

<u>APPLICATION NO:</u>	23/01190/FUL	<u>CASE OFFICER:</u>	Reece Black
<u>WARD:</u>	Roby	<u>PARISH:</u>	
<u>LOCATION:</u>	3 Pine Tree Road, Huyton, Knowsley		
<u>PROPOSAL:</u>	ERECTION OF A TWO STOREY SIDE AND REAR EXTENSION TOGETHER WITH A FRONT PORCH EXTENSION, LOFT CONVERSION AND ERECTION OF REAR DORMER		

Site Description

The application site is located at 3 Pine Tree Road, Huyton and is located in an area allocated as a Primarily Residential Area in the Development Plan. The application property is a semi-detached dwelling and is rendered facing on its front, side and rear elevations, along with black UPVC openings and brown, interlocking roof tiles.

The application property is West facing on the residential street, the property features hard standing to the front of the property that could accommodate a minimum of two vehicles and is enclosed by a low, brick-built boundary wall. As existing, waste bins are already stored to the front of the dwelling.

There is an approximate distance of 6.04m between the existing front elevation of the dwelling and the public highway.

Proposal

The application seeks permission for the erection of a two-storey side and rear extension together with a front porch extension, loft conversion and erection of rear dormer.

The proposed two-storey side extension would have a width of 2.36m and a depth of 8.76m; when combined with the side elevation of the ground floor, rear extension, this would have a cumulative depth of 12.76m. The proposed would be served by a dual-pitched roof, in which the eaves would be 5.04m and the highest part of the roof would measure 7.05m. The ridge line of this roof would be lower than the main roof of the dwelling.

The proposed rear extension would be a two-storey projection and would project out 4m on the ground floor and 2m on the first-floor storey. This would have a width of 6.77m, this would have a cumulative width of 9.27m when combined with the rear elevation of the proposed two-storey side extension. Both rear extensions would be served by mono-pitched roofs. The ground floor pitched roof would measure 2.58m at the eaves and 3.24m at the highest point. The first-floor roof would measure 4.72m at the eaves and 5.43m at the highest point. The ground floor rear extension would feature bi-folding doors and an access door.

The proposed two-storey side and rear extension would be a 'wrap around' addition to the dwelling. The front elevation of the proposed two-storey side extension would be set back from the existing adjoining front wall elevation of the dwelling by 1m. The side elevation of the proposal includes a small window that would serve a bathroom. The submitted floor plan shows this would be installed and constructed with obscure glazing.

The proposed front porch extension would project 1.5m and would have a width of 2.81m. This would be served by a small dual-pitched roof, which would measure 2.49m at the eaves and 3.2m at its highest point. The proposal would see the demolition of the existing flat porch roof and brick-built frame.

The proposal also includes a hip to gable roof and loft conversion, together with the erection of a full-width, flat roofed, rear dormer. The loft conversion would have a width of 9.28m and a depth of 8.71m. The rear dormer would have a projection from the ridge line of 3.73m, a height of 1.92m and a width of 8.27m. The dormer would also feature 2 windows on its rear elevation. The window that would serve a bathroom within the dormer would be constructed with obscured glazing.

The proposal would also see the removal of the front boundary wall to widen access to the existing front hardstanding. As existing, there is already a full dropped kerb that covers the full width of the front hardstanding and therefore the dropped kerb would not need to be extended.

The application has seen a series of amendments to consider form and mass, projection, relation to the existing dwelling etc. This included the application being withdrawn and resubmitted under a free go. The most significant amendments include the incorporation of a pitched roof to the first-floor rear extension, the set-in of the front wall of the first floor of the proposed two-storey side extension by 1m and the set-in of the first-floor rear projection, from 4m to 2m. This was agreed in order to accord with the New Residential Development SPD, in the interest of protecting privacy and amenity views for the rear elevations of the opposite building line of dwellings that the rear of the application property faces, and specifically, Appendix 4: Interface Distances. This has been revised to ensure that the proposal is within the guidance which states that new to new principal rear elevations for 2 storey properties should achieve a minimum of 20 metre offset.

Consultations

None Required.

Representations

This application has been publicised by letters sent to 8 neighbours.

There have been 1 letters of objection, 0 letters of support and 0 letters of comment. The representations are summarised as follows:-

5 Pine Tree Road – On the grounds that the application is not fully compliant with certain clauses of the Householder Development SPD, June 2016 guidance. Objections were made in regard to over-development, street scene, car parking, provision for refuse collection, as well as other points.

