

<u>APPLICATION NO:</u>	25/00107/FUL	<u>CASE OFFICER:</u>	Reece Black
<u>WARD:</u>	Whiston & Cronton	<u>PARISH:</u>	Whiston Town Council
<u>LOCATION:</u>	8 Croftwood Grove, Whiston, Knowsley		
<u>PROPOSAL:</u>	ERECTION OF SINGLE STOREY SIDE EXTENSION		

Site Description

The application site is located at 8 Croftwood Grove and is located within a Primary Residential Area in the Local Plan Policies Map. The application property is an end-terraced, two-storey property and benefits from a rear conservatory with a front porch projection. Black metallic railings at a height of roughly 1.8m have been erected to the side of the property and refuse bins are stored behind the gates and fence.

The application site is served by paved hardstanding to the side of the dwelling which measures on site at a depth of 7m and 2.9m in width. The application property is situated off a private road of unadopted highway which provides a 'shared driveway' and fronts a turning head of Croftwood Grove. The application property and the four terraced properties, No's 9-12 Croftwood Grove, to the north/north-west of the application property all access their properties, and off-street parking arrangements via this 'shared drive' accessed from the turning head, which is the only vehicular route to the application property No's 9-12 Croftwood Grove; the shared drive for these properties is coloured red in its surfacing to differentiate it from the individual driveways of the properties. The front garden area displays an open-plan layout and soft landscaping with a patio pathway leading to the porch entrance of the property.

Proposal

The proposal is for the erection of a single storey side extension.

The proposed development would have a width of 2.88m and a depth of 6.64m. This would be set-back from the front porch by 1.8m and the rear elevation of the proposal would sit flush with the rear elevation of the dwelling. This would be served by a mono-pitched roof, which would measure 2.23m at the eaves and 3.65m at the tallest point.

The proposed development would resurface the existing grassed front garden with tarmac to provide a parking space. The existing metallic gates to the rear of the hardstanding adjacent the side of the property would be removed to facilitate the proposal.

Consultations

Local Highway Authority: – Objection received due to concerns over highway safety and adequate parking provision.

Representations

This application has been publicised by letters sent to 10 neighbours. The application has also been advertised by site notice. No representations have been received.

Planning History

APP. NO: 00/00190/FUL
PROPOSAL: ERECTION OF 34 NO. RESIDENTIAL DWELLINGS
COMPRISING 3NO. DETACHED, 8NO. SEMI DETACHED
AND 23 TERRACED
DECISION: GRANTED
DECISION DATE: 13 October 2000

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

CS19 - Design Quality and Accessibility in New Development

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

H5 - Development within Primarily Residential Areas

H8 - Extensions and Alterations to Residential Properties

SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENTS

Ensuring a Choice of Travel SPD (2010)

Householder Development SPD (2016)

Article 35 Statement

The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this

application by identifying matters of concern with the proposal and discussing those with the applicant. However, the issues are so fundamental to the proposal that it has not been possible to negotiate a satisfactory way forward and due to the harm which has been clearly identified within the reason for the refusal, approval has not been possible.

ASSESSMENT

Saved Policy H5 in the Replacement Unitary Development Plan states that development within Primarily Residential Areas will be permitted provided that:

New development within the Primarily Residential Area which is for uses appropriate to a residential area will be permitted provided 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.

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

PRINCIPLE OF DEVELOPMENT

The site is identified as a Primarily Residential Area in the adopted Unitary Development Plan for housing development. As such, a domestic extension to the existing residential property is considered acceptable in principle, subject to compliance with local planning policy and guidance.

HIGHWAYS

The application property currently can accommodate 1 vehicle in the curtilage of the dwelling, offered by the tarmac hardstanding adjacent the side of the dwelling. The submitted plans outline that parking for 1 space could still be achieved in front of the proposed development and the dimensions for this space measure 5m x 2.8m to mimic the existing parking provisions utilised by the applicant. As stated, an additional parking space would be created by replacing the soft landscaping to the front garden area – the outlined space measures dimensions of 2.6m x 5m.

