
PLANNING STATEMENT (GREEN BELT) IN SUPPORT OF THE DEMOLITION AND ERECTION OF
A REPLACEMENT OUTBUILDING WITHIN THE RESIDENTIAL CURTILAGE OF WHITE HOUSE
FARM, PRESCOT ROAD, CRONTON, WA8 5PS

PREPARED BY: ABL Planning & Development
AMMENDED BY: Planning Applicant

DATE: JULY 2025

REV: ISSUE 2, Amended to reflect KBC requested changes 30th June 25.

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 This planning statement has been prepared by ABL Planning & Development and subsequently amended by the planning applicant to support a planning application in relation to a householder planning application for:

“The demolition and erection of a replacement outbuilding within the residential curtilage of White House Farm”

- 1.2 To support the application, this statement has been sectioned into 6 parts:

1. Introduction
2. Site description
3. Application proposal
4. Relevant planning policy
5. Policy Consideration
6. Conclusion

- 1.3 As the proposal relates to a ‘householder development’, there is no national requirement to submit a planning statement to support the application. In addition, whilst the Council has a Local Validation List, the List is considered out of date as per the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015, Article 11 2(e) and 3(d).
- 1.4 The focus of this planning statement is therefore limited to the matter of the sites location in the Green Belt. The statement is to be read in conjunction with drawings and reports submitted as part of this planning application RJ Design (NW) Ltd.

2. SITE DESCRIPTION

- 2.1 The application site comprises a detached residential dwelling and outbuilding (barn) set within a modest plot. Access to the site is from Prescott Road, which is to the east of the site. A residential dwelling (Red House Farm) and a residential dwelling and equestrian centre (Lower House Farm) are sited respectively to the north and east of the application site. Open fields lies beyond the western and southern boundaries.
- 2.2 The dwelling house appears to benefit from full permitted development rights as per the General permitted Development Order (2015) as amended.
- 2.3 The site is not within an Article 2(3) land or subject to any Article 4 directions. The site is not Listed by Historic England or Locally Listed. The site does lie within the Green Belt.

2.1 PLANNING HISTORY

2.1.1 The Council's website highlights an extensive planning history for the site however, the most pertinent application relevant to this proposal is:

- 15/00803/CLU - Certificate of Lawfulness for the existing use of building and land as residential curtilage – Granted 4th February 2016.

3. APPLICATION PROPOSAL

3.1 This application relates to the demolition and erection of a replacement outbuilding within the residential curtilage of White House Farm.

4 RELEVANT PLANNING POLICY

4.1 At the time of writing, the adopted Development Plan comprises:-

- Knowsley Local Plan Core Strategy 2016
- Knowsley Replacement Unitary Development Plan 2006 (saved policies)

4.2 There are additional documents that are material considerations which are:

- National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2021
- Design Quality in New Development SPD 2016
- Householder Development SPD 2016

4.3 Whilst the Development Plan is to be read as a whole, the pertinent Green Belt policies that relate to this proposal are:

- CS2 – Development Principles
- CS5 – Green Belt
- H8 - Extensions and Alterations to Residential Properties
- G7 – Alteration, Extension or Replacement of Existing Dwellings in the Green Belt

4.4 Section 38(6) of the Town and Country Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 places a statutory duty on local planning authorities to determine planning applications in accordance with the development plan unless material planning considerations indicate otherwise. Section 39 of the Act requires decision makers to exercise their functions with the objective of contributing to the achievement of sustainable development.

THE NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY FRAMEWORK (2021)

The Presumption in favour of sustainable development

4.5 The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development. Achieving sustainable development means that the planning system has three overarching objectives; economic, social and environmental which are interdependent and need to be pursued in mutually supportive ways.

- 4.6 At the heart of the Framework is the ‘presumption in favour of sustainable development’. Paragraph 11 of the Framework states:

“... For decision-taking this means:

c) approving development where it accords with an up-to-date development plan, or where there are no relevant development plan policies; or

d) where the policies which are most important for determining the application are out-of-date, granting permission unless adverse impacts would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, or policies in the Framework indicate development should be restricted”.

- 4.7 Paragraph 12 of the Framework continues to state:

“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 (including any neighbourhood plans that form part of the development plan), permission should not usually 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”.

- 4.8 This statement will demonstrate that the proposal accords with the Green Belt policies in the adopted Development Plan and the proposal is not inappropriate development within the Green Belt.

5 POLICY CONSIDERATION

GREEN BELT

- 5.1 Paragraph 147 of the NPPF states that:

“Inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances”.

- 5.2 Paragraph 149 of the NPPF goes further to say:

“A local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate within the Green Belt. Exceptions to this are:

“... c) the extension or alteration of a building provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building;

“d) the replacement of a building, provided the new building is in the same use and not materially larger than the one it replaces...”

- 5.3 The Framework does not provide guidance on what is considered a disproportionate addition nor does it provide any guidance on what is considered to be materially larger.

5.4 Policy CS5 of the Knowsley Local Plan Core Strategy does not state within the policy what constitutes a disproportionate addition nor does it provide any detail on what constitutes ‘materially larger’. Policy CS5 generally reiterates the Green Belt guidance as set out in the Framework.