Planning History

APP. NO:	22/00777/FUL
PROPOSAL:	ERECTION OF TWO STOREY SIDE AND REAR EXTENSION, SINGLE STOREY FRONT EXTENSION, REAR DORMER EXTENSION AND LOFT CONVERSION
DECISION:	WITHDRAWN
DECISION DATE:	13 April 2023

Relevant Policy

Paragraph 11 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states that planning decisions should apply a presumption in favour of sustainable development. This means approving development proposals that accord with an up-to-date development plan without delay; or where the development plan is absent, silent or out of date planning permission should be granted unless the application of policies in the NPPF that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a clear reason for refusing the development proposed; or any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the NPPF taken as a whole.

Paragraph 12 of the NPPF clarifies that the presumption in favour of sustainable development does not change the statutory status of the development plan as the starting point for decision making. Where a planning application conflicts with an up-to-date development plan, permission should not normally be granted. Local planning authorities may take decisions that depart from an up-to-date development plan, but only if material considerations in a particular case indicate that the plan should not be followed.

The development plan in Knowsley comprises the Saved Policies of the Replacement Unitary Development Plan, the Core Strategy Local Plan and the Joint Waste Local Plan. The following policies are relevant to the determination of this application.

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

CS2 - Development Principles

CS19 - Design Quality and Accessibility in New Development

H5 - Development within Primarily Residential Areas

H8 - Extensions and Alterations to Residential Properties

In addition, the Householder Development SPD (2016) and New Residential Development SPD (2018) are a material consideration for the purposes of this planning application and provides additional guidance in relation to householder development within Knowsley Borough.

Article 35 Statement

The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by assessing the proposal against all material considerations, including planning policies and any representations that may have been received and subsequently determining to grant planning permission in accordance with the presumption in favour of sustainable development, as set out within the National Planning Policy Framework.

Assessment

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

Design

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.

The Householder Development SPD states that two storey side extensions should be designed to avoid having an overbearing effect or causing unacceptable loss of light or privacy for neighbours.

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

The Householder Development SPD stipulates that for roof alterations and dormer extensions that they should not overlook other dwellings and must not project above the ridgeline of the dwelling.

The existing dwelling is rendered finish with black UPVC openings and tiled roofing. The proposed development would also be rendered finish on its exterior to match and include materials which are keeping in with those found at the application property and would feature a dual-pitched roof for the two-storey side extension and a mono-pitched roof on both storeys for the rear extensions.

These are considered acceptable choices as the pitched roof that would serve the two-storey side extension would be in-keeping with the roof of the proposed converted roof of the dwelling, the ridge line of the proposal would also be lower than the roof that serves the dwelling. The pitched roofs which would be employed to serve the rear extension projections, would be set at a reduced pitch in contrast to the roof that serves the main dwelling; this would be considered acceptable and would help mitigate any potential impact to neighbours from overshadowing.

The proposed development is considered to have an acceptable design and would not be considered to appear out of place or incongruous in the street scene. The application property is sited within a Primarily Residential Area, in which other dwellings sited within the locality feature a range of alterations and extensions. Overall, the proposal would be considered a subordinate addition to the dwelling and would not cause adverse harm to the character of the dwelling or the street scene. The ridgeline of the roof that would serve the proposed two-storey side extension was set further down through an amendment secured to ensure the proposed two-storey side extension was a visually subordinate addition to the existing house.

The proposed front extension would retain and respect the overall style and design of the existing front elevation of the dwelling and the wider character of the residential area. The Householder Development SPD states that the size and projection of front extensions and porches that may be permitted depends on the type of dwelling and

degree of set-back from the highway. It is considered on this occasion that a moderate front porch projection would be a subordinate addition to the dwelling and have a sufficient set back to prevent any substantial harm to the street scene. The porch would be the only front projection that encroaches further forward, between the porch and public highway would remain 5.05m, which is considered sufficient.

The proposed roof alteration and erection of a rear dormer extension is considered acceptable. The Householder Development SPD states that a dormer should normally be set back at least 1m from the main elevation it relates to and 0.5m from the roof edge on either side to prevent it having an overbearing effect on the street scene and adjoining dwellings. The proposed elevations demonstrate that the dormer would be in accord with these guidelines.