Ensuring a Choice of Travel SPD (Appendix A) requires that properties with 4 bedrooms accommodate 3 off-street parking spaces. The Householder Development SPD stipulates:

- that car spaces provided at the side of dwellings should have a minimum dimension of 5m x 2.75m (this width is necessary to enable a car door to be opened and used satisfactorily).
- Car spaces provided on front drives should have dimensions of at least 5.0m x 3m (this width is considered necessary to allow pedestrian path to the dwelling).

The Householder Development SPD outlines that circumstances vary and *depending on the existing level of parking provision and the particular environmental and highway conditions in the locality...fewer spaces than set out in the parking standards will only be acceptable if the highway and environmental conditions in the locality allow, for example in areas with wider access roads and plots. Proposals that would result in an adverse impact on street parking conditions to the detriment of highway safety or the amenity of local residents would not be acceptable.*

The proposed development would introduce an additional bedroom to the property and subsequently the application property would have 4 no. bedrooms. Although, the proposed development has made provisions for 2 no. spaces in the curtilage of the dwelling, which would represent a shortfall of the required 3 no. spaces, this shortfall would be acceptable to compromise on 2 no. spaces – due to the fact these are maximum standards. Notwithstanding this point, however, the proposal does not comply with the minimum dimensions outlined in the Householder Development SPD.

Although the space to the side of the dwelling would mimic the existing parking adjacent the gable wall, most of the space would surpass the existing front elevation of the dwelling and therefore this space would be required to measure 3m x 5m. The additional space provided to the resurfaced front of the dwelling, as outlined fails to meet these minimum requirements. Even if the width were extended to 3m to comply with these required dimensions, both spaces would encroach into the 'shared driveway' accessed off the turning head on Croftwood Grove. The off-street parking provisions for the application property are located adjacent the dwelling with a visual differentiation (with a grey colour in the surfacing), and finish in line with the front elevation of the original dwelling, where it then adjoins the shared driveway, which is more red in appearance and serves the other four dwellings off the private road.

The Local Highway Authority were consulted on the proposed development and have raised an objection to the proposed development. Highways have advised that the plans show that both of the proposed spaces will encroach onto the shared private drive serving the application property and neighbouring properties (differentiated by the difference in coloured surfacing). In addition to concerns shared by the Local Planning Authority, Highways object on the basis that the proposed development and its subsequent parking provisions would therefore narrow the access to the other properties and is therefore not supported by Highways.

It is understood that the land is within full ownership of the applicant, however, whilst this confirms the applicant's legal right to use the space, it does not nullify Highways' concerns about the practicality and long-term appropriateness of this space being relied upon as a parking solution. For highway safety and parking considerations, the issue is not founded on ownership, but functionality, by means of obstruction and manoeuvrability, and impact, by displacement of vehicles impeded by the obstruction/restriction of the shared driveway. Parking provisions which are dependent on shared driveways are not generally supported as formal parking spaces where they can restrict movement or generate conflict with neighbouring

users / visitors for the reasons outlined above. Given the shared driveway serves the four other properties, and as the only vehicular route and their in-curtilage parking provisions, the implications of the proposed development and its proposed parking provision would adversely impact highway safety and parking within the locality and the amenity of the residents of those four houses.

The consequences of the proposed development and its parking arrangements would lead to encroachment onto the shared driveway and would adversely affect access to the other properties off the private road and cause a bottleneck regarding access, egress and manoeuvrability of vehicles and result in the loss of nearly the entirety of the original off-street parking provisions for the property; intended to serve 2 vehicles. Displacement of vehicles onto Croftwood Grove dispersed throughout the cul-de-sac from having to utilise on-street parking raises safety concerns as the increase in roadside parking in this area is likely to adversely impact on driver visibility and safe manoeuvring of Croftwood Gove, a small L-shaped no-through road of residential properties. These issues highlighted are contrary to the Householder Development SPD, which stipulates that *a common factor with all types of extension is the need to preserve a satisfactory amount of off-street parking provision within the boundaries of the dwelling. This factor is particularly common when proposals are submitted for side or front extensions, which very frequently affect the available parking spaced within a dwelling. Failure to provide satisfactory parking provisions can lead to on-street parking which is both unsightly and hazardous (e.g. for children or persons crossing the road).*

This view is supported by the Local Highway Authority who assert that the parking arrangements are not acceptable for the reasons outlined above. This is due to the parking demonstrated presenting a shortfall of the minimum dimensions as outlined, but moreover, there is a need to ensure that is sufficient space for vehicles to manoeuvre safely without causing obstruction and avoid adversely impacting access or egress for the other properties which are dependent on the shared driveway.

