely by a large built structure. The amended plans worsen the impacts to outlook now it has moved closer to the front elevation of my property.
- The scale of the extension is far too big for the size of the plot. Concerns raised that the properties sit within reasonably well-proportioned plots, with a sense of space between the houses and gardens. Concerns on scale, height and footprint of the proposal.

Planning History

No recorded planning history.

Relevant Policy

Policy S3 (Presumption in favour of sustainable development) of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states that:

1. Decisions on development proposals should apply a presumption in favour of sustainable development. This means:

a. Policy S4 in this Framework should be applied when considering development proposals within settlements;

b. Outside settlements, policy S5 should be applied; and

c. In all locations, development proposals that accord with both an up-to-date development plan and the decision-making policies in this Framework should be approved without delay.

Policy S4: Principle of development within settlements states that:

1. Development proposals within settlements should be approved unless the benefits of doing so would be substantially outweighed by any adverse effects, when

assessed against the national decision-making policies in this Framework.

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

CS19 - Design Quality and Accessibility in New Development

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

H5 - Development within Primarily Residential Areas

H8 - Extensions and Alterations to Residential Properties

SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT (SPDs)

Ensuring a Choice of Travel SPD (2010)

Householder Development SPD (2016)

New Residential Development SPD (2018)

Article 35 Statement

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

Assessment

Saved Policy H5 in the Replacement Unitary Development Plan states that development within primarily residential areas 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.

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

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

Design and Residential Amenity

6.4 of the Householder Development SPD stipulates that *the overall scale of the development should not look out of place in the street scene or other immediate environment. Extensions should normally be subordinate to the original dwelling.* The proposed development comprehensively is considered to be of a subordinate scale, given that the width of the side extension and the depth of the rear extension would not exceed half the width and depth of the existing dwellinghouse. Furthermore, the existing internal floor space of both storeys measures at 179sqm whilst the proposal would result in a cumulative internal floor space of both storeys of 225sqm. Cumulatively due to the fact that this figure would be distributed across different sections of the extended dwellinghouse and further considerations such as a large extent of the proposal being discreetly located to the rear of the property and the ridgeline of the two-storey rear extension being set 0.8m below the main ridgeline of the dwellinghouse, it would not result in any significant out of scale, form and massing, or appear disproportionate to the original dwelling or adversely harm the character of the area.

The Householder Development SPD states that *rear extensions should be designed to avoid causing overshadowing, loss of outlook or loss of privacy to the neighbours, or appear unduly dominant to neighbours.*

Single storey rear extension:

The Householder Development SPD stipulates that *a single storey rear extension located on or immediately adjacent to the party boundary with a neighbouring dwelling will normally be acceptable if it does not project more than 4m from the rear elevation of the existing dwelling. A single storey extension beyond 4m (or in a situation where the application property has a rear elevation which is set further back than the rear elevation of the neighbouring dwelling) will normally only be permitted if it does not breach the 45-degree rule.*

The proposed ground floor rear extension would project 3m beyond the original rear wall of the host dwelling. The detached neighbouring property, 6 Whitestone Close is set back from the host property by 1.2m, making the overall projection of the rear extension 4.2m. Whilst this would conflict with the guidance within the Householder SPD of 4m, it would be a marginal extent of 0.2m and this minor amount would not be appreciable. The proposed site plan also illustrates a 45-degree line drawn from the adjacent property's ground-floor patio doors, confirming that the development would not breach the Council's 45-degree rule and would therefore not result in an unacceptable loss of outlook or light to the neighbouring occupiers.

There is also a distance of 2.1m between the application property and No.6, which would further ensure that the proposed ground floor rear extension would not appear unduly dominant or enlarged by retaining some space from the eastern side plot boundary.

The proposed ground floor rear extension would be served by a hipped roof, in which the ridgeline would tie in at the corner and pull away from the party boundary, which

would further reduce any impact to the patio windows on the ground floor rear elevation of No.6. It is for these reasons that this element of the proposal, would be acceptable on design and not result in any unacceptable harm to residential amenity considerations on the occupants of No.6.

