

<u>APPLICATION NO:</u>	25/00170/FUL	<u>CASE OFFICER:</u>	Lee Osborne
<u>WARD:</u>	Halewood North	<u>PARISH:</u>	Tarbock Parish Council
<u>LOCATION:</u>	Bosco Hall Farm, Ash Lane, Tarbock Green		
<u>PROPOSAL:</u>	ERECTION OF SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION (DEMOLITION OF CONSERVATORY)		

Site Description

This application relates to a detached two storey residential cottage situated within the Green Belt with a large garden area. There are fields to the rear and the front.

Proposal

The application seeks planning permission to remove the existing conservatory on the rear of the house and to erect a single storey extension where the conservatory is currently sited but extending to the gable of the house.

The extension would have a width of 6.2m and a depth of 2.7m. The extension would have a pitched roof with a height of 2.2m to eaves and 3.7m to ridge height. The extension would be rendered to match the existing house. The extension would provide living room accommodation.

The existing conservatory to be removed has a maximum width of 3.8m and a maximum depth of 2.8m with a maximum height of 2.5m.

Consultations

Tarbock Parish Council - No Comments Received

Representations

This application has been publicised by letters sent to 4 neighbours. No representations have been received.

Planning History

94/00757/APP - DEMOLITION OF EXISTING BARN AND ERECTION OF TWO STOREY SIDE. Granted: 20.02.1995.

01/00282/FUL - ERECTION OF CONSERVATORY TO REAR OF DWELLING. Granted: 01.06.2001.

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development plan without delay; or where the development plan is absent, silent or out of date planning permission should be granted unless the application of policies in the NPPF that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a clear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 - Extensions and Alterations to Residential Properties

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

The application is for the demolition of a conservatory on the rear of a house in the Green Belt and erecting a single storey extension on the rear of the property, and is acceptable in principle.

Green Belt Policy Consideration

The two-storey extension and the conservatory take the extensions to the property a little under 50% (not including agricultural outbuildings). The proposed extension would be wider than the conservatory at 6.2m, with the depth almost the same as the maximum depth of the conservatory at 2.7m (conservatory maximum depth 2.8m). The extension would have a pitched roof considerably higher than the roof of the conservatory at 3.7m to ridge (2.2m to eaves) with the conservatory being 2.5m to the top of the roof and 2.3m to eaves. However given that the extension would not project beyond the maximum depth of the conservatory and would extend up to and

not beyond the gable the extension would not impact on the openness of the Green Belt and not conflict with reasons for including land within it. It is therefore considered that the proposal does not conflict with NPPF paras 153 and 154, Policy CS 5 of the Core Strategy and Saved Policy G7 of the UDP.

Design and Visual Amenity Considerations

The design of the proposed extension is acceptable and broadly in keeping with the houses. The proposed extension would be more considerate with regards the setting and context of the site than the conservatory and would not be detrimental to the visual amenities of the area.

The application complies with Policies CS2 and CS19 of the Core Strategy and Saved Policies G7 and H8 of the UDP.

Residential Amenity Considerations

The application is to replace a conservatory with a larger single storey extension on the rear of a house and does not raise residential amenity concerns including privacy or overlooking issues.

The application complies with Policies CS2 and CS19 of the Core Strategy and Saved Policies G7 and H8 of the UDP.

Conclusion

It is considered that the proposed extension would not impact upon the openness of the Green Belt or the reasons for including land within and would improve the appearance of the dwelling given the context of the site and its location. The application does not conflict with Green Belt considerations and complies with planning policies, and is recommended for approval.

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.

SCHEDULE 1

Date Received	Ref. No	Version	Drawing/Document Title
21/03/2025	0001-01B	-	SITE LOCATION PLAN
14/03/2025	0001-06	-	PROPOSED BLOCK PLAN
21/03/2025	0001-03	A	PROPOSED ELEVATIONS AND PROPOSED GROUND FLOOR PLAN
21/03/2025	0001-04	A	PROPOSED ROOF PLAN
21/03/2025	0001-07	A	SECTION A-A

Signed Case Officer¹: Lee Osborne

Signed Authorising Officer²: Jo Sheridan

Date: 16/05/2025

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 Mining Remediation Authority on 0345 762 6846 or if a hazard is encountered on site call the emergency line 0800 288 4242.

Further information is also available on the Mining Remediation Authority website at: Mining Remediation Authority - GOV.UK

Standing Advice valid from 1st January 2025 until 31st December 2026

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

