

<u>APPLICATION NO:</u>	22/00124/FUL	<u>CASE OFFICER:</u>	Lee Osborne
<u>WARD:</u>	Whiston & Cronton	<u>PARISH:</u>	Cronton Parish Council
<u>LOCATION:</u>	Denbigh, Pex Hill, Cronton		
<u>PROPOSAL:</u>	DEMOLITION OF EXISTING GARAGE AND ERECTION OF A TWO STOREY SIDE EXTENSION TOGETHER WITH A FIRST FLOOR EXTENSION ABOVE EXISTING GROUND FLOOR EXTENSION AND PROVISION OF TWO JULIET BALCONIES ON THE REAR.		

Site Description

The application relates to a detached house on Pex Hill. The site is on the edge of Widnes urban area and the entrance to Pex Hill is opposite the eastern end of the Riverside FE College – Halton campus. Pex Hill comprises detached houses and bungalows in mostly large plots; there are several narrower plots however there is considerable length to these plots. The type, style and ages of the dwellings on Pex Hill vary considerably. Pex Hill is quite steep and has dwellings either side, with a number of the dwellings set behind high gated front boundary walls and fences, whilst others are more open to the carriage way. Pex Hill is within the Green Belt.

The dwelling is a double fronted red brick house with pyramid type roof of very short central ridge, built in the late 1930s and there is a detached red brick garage with pyramid type roof to the side. It is not known if the garage was built with the house, although with the location of the property and the likely type of owner it was aimed at (a house of this type and scale would likely have been for a professional) it is reasonable to assume that it may well have been particularly with the pyramid roof. The house has a single storey extension across the rear with a sloping roof; prior to this extension being built there was a single storey on the back of the same depth but with a significantly smaller width. With the pyramid roof it had it is reasonable to take this extension as having been built with the house. There is a wooden ‘summer house’ on a raised bed and a small brick built outbuilding both to the rear. Given the house was completed in 1938 the brick outbuilding may be a rebuild of a previous outbuilding (e.g., coal or wood fuel storage building).

The site is triangular in shape and extends considerably to the north of the house, giving the plot considerable width. The front of the site and ground floor of the house is shielded from view from Pex Hill by brick wall and piers with timber infill between and high solid gates.

Proposal

The proposal is to demolish the garage and to erect a two-storey extension to the side together with a first floor extension to the rear above the existing ground floor extension.

The extension would have a depth of 11.3m deep, the depth of the existing house as extended at the rear, and a width of 5.4m. A first floor extension would be

constructed over the single storey extension at the rear of the existing house which would tie in with the side extension. The roof of the extended house would be hipped at both ends with a central ridge line. At the rear the full width extension would have two pitched roofs, one to each half of the widened house with valley between and hipped into the main roof. The two rear bedroom windows at either end of the house would have Juliet balconies.

The extensions would comprise a classroom / study at the front with a garden room at the rear to the ground floor. Above would be two bedrooms with a connecting en-suite between, with the first floor extension on the rear comprising a bedroom extension with en-suite and a bathroom. The existing bathroom and front bedroom en-suite area would be reconfigured. The works are partly to give greater room in the house to help cope with the applicant's child who has severe autism and requires 24 hours support, together with space for the applicant's parents to reside with the family, and who also add to the support for the child.

Consultations

Cronton Parish Council - No comments received.
Halton Borough Council - No comments received.

Representations

This application has been publicised by letters sent to 3 neighbours. It has also been advertised by Site Notice. No representations have been received.

Planning History

K/APP/1890 - PROPOSED BUNGALOW. Refused: 26.01.1977.
K/APP/7549 - PROPOSED BUNGALOW. Refused: 02.09.1983. Appeal dismissed: 04.04.1984.

