

<u>APPLICATION NO:</u>	25/00301/FUL	<u>CASE OFFICER:</u>	Louise Robinson
<u>WARD:</u>	Prescot North	<u>PARISH:</u>	Knowsley Parish Council
<u>LOCATION:</u>	6 Singleton Drive, Knowsley Village, Knowsley, L34 0HP		
<u>PROPOSAL:</u>	ERECTION OF A TWO STOREY SIDE EXTENSION, SINGLE STOREY FRONT EXTENSION TOGETHER WITH THE DEMOLITION OF EXISTING GARAGE.		

Site Description

The site subject of the application is a two-storey semi-detached dwelling located on Singleton Drive, Knowsley Village. The dwelling is characterised by brick to all elevations. The front elevation of the dwelling has half brick (at ground floor level) and half grey hanging tiles (at first-floor level). It also has a gable-tiled roof and white UPVC windows. The dwelling also currently benefits from a single storey detached garage to the side.

There is off-street parking available for 1no. vehicle at present.

The surrounding area is characterised by semi-detached and terraced dwellings of which many have been extended to the side (through single storey or two-storey extensions).

Proposal

Planning permission is sought to erect a two-storey extension to the side and a single storey extension to the front, following the demolition of the existing detached garage.

Two-storey side extension

The extension would have a depth of 8.77m (projecting 1.20m beyond the existing front elevation of the dwelling) and a width of 2.90m. It would have a tiled gable roof with an eaves height of 5.17m, and a ridge height of 7.40m. The roof would incorporate a dropped ridge of 0.20m.

The extension would also be set-back from the front elevation of the dwelling by 1.0m at first-floor level, but when including the dimensions of the proposed front extension, the set-back would be somewhat 1.90m.

At ground floor level, 1no. UPVC window is to be installed within the rear elevation and 1no. UPVC door within the side elevations. At first floor level, 2no. UPVC windows; 1no. within the front elevation and 1no. within the rear elevation, are to be installed.

The extension would allow for a new lounge, utility room and W.C. at ground floor level, and an additional 4th-Bedroom and en-suite at first-floor level.

Single storey front extension

The extension would have a projection of 1.20m beyond the existing front elevation of the dwelling and a width of 4.88m (connecting with the proposed two-storey side extension). It would have a pitched roof with an eaves height of 2.73m and ridge heights of 3.32m and 3.65m. Within the front elevation, 1no. UPVC door and 1no. UPVC window are to be installed.

The extension would incorporate the new lounge and would allow for a new hallway / porch into the dwellinghouse.

Consultations

Highways – Objection received due to concerns over highway safety and adequate parking provision.

Representations

This application has been publicised by letters sent to 9 neighbours. No comments or objections were received during the consultation period.

Planning History

No relevant planning history.

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.

NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY FRAMEWORK

KNOWSLEY LOCAL PLAN: CORE STRATEGY

Policy CS2 Development Principles

Policy CS19 Design Quality and Accessibility in New Development

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

Policy H5	Development Within Primarily Residential Areas
Policy H8	Extensions and Alterations to Residential Properties

SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENTS

Householder Development SPD
Ensuring a Choice of Travel SPD

OTHER POLICIES AND DOCUMENTS

Knowsley Highways Policy and Manual for Streets
Knowsley Highways Vehicle Crossing Policy – Dropped Kerbs

Article 35 Statement

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

Assessment

Saved Policy H8 in the Replacement Unitary Development Plan (2006) 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 to be 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 to highway users by obstructing visibility for pedestrians or drivers of motor vehicles.
- e) Adequate parking and garden space would remain for use by the residents of the extended property.

Principle of Development

The application site is identified as a Primarily Residential Area in the Knowsley Local Plan: Core Strategy. As such, the domestic extensions proposed are considered to be acceptable in principle, subject to compliance with local planning policy and guidance.

Residential Amenity

Two-storey side extension

The Householder Development SPD outlines that two-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 creating a terracing effect, either by themselves or in conjunction with similar extensions.

The SPD also outlines that 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 two-storey side extension would have a 1.0m set-back at first-floor level from the existing front wall of the original dwelling and also would incorporate a 0.20m dropped ridge. As the first-floor set back would meet the SPD's guidance, the side extension is considered to be acceptable, as it would not have a negative impact on the residential amenity.

Impact on No.8 Singleton Drive

The extension would be located away from the attached neighbouring dwelling No.8 and therefore would have no impact on the amenity of this dwelling.