The cubic content of the resulting roof space would exceed the cubic content of the original roof space by more than 50 cubic metres that is prescribed under Permitted Development Rights. The proposed enlarged cubic roof space for the loft conversion and rear dormer was a total of approximately 54 cubic metres and is only marginally in excess of what would conventionally be allowed under Permitted Development. The proposed roof conversion and dormer extension is a full-width extension and is carried over to the rear of the proposed two-storey side extension and this section measures at 1.85m.

The Householder Development SPD states that attention needs to be given to design to ensure a sensitive and appropriate approach which conserves the character of the original building and roofscape. It is considered, however, that the roof alteration and conversion would be within the parameters of Permitted Development and subsequently, there are other dwellings in the street such as 9 and 11 Pine Tree Road, which feature pitched roofs in oppose to hipped roofs. Hipped roofs are common in the area; however, they are not considered to be a defining characteristic of the local area. Based on the above points, the proposed roof conversion would be acceptable.

Moreover, the section of the rear dormer that is carried over to the proposed side extension is the only part that would not benefit from Permitted Development Rights, as this is not part of the original house. Subsequently, although the dormer is of a larger size due to its full width scale it would not be considered that this section would have a materially significant adverse impact on the character of the dwelling or local area then had it been completed within the parameters of Permitted Development. The dormer would also not be readily visible from the public highway or public vantage points as it would be sited to the rear of the dwelling and therefore would not hold a prominent position in the street scene.

The guidance also states that the openings on dormers should generally be noticeably smaller than the windows on the storeys below but should echo the general proportions and shape of the openings below. The windowsills have been raised to be in accord with this guidance and be in keeping and harmonious with the proportions and shape of the other openings on the rear elevation of the dwelling.

Overall, it is considered that the proposed development would have an acceptable design and would be in accord with the Householder Development SPD and Saved Policy H8.

Residential Amenity

The Householder Development SPD states that two-storey side extensions should be designed to avoid having an overbearing effect or causing unacceptable loss of light or privacy for neighbours. It also states proposed developments should avoid creating 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.

The Householder Development SPD also states that usually 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 submitted plans show that the proposed two-storey side extension would be constructed with a 1m set-back of the front wall of the first-floor of the extension from the immediately adjoining part of the main front wall of the original dwelling. Therefore, it is considered that the proposed development would not result in the creation of a terracing effect, would not cause any significant harm to any local amenities and it would be in accord with the Householder Development SPD.

The Householder Development SPD states 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 breach more than 4m from the rear elevation of the existing dwelling.

The Householder Development SPD stipulates that two storey extensions of up to 3 metres will normally be acceptable.

The proposed rear extension would be in accord of this guidance. The ground floor would not project further than 4m. The proposed first-floor saw an amendment to be reduced from a projection of 3m to 2m. Although the 3m was acceptable in principle, the New Residential Development SPD, Appendix 4 – Interface Distances and Private Amenity, states that new to new principal rear elevations for 2 storey properties should achieve a minimum of 20 metre offset. Between the two rear building lines sited behind the application site that face one another, there is an existing approximate interface distance of 22m. Therefore, in the interests of safeguarding residential amenity and privacy, it was necessary to revise the proposed rear projections of the first-floor and amend these from 3m to 2m.

Therefore, it is considered that the proposed development would not cause any significant harm to any local amenities and would be in accord with the Householder Development SPD.

1 Pine Tree Road

No.1 is the adjacent, semi-detached dwelling and is sited North of the application site. The main front and rear elevations of both properties sit in line with one another. At present, there is an approximate interface distance of 4.74m between the two gable walls. No.1 benefits from a rear conservatory, that projects out by approximately 3m.

The gable wall of no.1 features 4 windows, two on the ground floor and two on the first-floor. The first-floor windows are believed to serve a hallway to the front and a

kitchen to the rear. The first-floor windows are understood to serve a hallway landing (this window is also constructed with frosted glass) and a bedroom.

The proposed two-storey side extensions construction would see the interface distance reduce to approximately 2.44m. The front elevation of the overall side extension would be set further back by 1.25m from the front elevation of no.1.