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

CS5 - Green Belt

CS19 - Design Quality and Accessibility in New Development

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

G7 - Alteration, Extension or Replacement of Existing Dwellings in the Green Belt

H8 -

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

The site is in designated Green Belt. Saved Policy G7 within Knowsley's UDP permits extension and alterations to residential dwellings within the Green Belt providing they respect the appearance of the existing dwelling, its setting and preserve the openness of the green belt. The proposal should not by itself or in conjunction with earlier developments result in a disproportionate addition over and above the size of the original dwelling. The explanation goes on to state that as a general guideline, enlargements of over 50% will normally be classed as disproportionate and not allowed. The size of the original dwelling is defined as that which existed on 1st July 1948, or the dwelling as originally built if this was later.

The NPPF also stipulates that extensions or alterations of a building are listed as exceptions to inappropriate development within the Green Belt. Paragraph 145. C) allows for extensions or alterations of a building if it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building.

NPPF and Policy CS5 'Green Belt' in the Core Strategy states that inappropriate development in the Green Belt will only be allowed where the harm caused to the Green Belt and any other harm is clearly outweighed by 'very special circumstances'.

Consideration must therefore be given to what classifies as the original dwelling. The house was completed in 1938 according to a keystone built into the building. The house is imposing; it is double fronted with an entrance focal statement. It is considered as such, together with the location, that the property was probably aimed at the professional market. The location and likely occupier market of the house means that it is reasonable to assume that the house was built with a garage. The current rear extension and 'summer house' are later additions whilst the outbuilding also appears to be. However, the current rear extension subsumed an earlier rear addition which is considered to form part of the original dwelling.

For the purposes of determining this application the original dwelling is considered to comprise the double fronted house (with the original rear projection - not the existing

single storey rear extension) and the garage.

The approximate volume of the 'original building' is therefore as follows:

Original Building:

(House without the roof) $9.2\text{m} \times 8\text{m} \times 5.3\text{m} = 390.1\text{m}^3$
(Roof of house) $9.2\text{m} \times 8\text{m} \times 9.4\text{m} \times 2.7\text{m} / 2 = 99.4\text{m}^3$
(Entrance structure without the roof) $3.1\text{m} \times 1.4\text{m} \times 5.3\text{m} = 23\text{m}^3$
(Roof of entrance structure) $3.1\text{m} \times 1.4\text{m} \times 1.1\text{m} / 2 = 2.4\text{m}^3$
(Front bay without roof) $2.2\text{m} \times 0.7\text{m} \times 2.8\text{m} = 4.3\text{m}^3 \times 2 = 8.6\text{m}^3$
(Roof of bay) $2.2\text{m} \times 0.7\text{m} \times 0.8\text{m} / 2 = 0.6\text{m}^3 \times 2 = 1.2\text{m}^3$
(Garage without roof) $5.6\text{m} \times 11.3\text{m} \times 2.4\text{m} = 151.8\text{m}^3$
(Garage roof) $5.6\text{m} \times 11.3\text{m} \times 1.1\text{m} / 2 = 34.8\text{m}^3$
(Rear extension without roof) $3.3\text{m} \times 3.6\text{m} \times 2.3\text{m} = 27.3\text{m}^3$
(Rear extension roof) $3.3\text{m} \times 3.6\text{m} \times 2.2\text{m} / 2 = 13.1\text{m}^3$

Volume of 'Original House' = 751.7m^3

Extended House

(House without the roof) $14.8\text{m} \times 11.3\text{m} \times 5.3\text{m} = 886.4\text{m}^3$
(Roof of house and extensions) = 212m^3 (extension roofs - double peaked roof at rear and roof to side extension)
(Entrance structure without the roof) $3.1\text{m} \times 1.4\text{m} \times 5.3\text{m} = 23\text{m}^3$
(Roof of entrance structure) $3.1\text{m} \times 1.4\text{m} \times 1.1\text{m} / 2 = 2.4\text{m}^3$
(Front bay without roof) $2.2\text{m} \times 0.7\text{m} \times 2.8\text{m} = 4.3\text{m}^3 \times 2 = 8.6\text{m}^3$
(Roof of bay) $2.2\text{m} \times 0.7\text{m} \times 0.8\text{m} / 2 = 0.6\text{m}^3 \times 2 = 1.2\text{m}^3$

Volume of Extended House = 1133.6m^3 .