Impact on No.4 Singleton Drive

Whilst there are 2no. first-floor windows located within the side elevation of the neighbouring dwelling, as these are identical to those currently found within the existing side elevation of the application site, they are assumed to serve a bathroom and landing and as such, are considered to be non-habitable. Therefore, it is considered that the two-storey side extension would have little impact on the residential amenity of the neighbouring dwelling.

The additional 1no. window at ground floor level within the rear elevation and 2no. windows (1no. front elevation, 1no. rear elevation) at first-floor level do not raise any overlooking concerns as they would not provide any additional views not already available from the front / rear of the dwelling. Furthermore, as drawing no.1325 indicates that the windows to be installed within the rear elevation would serve a utility room / W.C and new en-suite, a condition will be placed on any granting of planning permission to ensure that these windows are installed with obscure glazing to protect the amenity of both the application site and neighbouring dwellings.

The additional 1no. door within the side elevation raises no overlooking concerns as it would be a like-for-like replacement of the existing door within the side elevation of the dwellinghouse.

Therefore, the two-storey side extension is considered to be acceptable in terms of any impacts on residential amenity and complies with Policy H8 and guidance provided by the Householder Development SPD.

Single Storey Front Extension

The Householder Development SPD states that front extensions and porches can be particularly prominent in the street scene and should be particularly carefully designed

to retain the character of residential areas. It also advises that the style, design, materials and scale of front extensions and porches should respect the character of the surrounding residential area.

The proposed front extension would have a projection of 1.20m beyond the existing front elevation.

Impact on No.8 and No.4 Singleton Drive

The extension would not exceed the 45-degree rule and would not impact on either dwellings habitable window(s) to the front of the properties. As such, it is considered that the proposed front porch extension would not create any additional impact on the residential amenity of either dwelling, and is considered to be acceptable.

The 1no. door and 1no. window within the front elevation raise no overlooking concerns due to their ground floor siting and would not create any additional views not already available from the front of the dwellinghouse.

Whilst the extension would not impact the neighbouring dwellinghouses, it would impact the parking availability by reducing the driveway length. As such, the single storey front porch extension is considered to be not acceptable in terms of any impacts on residential amenity and does not comply with Policy H8 (points d and e) and guidance provided by the Householder Development SPD.

Design

The two-storey side extension and single storey front extension would be visible from the wider street scene of Singleton Drive. The extensions are to be finished in a matching brickwork. As the materials would match that of existing, the extensions are considered to be acceptable in visual terms.

The two-storey side extension would have a pitched tiled roof. Additionally, the first-floor set-back would also incorporate a pitched tiled roof. As the existing roof-profile is a gable roof, it is considered that the proposed roof profile would be acceptable, as it would match that of existing and would comply with Householder Development SPD guidance.

The single storey front extension would have a pitched roof which would connect to join the 'first-floor set-back' of the two-storey side extension. As the roof-profile would match that of the existing dwelling and the proposed two-storey side extension, the roof-profile is considered to be acceptable.

The doors and windows to be installed would be UPVC. The additional doors and windows would match the materials of the existing fenestrations found at the dwelling and are acceptable in this instance.

Overall, the extensions and alterations are considered to be acceptable in terms of any impacts on the visual amenity of the host property and the surrounding area and complies with Policy H8 and guidance provided by the Householder Development SPD.

Highways

Saved Policy H8 in the Replacement Unitary Development Plan (2006) states that proposals for extension to dwellings will be permitted provided that:

- d) The proposal would not create potential hazards to highway users by obstructing visibility for pedestrians or drivers of motor vehicles.
- e) Adequate parking and garden space would remain for use by the residents of the extended property.

The Householder Development SPD outlines that circumstances vary and 'depending on the existing level of parking provision and the particular environmental and highways 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 SPD states that a 4+ Bedroom should provide off-street parking for 3no. vehicles, measuring 5.0m (L) x 3.0m (W), for a parking space to the front of the property.

The proposal would introduce an additional bedroom to the property making the dwelling a 4-bedroom dwellinghouse. The dwellinghouse currently benefits from 1no. off-street parking space. The proposed site plan (drawing no.1325/A4 REV 1) indicates that 2no. off-street parking spaces would be provided to the front of the dwelling. The driveway would have a length of 9.70m and a width of 6.20m. 1no. of the parking spaces provided would be in a 'portrait' position and the other would be positioned on an angle slightly. The proposed 2no. parking spaces illustrate dimensions of 5.0m x 3.0m each when scaled, however these dimensions measure 4.5m by 2.8m. Whilst the proposed development has made provisions for 2no. spaces within the curtilage of the dwelling, this would be a shortfall of 1 space. This shortfall would be acceptable as the 3no. parking spaces for a 4+ Bedroom dwelling in the SPD are maximum standards, provided the minimum dimensions were proposed.