As a result of the proposed two-storey side extension, there may be a partial loss of light and overshadowing, but this is not considered to be to an unacceptable degree. There would still be a gap of 2.44m between the properties. In addition, the windows which may result in an inevitable and partial loss of light, are not understood to serve habitable rooms. Due to the space retained, it is not considered that the proposed development would appear unduly dominant or overbearing, it would not present a materially significant difference in amenity views as any outlook out of these windows face on to a gable wall as existing. The proposed extension does not introduce additional, or reinstall existing windows and therefore, it is considered that this would enhance and improve the privacy between the two properties. This is with the exception of the window indicated on the gable wall of the proposal as it is to be constructed with obscure glazing and therefore, would not be considered to facilitate any direct overlooking between the two properties.

The proposed rear extension is within the parameters and guidance of the Householder Development SPD and demonstrates an acceptable projection in relation to nearby dwellings per the guidance contained in the New Residential Development SPD.

The proposed front projection would not cause any issues to amenity views or overshadowing.

The proposed loft conversion and rear dormer would not be considered to cause any significant issues in regard to amenities or privacy. The window closest to the gable wall on the rear dormer, which would serve a bathroom, would be constructed with obscure glazing. This would ensure the proposal would not result in direct overlooking to the rear garden of no.1 and maintain privacy. Therefore, the proposal would not be considered to have an adverse impact.

There is also sufficient boundary treatment between the rear gardens of 1 and 3 Pine Tree Road in the form of 1.8m timber fencing.

Overall, the proposed development would be within the guidance of the Householder Development SPD and would not have an unacceptable impact on the amenities or privacy of the occupants of no.1.

5 Pine Tree Road

No.5 is the paired, semi-detached dwelling to the application property. The main front and rear building lines of both properties sit in line with one another. No.5 benefits from a front porch extension and a rear conservatory, that projects out by approximately 2m.

The proposed two-storey side extension would be erected off of the gable wall of the application site, as a result, the majority of the proposal would not be readily visible to the occupants of no.5.

The proposed two-storey rear extension is within the guidance of both the Householder Development SPD and the New Residential Development SPD guidance. It is not considered to result in an unacceptable impact on the amenities or privacy of the occupants of no.5.

The proposed front projection would not cause any issues to amenity views or overshadowing.

The proposed loft conversion and rear dormer has been addressed previously in this report and it is deemed appropriate on this occasion for the guidance to be relaxed given that the proposal is only marginally in excess of the Permitted Development parameters and therefore it is unlikely that this would present a significantly detrimental impact on the amenities or privacy. It is also considered that any notable impact between existing to proposed would soften over time and the marginal excess of the proposed rear dormer would not be significantly greater had the proposal been fundamentally within the parameters of Permitted Development.

There is also sufficient boundary treatment between the rear gardens of 3 and 5 Pine Tree Road in the form of 1.8m timber fencing.

The occupants of no.5. have submitted a detailed description outlining the grounds for objection. These are as follows:

Section 1 Over Development – The proposed development overall extends the application property in multiple forms, and this contributes to any impression of overdevelopment. The proposed development in terms of the front, side and rear extensions are in accord with the Householder Development SPD guidance and are considered to be subordinate additions to the existing dwelling. The proposed roof conversion and dormer extension would also be considered to be an appropriate and acceptable addition to the dwelling. The application site is located in a Primarily Residential Area in the Development Plan and therefore it is considered that domestic extension(s) would therefore, be acceptable in principle, subject to compliance with local planning policy and guidance. The local area is also characterised by building lines of semi-detached dwellings, many of which in the locality have been extended and altered in a variety of ways. Therefore, it is not considered that the proposal would be considered incongruous or out of character to the dwelling or local area. There would remain over 50% private amenity space in the rear garden of the dwelling and sufficient amount of space to the front of the dwelling. Overall, it is therefore considered that the proposed development would not constitute over development.

Section 2 & 3 Roofline and Existing Architectural Constraints – The proposal includes a hip to gable loft conversion. As stated, prior, under Permitted Development, this would be acceptable to complete. Furthermore, several neighbouring residences such as 7, 9, 11 and 13 are all served by pitched roofs and therefore hipped roofs would not be considered incongruous in the area. Permitted Development guidelines of Class B would also allow in principle, the scope for dormer extensions. Any account for the relaxation of the general guidance of the Householder Development SPD on roof alterations and dormer extensions has been addressed previously throughout this report and that the material impact of the proposal submitted would not be significantly different to what would be allowed under Permitted Development. It is considered that when considered overall, taking the above into account, the proposed development would respond adequately to its context.