On this basis the proposal would only be marginally above 50% of the house as deemed original at 50.8%. On balance this is considered appropriate as the Householder Development Supplementary Planning Document which gives a 50% maximum volume figure above the original dwelling for extensions in the Green Belt is guidance, as is the written explanation of Policy which prefaces the 50% figure given with "As a general guideline...".

From the front the overall design is in keeping with the existing house albeit with a pitched roof hipped at either end rather than the existing roof of the blunt pyramid design although any two storey extension to the side would give rise to a different roof style than the existing, and that proposed maintains sloping sides at either end. It is considered that the roof pikes on the rear would be acceptable both viewed from the side and the rear and would not detract to the character to significant degree. Viewed from the front the extension would have an acceptable impact on the openness of the Green Belt, being proportionally acceptable. The first floor extension on the rear is determined by the existing ground floor extension but of itself is not overly dominant at approximately 3.2m deep. The plot is large, and the extension would not be readily seen from the rear where there are fields and therefore the double pike would not be visible from a public view, although the sides would be and particularly the southern end one when viewed looking northwards from south of the site on Pex Hill on an angled view before the view became that of the front. As such it is considered that the extension would not impact adversely on the Green Belt or the openness of the Green Belt and at 51% increase broadly complies in this instance with saved Policy G7 and does not conflict with the NPPF or Policy CS5. Furthermore, there are also the mitigating circumstances of the use of part of the extension for additional living and educational space for a severely autistic child with

additional space for supporting grandparents, although these are not considered 'very special circumstances' in the context of the NPPF.

The justification for Saved Policy G7 states that proposals for substantial new outbuildings that are within the curtilage of a property and within 5m of the dwelling will be considered in the same way as extensions. However, the policy or its justification does not state that if there is an outbuilding within 5m of the dwelling it should be included in the volume calculations and therefore the existing small outbuilding has been excluded from the volume calculation in this instance. A similar building may have originally been located here for fuel storage (e.g., coal) and in any case, it has little impact on the openness of the Green Belt because of its modest scale and height and not being readily visible from outside the site. The garage was taken into account in the volume calculations as that is sited next to the house and clearly forms part of a duality of the larger house and the adjacent smaller pyramid roof garage.

Highways

There is space for in excess of three cars on the drive at the front of the house. No other highways issues are raised.

Residential Amenity / Privacy

The application is for extensions to the side and rear of a house in the Green Belt with a dwelling over 100m to the north with a large plot together with the large application site plot extending northwards between. Over the road from the house there is the side of a large plot followed by the side of a detached house 50m from the application house sitting within that plot. No residential amenity issues are raised by the proposals or privacy issues.

Conclusion

The proposal would be acceptable in design and would not be significantly detrimental to the character of the house due to disproportionality of appearance and would not be detrimental to visual or residential amenity. The proposal would have acceptable impacts on the Green Belt and its openness. It would be acceptable in terms of the character and appearance of the area and raises no highway issues.

Recommendation

That Planning Permission be granted subject to the following conditions: -

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.

SCHEDULE 1

Date Received	Ref. No	Version	Drawing/Document Title
11/07/2022	WA8 5QN/D/01	A	PROPOSED ELEVATIONS & LOCATION PLAN
11/07/2022	WA8 5QN/D/02	B	EXISTING AND PROPOSED FLOOR PLANS
11/07/2022	WA8 5QN/D/03	B	SECTION
11/07/2022	WA8 5QN/D/04	A	PROPOSED BLOCK AND ROOF PLAN: BLOCK PLAN SHEET 2 OF 2

Signed Case Officer: **Lee Osborne**

Signed Authorising Officer: **Alan Kilroe**

Date: **23 November 2022**

Informatives

- 1 The proposed development lies within a coal mining area which may contain unrecorded coal mining related hazards. If any coal mining feature is encountered during development, this should be reported immediately to the Coal Authority on 0345 762 6848.

Further information is also available on the Coal Authority website at:
www.gov.uk/government/organisations/the-coal-authority

Appendix 1 – Site Photographs