Two-storey rear extension:

The Householder Development SPD stipulates that *two-storey rear extensions of up to 3m will normally be acceptable. Extensions beyond 3m will only be acceptable if they do not breach the 45-degree rule.* The SPD furthers that *two-storey rear extensions would not normally be allowed to come within 7 meters from the rear boundary, should normally have a pitched roof and windows should normally be restricted to rear elevations, to avoid overlooking of neighbouring gardens and dwellings.*

The proposed two-storey rear extension would project 2.9m beyond the original rear wall of the dwelling and would be erected 3.9m away from the boundary shared with No.6 and would therefore, comply with the guidance outlined in the SPD. Whilst the proposal does not exceed the 3m guidance, the proposed site plan demonstrates that this element of the proposal would not breach the 45-degree rule from the closest first-floor rear window of No.6 and furthermore, would be erected over 3.9m away from the 45-degree splay line. The proposal contains no side facing windows and any windows are concentrated to the rear elevation, preventing any visual intrusion. The proposal would be served by a hipped roof, which although would differ from the dual-pitched roof of the dwelling, would avoid a flat roof and would also emulate the roof design of the two-storey rear extension of No.6. The selection of a hipped design would reduce the degree of shadow cast to the neighbouring rear garden of No.6.

No.6 Whitestone Close have submitted a right to light assessment which raises concerns on loss of light, particularly to the ground floor rear lounge patio doors, the first-floor rear bedroom window and the rear patio and garden areas. The assessment outlines that the planning application under consideration is absent of daylight and sunlight assessment and requests that one is completed. It is not a requirement for a daylight and sunlight assessment to be submitted and the matters of obstruction of light, impact of any overshadowing etc are noted and these material considerations are considered as part of the appraisal of a planning application in line with the guidance of the Householder Development SPD, such as projection parameter guidance, 45-degree rule and other material considerations, such as proximity to boundary, roof designs etc. The submitted assessment is based on the original application and does not take account of the amendments to the application.

For the consideration of No.6's rear garden, it is acknowledged that the proposed two storey rear extension would result in a partial degree of overshadowing to parts of the garden, particularly to the boundary shared with the application property. The application property as existing will already cast a degree of shadow and given that the rear elevations of the properties to Whitestone Close are north facing, this means that as existing it will receive less direct sunlight and more shade. The impact to the rear garden of No.6 by way of overshadowing from a two-storey rear extension is acknowledged and the proposal has been amended during the assessment phase of determining the planning application to reduce its impact on neighbouring properties. In particular, the revised first-floor design, its relocation and the hipped roof form help to reduce the overshadowing. Taking these amendments into account, the level of additional overshadowing is not considered sufficient to justify a refusal of the planning application.

Considering other amenities for the consideration of No.6, it is considered that whilst the proposal would be readily visible from the rear garden of No.6, given it would not be erected immediately adjacent the boundary, it is considered that sufficient outlook would remain, particularly with outlook to the north-west to the east. The loss of a private view is not a material planning consideration. The proposal has been amended to relocate the first-floor rear aspect, which reduces the potential for the proposed two-storey rear extension to present as an overbearing feature.

A concern has been raised that the 'Proposed Site Plan' submitted may not measure accurately regarding the distance of the original rear elevation of the dwelling to the rear plot boundary. The submitted site plan measures 9.8m from the original rear elevation to the rear plot boundary and it shows that the proposed two-storey rear extension would leave 6.9m to the rear plot boundary. The objections have stated that these measurements are incorrect and the distance between the proposed rear extension and the rear plot boundary would be 6.4m. These discrepancies have been put to the agent in writing that their on-site measurements from the original rear elevation to the rear boundary fence measured a distance of 9.6m and with the proposal of 2.9m would leave a distance of 6.7m.

It is not uncommon for discrepancies and inaccuracies to occur due to reasons such as scaling errors and outdated site surveys etc. However, notwithstanding these discrepancies, it is Officer's opinion that even in the instance of 6.4/6.5m from the rear plot boundary to the proposed rear elevation, that this would result in a different view in the assessment. The reasons for this are that an SPD provides guidance on how policies within the Local Plan will be interpreted and applied and therefore there are instances where leniency to guidance can be applied due to material considerations. It is considered that if 6.4m were to be retained from the rear plot boundary, this would still be acceptable. There are no dwellings to the rear of the host property (which overlooks a school) and given that there would be sufficient space (of at least 1m) retained to either side elevation of the property and that more than 50% of the private rear garden would remain, it would prevent a cramped appearance within the plot and more than sufficient garden space, for siting out, would remain useable.