Section 4 Street Scene – This objection refers to the provision of refuse storage has now been relocated to the front of the dwelling and stipulating this would have a detrimental impact on the street scene.

As access to the rear of the property has been removed, a suitable bin store to house the bins to the front of the property would be required. As per the guidance of the Householder Development SPD 6.25 states that proposals should ensure that adequate provision is made / retained for refuse collection and recycling. 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.

To ensure compliance with this clause of the Householder Development SPD, this has been secured by condition and following the agreement from the Local Planning Authority on an acceptable design, suitable bin storage that does not significantly impact on the local residential visual amenity will be secured. This would be considered an appropriate workaround to provide a space for the bins without compromising the street scene.

Section 4 of the objection also asserts that, regular spacing between the properties in Pine Tree Road on average is approximately 2.5m from gable to party boundary. Although the Householder Development SPD stipulates to take account of regular spacing between dwellings, the SPD also provides more tailored and relevant guidance on extensions to the side of dwellings, which through amendments have been followed. Therefore, the proposed development would be in accord with the guidance of the SPD in regard to side extensions. The proposed development reduced the front wall of the first floor to ensure it prevents any potential terracing effect and would subsequently not cause an architectural shift in the buildings.

Section 5 Car Parking and Highway Safety – The proposal would see an increase in the number of bedrooms at the property. The objection notes that the parking standards are outlined in the Householder Development SPD and states that the minimum provision for parking spaces in a 4+ bed property is 3 parking spaces. The proposed development would not result in the loss of any existing parking provisions currently utilised by the property. The submitted Proposed Context plan demonstrates that two parking spaces would be retained and available to the occupants. In addition, the front boundary wall would be removed to facilitate full access to the full width of available hardstanding. Moreover, the two spaces would still meet the required parking dimensions for two vehicles of 5.7m x 5m and the council standards are a maximum of parking standards. As the proposal would not result in the loss of any existing parking provisions and would retain two parking spaces within the curtilage of the dwelling, this would be acceptable. Furthermore, from completing the site visit, it is observed that vehicles park on the street and it is considered that it would be acceptable for any additional need for parking for a third space to be provided by on-street parking and this would not be considered to result in an unacceptable or adverse impact on highway safety.

There is also reference to soft landscaping treatment in the objection from no.5. The proposed development would retain existing porous paving slabs. The submitted Proposed Context also annotates landscaping which would help soften parked vehicles, which would not be effectively screened following the removal of the existing front boundary brick wall. It is not considered that the proposed development would result in a considerable increase to surface run-off, flooding or water pouring onto the public highway.

Section 6 Impact on Neighbours – As stated from the response to Section 1 of the objection of no.5 and previously in this report, the proposed development is largely in accord with the guidance of the Householder Development SPD and in addition the application has seen several amendments to reduce projections in order to protect neighbouring amenities, character of the area and accord with guidance and policy. The roof alteration and rear dormer has also been addressed previously. Overall, it is not considered that the proposed development would result in an overbearing effect on the neighbouring properties. As the objection notes, there is 1 window on the side elevation of the proposed two-storey side extension, the householder development SPD states that windows on gable walls that overlook neighbouring properties should be avoided. As the submitted Proposed Elevations stipulate, the proposed window would be constructed with obscure glazing and would not facilitate any overlooking. Therefore, as there would be no direct overlooking, it would be acceptable.

Section 7 Two-Storey Side Extension – The objection here stipulates that the proposed two-storey side extension would result in an overbearing effect, would be considered excessive and result in a terracing effect. The proposed two-storey side extension has been assessed in this report, and following amendments to the proposal, has been reduced and as a result, is not considered to be overbearing. In addition, the front wall of the first-floor has been set back by 1m to ensure it is in accord with the Householder Development SPD guidance. Moreover, the guidance clearly states that the 1m set-in should be the front wall OR from the party boundary, it is not applied to both. Following the 1m set in at the front, the proposed development is not considered to result in the creation of a terracing effect or overall architectural change should no.1. Pine Tree Road choose to extend to the side also. The proposed two-storey side extension, would be a visually identifiable subordinate addition to the dwelling and is in accord with all relevant guidance in relation to its form, mass, scale, projection etc.