Highways Comments

Highways originally raised an objection, and advised that the following modifications would be required before the objection can be lifted:

Parking Layout and Surfacing

A revised plan is required showing the altered front garden layout and proposed parking arrangement. The parking area must be appropriately paved. If non-permeable materials are proposed, a suitable drainage strategy (e.g. ACO drain to garden soakaway) must be included.

Access Arrangements

The driveway entrance must be widened, together with the extension of the existing dropped kerb. These works shall be carried out by the Council's approved contractor, Tarmac.

Cycle Parking

Provision must be made for two secure, covered cycle storage spaces in accordance with the Council's Parking Standards. These should be clearly shown on revised layout plans and may be accommodated within the rear garden or in a dedicated store.

Following the receipt of amended plans to address the above requirements highways have maintained their objection on the basis that the two parking spaces to be provided are substandard. Whilst the plans illustrate dimension of 5m by 3m each

when scaled, these dimension measure 4.5m by 2.8m. The result is that vehicles will likely overhang onto the adopted highway blocking the free flow of pedestrian movement.

In addition, to qualify for a dropped kerb from the local highway authority, the driveway must be a minimum of 5.5m by 3m. This is contained within Knowsley's Highways Policy and Manual for Streets. The policy goes on to state that the driveway must be in place before a dropped kerb can be constructed.

Highways have stated that the proposal would not qualify as an acceptable parking space at the maximum indicates size of 5m length, as there is a risk of overhang into the public footway at the reduced length, particularly coupled with the fact that the space is so close to the boundary wall of the proposed property.

Highways advise revisiting the design to maximise the length of the driveway to ensure there is no encroachment onto the public highway, as this would constitute an offence under Section 137 of the Highways Act 1980 which makes it an offence to *"wilfully obstruct the free passage along the highway"*.

The cycle parking is deemed acceptable being secured and covered.

In summary, the proposed parking arrangement would not be acceptable, due to the concerns raised above. The extensions raise concerns, as they would have a negative impact on the parking already available found at the property. At present, the existing driveway is somewhat small in size (as shown by photographs at the end of this report), as the front of the vehicle parked within the curtilage comes in close proximity with the public footpath to the front of the property.

The introduction of the front extension with a projection of 1.20m beyond the existing front elevation would only reduce the current driveway measurements further, and as such would have a negative impact on the highway safety.

Paragraph 116 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that 'development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an acceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network, following mitigation, would be severe, taking into account all reasonable future scenarios'.

As such, the proposal is considered to be not acceptable, as it would cause significantly negative harm to the highway safety due to the replacement parking arrangements being inadequate. Therefore, it would not comply with Policy H8 of the Replacement UDP, Policies CS2 and CS19 of the Core Strategy, Highways Policies, and the NPPF.

Conclusion

Whilst the proposal would be acceptable in terms of any impacts on the residential and visual amenity, it would have a negative impact on highway safety. As such, the proposal does not comply with the Knowsley Local Plan: Core Strategy, Replacement UDP Policies and guidance provided in the NPPF, and is therefore recommended for refusal.

Recommendation

That planning permission be refused for the following reason:

- 1) The proposed development would result in inadequate on-site parking provision, failing to comply with the Local Highway Authorities minimum dimensions. This would lead to vehicles overhanging or encroaching upon the public footpath, creating an unacceptable impact on highway and pedestrian safety. The proposal therefore fails to comply with the National Planning Policy Framework (2024), Saved Policy 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, the Householder Development SPD, adopted 2016, along with the Ensuring a Choice of Travel SPD, adopted September 2010.

SCHEDULE 1

Date Received	Ref. No	Version	Drawing/Document Title
28.07.2025	-	-	Location Plan
08.09.2025	1325/A1	REV 1	Existing and Proposed Plans and Elevations
08.09.2025	1325/A4	REV 1	Block Plan
12.10.2025	1325/A4A		Car Parking Layout

Signed Case Officer¹:

Louise Robinson

**Signed Authorising
Officer²:**

Jo Sheridan

Date:

12/11/2025

Informatives

N/A

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

Site Photographs