Two-storey side extension:

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. They should also avoid causing 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. Either a minimum space of 1m should be preserved between the extension and the party boundary to the side of the property, OR the front wall of the first-floor of the extension should be set-back at least 1m from the immediately adjoining part of the main front wall of the original dwelling.

The proposed two-storey side extension involve the rear section of the existing ground floor side extension being re-constructed to be fully brick built (with the removal of Perspex roof and 3 no. side facing windows and installation of both a single window and new side entrance door to the property) and a first-floor side extension built directly above. The proposed two-storey side extension would not result in the creation of any actual or potential terracing effect given that a space of 1.1m would be retained between the proposed extension and the party boundary

shared with No.6 Whitestone Close. This section of the proposal would project 1.2m beyond the rear elevation of the adjacent neighbour (No.6) which would be considered acceptable (the rear extensions / projections have been covered earlier within the assessment section of the report).

The Householder Development SPD stipulates that *the roof of an extension should normally be at a lower level than the original. The design of the roof and the slope of the roof should echo that of the original dwelling, where appropriate.*

The proposed two-storey side extension would directly extend the ridgeline of the existing dwellinghouse and therefore ensure that the proposed side extension would match the design (dual-pitched) and slope / pitch of the roof. Whilst the ridgeline would not be set at a lower level to the main roof of the original dwelling, it would be considered acceptable in design terms as it would result in a more symmetrical appearance to the extended dwelling. The application property is part of a small group of detached dwellings to the north side of Whitestone Close and No.6 has previously been extended with a directly extended ridgeline rather than a subordinate, stepped ridge; it is therefore considered that in design terms it would be more appropriate to allow leniency for this policy requirement, given that it would result in a better design, when considered in the context of the application site and the wider character of the locality.

The ground floor side elevation of the side extension would see the installation of a new window and creation of a new entrance to the property (which is also shown to contain a window). Both of these openings are orientated toward the existing timber boundary fence and the gable wall of No.6, however, as the gable wall of No.6 contains no openings no overlooking or visual intrusion would be considered to occur and these openings are considered acceptable.

The first-floor rear elevation of the proposed two-storey side extension would contain a window. This window would be situated within 1.9m from the party boundary shared with No.6. The guidance of the Householder Development SPD is that *windows should normally be restricted to rear elevations, to avoid overlooking of neighbouring gardens and dwellings.* It is considered, however, that the edge of the first-floor rear window closest to the side elevation, is situated approximately 1.6m from the party boundary and given that the proposed side extension would project a further 1.2m beyond the rear elevation of No.6, this window proposed at first-floor would not offer any greater degree of overlooking into the private garden of No.6 (with only a small corner at the bottom of No.6's garden potentially being overlooked from this window).

The New Residential Development SPD outlines in Appendix 4: Interface distances and private amenity, point 4 stipulates *principal elevation to gable should be a minimum of 12m.* The side elevation of the proposal would retain a 20m side interface distance from the front elevations of the properties situated to the west (No.4 Knowsley Lane) and subsequently would comply with this guidance to ensure that the proposal would not result in harm to outlook from the main habitable windows of these properties.

Pitched roof to front elevation:

The application also includes minor alterations which include the construction of a hipped roof to the front of the dwelling, which would replace the existing flat roof of the front projecting sections. Whilst this would not match the general dual-pitched roof design of the main dwelling, given it would be a hipped roof, as it slopes to all

sides, it would still be considered an improvement to the design and visual amenities of the dwelling and the wider street scene. Furthermore, it would emulate the front roof to the front elevation of No.6, furthering a positively integrating design.

Materials:

The existing property is predominately brick facing to its elevations (notwithstanding the first-floor front elevation which is faced in hung tile), with brown, interlocking roof tiles and white UPVC openings. The submitted plans contain annotations on materials, which stipulate that the overall dwelling (both the existing and proposed extension) would be ivory cement render facing to the front elevation whilst the side and rear elevations would be faced with matching brickwork, in addition with matching materials of the proposals' windows and roof tiles to the original dwellinghouse. The properties to the east which sit in a building row and form a small cluster of dwellings (No's 6 and 7) also are faced in render to elevations. Therefore, the use of both rendering and brickwork to the elevations, would be considered in keeping to the character and appearance of the locality. The details on materials provided on the proposed elevations are acceptable and would be further secured by way of condition.