The Householder Development SPD also asserts that *where replacement or additional parking will be necessary in front gardens, proposals should clearly indicate landscaping and boundary treatments to soften the appearance of or screen parked cars. Proposals should ensure that at least 50% of the front garden area remains porous or provisions should be made to direct run-off water from the hard surface to permeable or porous area or surface within the curtilage of the dwelling.*

Notwithstanding the loss of soft landscaping to facilitate the additional parking, no additional or replacement landscaping details are included as the entirety of the front garden area to be fully paved for parking. Boundary treatment is also not a viable option given the open-plan design of the estate (which is mandated by a planning condition for the erection of the residential estate) that outlines no boundary treatment shall be erected past the front elevation of dwellings. No provisions are indicated to outline whether the surfacing would be porous or any methods to capture (i.e. ACO drainage) or to direct run-off water to prevent it pouring onto the public highway. This fails to accord with the guidance of the Householder Development SPD. Although, in order to ensure that any development would not result in surface water draining onto the highway a suitable condition requiring the applicant to demonstrate that adequate means would be included within the curtilage to ensure that there would be no surface water run-off could be secured by way of a condition, if planning permission were to be granted.

Paragraph 116 of the National Planning Policy Framework states *development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an*

unacceptable impact on highway safety, or residual impacts on the road network, following mitigation, would be severe taking into account all reasonable future scenarios.

It is considered that the site and its particular environmental and highway conditions in the locality do not present circumstances where leniency could be demonstrated as for the reasons discussed above. The proposed development has presented an inadequate alternative and replacement parking arrangement and would be considered to result in adverse highway safety impacts, particularly on the four terraced properties adjacent the application site and due to displacement of parked cars. The consequence of the proposal would adversely impact on the wider highway conditions for Croftwood Grove and result in significant highway safety and parking concerns. For the reasons outlined, the proposal would contravene with the Householder Development SPD and with Criterion c, d and e of Saved Policy H8, Criterion 2 of Saved Policy H5, CS2 and CS19 of the Knowsley Local Plan: Core Strategy and the NPPF.

DESIGN AND RESIDENTIAL AMENITY

The Householder Development SPD states that *single storey side extensions should be designed so that they preserve the street scene, protect light and privacy of neighbours and ensure that they provide sufficient parking spaces.*

The proposed side extension would be erected on the party boundary shared with No.9. The side extension would be marginally larger than half the width of the original dwelling, although in appearance this would not appear insubordinate in scale; the extension is broadly in character with the existing dwelling. The proposed development would be served by a pitched roof which would be acceptable and accord with the Householder Development SPD. The proposal would involve a combination of front garden conversion and parking to the front of the proposed extension, both spaces would involve encroaching onto the 'shared access' to meet parking standards. Although visually, this would result in the removal of the existing soft landscaping to the properties front, it is considered that this issue alone would not warrant a refusal; the acceptability of the parking layout for highway safety matters has been discussed in further detail previously in the report.

The side extension would have a negligible impact on the amenities and privacy of No.9 as there are no windows on the ground floor gable wall of No.9 or side windows on the proposal. No.9 contains a window in the middle of the gable wall, first-floor, which would not be impacted. The proposal would contain 2 no. rooflights but this would not raise any amenity or privacy concerns.

Design and Waste Management

The Householder Development SPD stipulates that *the extension should leave adequate room around the dwelling to avoid a cramped appearance within the plot. It should also leave adequate garden areas for sitting out, the storing of refuse bins etc.*

The submitted plans outline that the proposed development would be erected on the party boundary with a limited set-back from the front porch elevation. Although on design alone, this would not be an unacceptable impact given that it is not unconventional for single storey side extensions to be built adjacent to or on the party boundary and sufficient space would be retained within the rear garden to ensure that the proposal would not result in a cramped appearance.