5.5 Saved Policy G7 (Alteration, Extension or Replacement of Existing Dwellings in the Green Belt) states:

“1. Proposals for the extension or alteration of an existing dwelling within the Green Belt, or for the construction of a detached garage or outbuilding within its curtilage, will be permitted provided that they meet the following criteria:

a) The form and materials of the development would respect the appearance of the existing dwelling and its setting, and preserve the openness of the Green Belt;

b) The development and any associated vehicular access routes, boundary treatment, garden, storage or vehicular parking areas would be provided without harming or unreasonably impacting on the amenity of any neighbouring property and the appearance of the surrounding area; and

c) In the case of proposals to extend an existing dwelling or for the construction of detached buildings within 5 metres of the existing dwelling, the proposal would not (either by itself or in conjunction with earlier developments) result in a disproportionate addition over and above the size of the original dwelling...”

5.6 The Householder Developments SPD whilst not policy¹, is a material consideration in the assessment of this application and provides guidance on what the Council considers appropriate additions to dwellings located in the Green Belt.

“... Policy G7 of the Unitary Development Plan requires that extensions to dwellings sited in the Green Belt are not, when taken together with previous extensions “disproportionate” in scale to the original dwelling. This is to prevent extensions eroding the openness of the Green Belt. The original house is the house as it existed on 1 July 1948 or as it was first built if it has been constructed since then. Disproportionate extensions are those which because of their scale and/or design change the character of the original dwelling should remain the dominant element. Where a dwelling proposed to be extended such that cumulative additions would amount to an increase on the original volume of over 50% these will normally be classed as disproportionate and unlikely to be allowed.”

APPLICANTS PROPOSAL AND IMPACT ON THE GREEN BELT

Existing Outbuilding

5.7 The existing outbuilding (barn) is, at its closest, sited approximately 2m from the existing dwellinghouse. The buildings footprint is approximately 7.5m x 13.6m. The building has a height of approximately 3.9m to eaves and maximum height of approximately 6m to ridge.

5.8 The outbuilding is within the residential curtilage and is used for the incidental enjoyment of the occupiers of the dwelling.

1 NPPF – Annex 2

Replacement Building

- 5.9 The proposed replacement outbuilding building will largely occupy the original footprint position as currently occupied by the building to be demolished which is approximately 2m from the existing dwellinghouse. It is intended to marginally re-orientate the building in a more Southerly direction to the benefit of green energy generation. The building will have a footprint measuring approximately 7.5m x 13.85m. The building will have a slightly lower eaves height, measuring approximately 3.8m. The building will have a maximum ridge height of approximately 6m.
- 5.10 A balcony at first floor level is proposed on the western elevation of the building. The balcony would have a project of approximately 1.2m and width of 7.5m.
- 5.11 Whilst there appears to be an absence within the adopted Development Plan of what is considered to be “materially larger”, notwithstanding the inclusion of the balcony, the existing outbuilding and replacement building are of a similar size.
- 5.12 The replacement outbuilding would be used for the incidental enjoyment of the occupiers of White House Farm and as such, would remain in the same use as the existing building that is proposed for demolition.
- 5.13 It is considered that owing to the size of the building even with the inclusion of the balcony on the west elevation, and proposed use of the development, there would be no harm to the openness of the Green Belt and as such, would not be inappropriate development within the Green Belt.
- 5.14 It is acknowledged that owing to the proposed siting of the replacement building (i.e. within 5m of the existing dwelling), the Council may assess the building in the context of saved Policy G7 – an extension / addition, albeit that it is a replacement outbuilding.
- 5.15 On that basis, it is not unreasonable to consider the volume of the existing building against the replacement outbuilding. The replacement outbuilding is, in volume, approximately 1.3% bigger than the existing building.
- 5.16 Owing to the fact that the replacement outbuilding would be offset against the existing outbuilding and would not be significantly materially larger in volume than the existing building, the replacement building would not result, and could not be considered, a disproportionate addition to the original dwelling.

DESIGN OF THE OUTBUILDING

- 5.17 The application is supported by a DAS and as such, this statement is not to supersede any content contained within that document but solely address matters of design in the context of the Green Belt.
- 5.18 Paragraph 130 of the Framework states:

“Planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments:

...b) are visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping;

c) are sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting, while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation or change (such as increased densities)...”

- 5.19 The proposed outbuilding has been designed to reflect the existing outbuilding and is proposed to be finished in materials that are sympathetic to the sites surroundings so not to appear incongruous.
- 5.20 The proposed balcony balustrade is to be constructed of steel post and horizontal rail/wire. Owing to its siting and open construction, the balcony will not harm the openness of the Green Belt. Similarly, whilst the proposed photovoltaic panels would sit on brackets on the southern plane of the roof, the installation of the panels would not impact upon the openness of the Green Belt.

6. CONCLUSION

- 6.1 Planning law requires that applications for planning permission be determined in accordance with the development plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.
- 6.2 Whilst the development is in the Green Belt, and by definition, the construction of new buildings should be considered inappropriate, the Framework at paragraph 149 does allow for exceptions to development in the Green Belt. This is further reiterated in the Knowsley Local Plan Core Strategy.
- 6.3 The replacement outbuilding will remain in the same incidental use as the existing building and will not be materially larger than that it is to replace. In addition, owing to the size of the building (volume), the replacement building would not be a disproportionate addition to the original dwellinghouse.
- 6.4 By virtue of the siting, design and use of the outbuilding, the replacement outbuilding does not appear incongruous in its surroundings, does not impact on the openness of the Green Belt nor does it give rise to any unacceptable levels of impact on adjacent / adjoining occupiers.
- 6.5 The proposal accords with Policies CS2 and CS5 of the Knowsley Local Plan Core Strategy and Saved Policies H8 and G7 of the Knowsley Replacement Unitary Development Plan and provisions of the Householder Development SPD and NPPF.
- 6.6 It is requested that planning permission is granted without delay.