Section 8 Objections to Proposed Roof Alterations Under Permitted Development (Class B Clause d ii) – Original roof space to created roof space is only applicable to the original roof of the dwelling and its conversion from hip to gable, as well as the erection of a rear dormer. Therefore, any resulting roof space from additional roofs created would not be included in the cubic content increase calculations when assessing applications under Permitted Development. Nevertheless, the cumulative resulting roof space of the roof conversion and rear dormer is in excess of the 50 cubic metre allowance permitted for a semi-detached dwelling, as stated earlier throughout the report. However, it is considered that as the cubic space is marginally in excess of this by approximately 4 cubic metres, the material impact of this excess is not considered to result in a greater degree of harm, had the rear dormer have been constructed within the parameters of Permitted Development. Therefore, it is considered that, this would be acceptable on this occasion and the section that would be in excess, sited on the proposed two-storey side extension, would not have a materially significant impact on the amenities or privacy of the occupants of no.5.

Section 9 Objections to Proposed Roof Alterations Under Permitted Development (Class C Clause c) – This section of the objection relates to the frontal elevation, that shows the proposed rooflight to be added exceeds the highest part of the original roof. This was an inaccuracy when drawn, as seen from the neighbour side elevation, that it does not exceed or protrude beyond this. This has been corrected on amended plans for the Proposed Elevations and does not project beyond the highest point of the roof. Therefore, this is no longer in contradiction and would be allowed under Permitted Development.

Overall, the proposed development is largely in accord with relevant policy and guidance, with any departure being justified with account taken for issues on design and residential amenity. The proposal would be deemed acceptable and suitable for a Primarily Residential Area, has seen sufficient revisions to ensure that it is in accord with relevant policies and to take account of any potential major issues and would not result in any unacceptable harm to the amenities and privacy of the occupants of no.5.

No other nearby residences are considered to suffer significant harm to their amenities and privacy as a result of the proposed development.

Highways

The proposal would see an increase in the number of bedrooms at the property from 3 to 5. It is considered that the existing two parking spaces within the curtilage of the boundary would be acceptable as these would be retained, as shown from the submitted Proposed Context plan.

In addition, the front boundary wall would be removed to facilitate full access to the full width of available hardstanding. Moreover, the two spaces would still meet the required parking dimensions for two vehicles of 5.7m x 5m. The Council's parking standards are for maximum provision and therefore the parking provisions provided would be acceptable.

As the proposal would not result in the loss of any existing parking provisions and would retain two parking spaces within the curtilage of the dwelling, this would be acceptable. Furthermore, from completing the site visit, it is observed that vehicles park on the street and it is considered that it would be acceptable for any additional need for parking for a third space to be provided by on-street parking. This would not be considered to result in an unacceptable or adverse impact on highway safety.

Conclusion

The proposal would be acceptable in terms of design, residential amenity and highways. The proposal also complies with the relevant Core Strategy, Replacement UDP policies and guidance in the NPPF and is therefore recommended for approval subject to conditions.

Recommendation

That Planning Permission be granted subject to the following condition(s):-

- 1) The development must be begun not later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date of this permission.

Reason: In order to comply with the requirements of Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).

- 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans and documents listed in Schedule 1.

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt.

- 3) The materials to be used on the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match those of the existing building in type, size, colour and texture.

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

- 4) The rear en-suite window of the proposed second floor and the side elevation window shall be constructed with obscure glazing, as shown on and to accord with the submitted plans, these shall remain obscurely glazed at all times.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity and to comply with Saved Policy H8 of the Knowsley Replacement Unitary Development Plan, adopted in 2016.

- 5) Full details and plans of a bin storage structure, including plans and elevations, shall be submitted to and agreed by Local Planning Authority, prior to the first occupation of the proposed development.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity and to comply with the Householder Development SPD.

SCHEDULE 1

Date Received	Ref. No	Version	Drawing/Document Title
05/06/2023	2201.E1.01	REV E	LOCATION PLAN
05/06/2023	2201.P1.01	REV E	PROPOSED CONTEXT
14/07/2023	2201.P2.01	REV F	PROPOSED ELEVATIONS
27/07/2023	2201.P1.02	REV G	PROPOSED PLANS

Signed Case Officer¹:

Reece Black

**Signed Authorising
Officer²:**

K Foster

Date:

31 July 2023

Informatives

Not applicable.

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

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

Appendix 1 – Site Photographs









Local dwellings sited near the application property that feature two-storey side extensions.



Site Photos and Google Street View of side extensions in the local area.