Notwithstanding the above, for the consideration of waste management, the Householder Development SPD states that *proposals should ensure that adequate provision is made / retained for refuse collection and recycling. Ideally a minimum distance of 1m should be retained between the side wall of any side extension and boundary to facilitate collection. This may not always be practicable, particularly in cases where houses have narrow plots. Extensions which remove access to the rear of a dwelling will normally only be acceptable if a secure bin store or alternative arrangements can be provided to the front of the dwelling, which would not have a detrimental impact on the street scene. In such cases acceptable alternative arrangements for bin collection need to be indicated in the planning submission.*

The submitted plans do not include any bin store or alternative arrangements. External access to the rear garden would be removed as a result of the proposal. There is a small external space to the rear of the proposed development, which measures at a depth of 2m, however, this would not be feasible as unauthorised access would have to be taken via the hardstanding within the ownership of the adjacent dwelling (No.9), this would also not be a practicable option as access could not be guaranteed in the long-term, i.e. should cars be parked there or in the event that No.9 decide to erect a side extension similar to the proposed development and extend the full width of their hardstanding, then external access to this space at the rear would be fully removed and refuse bins would have to be stored within the front garden area.

Upon the Officers' site visit it was noted that at least 7 no. refuse bins are utilised by the property. The submitted plans do not outline any suitable arrangements for bin storage and collection and there does not appear any practically useable space within the front garden area which could accommodate bin stores, in conjunction with the parking required.

Furthermore, given that the proposed developments open-plan in layout and design, the clutter of numerous refuse bins placed within any remaining space would appear harmful to the visual amenities of the street scene, which would raise concerns to overdevelopment of the plot and would contravene with the SPD.

Conclusion

The proposal would result in unacceptable highway safety concerns and inadequate parking arrangements which would not be supported by the Local Planning Authority. Numerous concerns have been identified within the report pertaining to highway issues. Furthermore, the proposed development has neglected to include any alternative arrangements for refuse bin storage. The proposed development would be contrary to Saved Policies H5 and H8 of the Knowsley Replacement Unitary Development Plan (2006), Policies CS2, CS7 and CS19 of the Knowsley Local Plan: Core Strategy (2016) and the Householder Development SPD (2016) and therefore would not be supported.

Recommendation

That planning permission be refused for the following reason:

- 1) The proposed development would involve the relocation and displacement of existing parking onto an area of land which is visually and functionally a shared vehicular access serving the application property and the adjacent properties of 9-12 Croftwood Grove. Parking a vehicle and / or overhanging into this area would introduce a risk of obstruction to the detriment of the satisfactory function of the shared access, highway safety and the residential amenity of the occupiers of 9-12 Croftwood Grove. The proposal has not included any sufficient indication of the provision for refuse storage and collection within the curtilage of the dwelling to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority. Consequently, the proposal is contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework (2024), Saved Policies H5 and H8 of the Knowsley Replacement Unitary Development Plan, adopted June 2006, Policies CS2 and CS19 of the Knowsley Local Plan: Core Strategy, adopted January 2016 and the Householder Development SPD, adopted 2016.

SCHEDULE 1

Date Received	Ref. No	Version	Drawing/Document Title
13.03.2025	003		LOCATION PLAN AND BLOCK PLAN
13.03.2025	002		PROPOSED FLOOR PLANS AND ELEVATIONS
13.03.2025	004		EXISTING AND PROPOSED SITE PLAN

Signed Case Officer¹: **Reece Black**

Signed Authorising Officer²: **Jo Sheridan**

Date: **23/06/2025**

Informatives

Not applicable.

¹ I confirm that I do not have a personal relationship with the applicant, agent or other interested parties; I also confirm that I do not have a financial interest in the site or the development proposed

² I confirm that I do not have a personal relationship with the applicant, agent or other interested parties; I also confirm that I do not have a financial interest in the site or the development proposed