Highways:

The application property at present can accommodate 2 no. vehicles in-plot and is a 4-bedroomed property. The proposed development would result in the extension of an existing bedroom but would not increase the existing number of bedrooms and the extensions would not affect the existing number of in-plot parking arrangements. Included within the proposed works would be the laying of permeable paving which would cover an area of 6m x 6.2m, which would still ensure that a minimum of 2 no. vehicles could park within the curtilage of the dwelling. Given that the proposed development would have no impact on the number of bedrooms or the number of in-plot parking spaces, the proposal would not result in any material change to the existing parking provisions utilised by the property. An informative will be included for the benefit of the applicant, should they wish to extend the existing dropped kerb vehicular access.

Bats:

It is acknowledged within the objections that concern is raised to considerations for bats and bat roosts. The application has not been supported by any ecological surveys (i.e. a preliminary bat roost survey). All bat species are European protected species (EPS) protected under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 and the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981, and it is an offence to intentionally harm bats or destroy bat their roosts during construction works. There is separate legislation which ensures the protection of bats and their roosts, and these would not be overridden should the application be granted.

An informative will be included with any decision notice should the application be granted to highlight to the applicant that any granting of planning permission does not extinguish the aforementioned legislation.

Non-planning considerations:

Some points which have been raised within the letters of objections include matters which cannot be considered under planning legislation, for example right to light, which is a private matter for any adjacent land owners to consider, but does not form

part of the planning process; material planning considerations such as obstruction of light and overshadowing have been considered within the design and residential amenity section of the report. Similarly matters involving drainage infrastructure are not material planning considerations for householder planning applications but are instead considered in the scope of Building Regulations. Matters are raised about comparisons to other existing extensions and suggested changes to the proposal (which have been shared with the agent), however, the submitted plans currently under consideration and what is put to the Local Planning Authority is what must be assessed and considered. Any material planning considerations have been addressed within the assessment part of the report.

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 development hereby permitted shall be constructed entirely of materials details of which are shown on plan No. 3026-RA-XX-XX-DR-A-0100 REV P04, titled 'PROPOSED PLANS AND ELEVATIONS', date received 01/09/2026. All materials which are annotated on the approved plan to match the existing on the proposed extension hereby permitted, shall match in terms of type, size, colour and texture.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity and to comply with Policies CS2 and CS19 of the Knowsley Local Plan Core Strategy, adopted January 2016 and Saved Policy H8 of the Knowsley Replacement Unitary Development Plan, adopted in June 2006 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

SCHEDULE 1

Date Received	Ref. No	Version	Drawing/Document Title
05/06/2026	-	-	LOCATION PLAN
01/09/2026	3026-RA-XX-XX-DR-A-0100	REV P04	PROPOSED PLANS AND ELEVATIONS
27/08/2026	3026-RA-XX-XX-DR-A-0091	-	PROPOSED GROUND AND FIRST FLOOR SITE PLAN

27/08/2026	3026-RA-XX-XX-DR-A-0090	REV P02	EXISTING AND PROPOSED SITE PLAN
------------	-------------------------	---------	---------------------------------

Signed Case Officer¹: Reece Black

Signed Authorising Officer²: Jo Sheridan

Date: 05/10/2026

Informatives

- 1 All bats are a protected species under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 and the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981. It is an offence to deliberately harm them, damage their breeding sites and resting places (including when bats are not present), possess or control them. The applicant is reminded that the granting of this planning permission does not override or absolve the applicant from other legislative requirements and should bats (or evidence of their roosts) be discovered, the applicant is advised to pause all construction works, refer to the aforementioned legislation and seek advice from an ecological consultant and potentially obtain a licence from Natural England before construction can restart.
- 2 It is an offence to carry out any works within the public highway without the permission of the Highway Authority. This permission requires the construction, improvement or alteration of an access to the public highway. Under Section 184 of the Highways Act 1980, the Highway Authority must specify the works to be carried out. Only the Highway Authority or a contractor approved by the Highway Authority may carry out these works. For the avoidance of doubt, the applicant is advised that the widening of the vehicular dropped kerb must be undertaken by Knowsley Council's approved contractor, Tarmac.

Contact details:

Email: Knowsley.highways@tarmac.com

Telephone: 0800 023 2334

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