

<u>APPLICATION NO:</u>	25/00558/FUL	<u>CASE OFFICER:</u>	Lee Osborne
<u>WARD:</u>	Whiston & Cronton	<u>PARISH:</u>	Cronton Parish Council
<u>LOCATION:</u>	59 Chapel Lane, Cronton, Knowsley		
<u>PROPOSAL:</u>	ERECTION OF A SINGLE STOREY SIDE AND REAR EXTENSION TOGETHER WITH WORKS TO CHANGE ROOF FROM DOUBLE RIDGE TO A ROOF SLOPING UP EITHER SIDE TO FORM A CENTRAL FLAT TOP, LOFT CONVERSION AND CREATION OF A SIDE GARAGE.		

Site Description

The application site comprises a detached extended house with relatively large front and rear garden backing onto an agricultural field. There are trees in the front garden area, including an oak which has TPO protection in the south west corner of the site at the boundary with 61 Chapel Lane. There is a tree adjacent the site access in extremely poor health. To the rear of the site are fields. There is housing to the south, with the house to the north separated from the application site by a large garden. Chapel Lane consist of various housing types of; there are terraced, semi-detached and detached housing of differing designs and sizes/scale.

Proposal

The proposal is to undertake works to the roof to change the roof from a double ridge roof with the lower ridge to the rear of the higher front ridge to form a single ridge roof together with a loft conversion of the changed roof and installation of two small dormers on the rear plane of the roof. It is also proposed to erect an extension on the side to form dressing room and en-suite to an existing ground floor bedroom at the front with lounge extension to the rear. A rear extension is proposed to the rear of the existing dining room and adjoining the existing kitchen to square off the rear existing single storey element of the rear elevation. The proposed extension will form the kitchen with the existing kitchen forming part of an open lounge /diner. The existing extension at the side will have a small front extension and internally would be changed to form garage with study behind and at the rear a utility room; currently there are two bedrooms and a shower room in this part of the house.

The side extension would have dimensions of 11.6m deep and a width at the front of 4m widening to 4.1m at the rear and would be the depth of the main house. The extension would have a height to top of the roof of approximately 4.7m and eaves height of approximately 2.7m. The roof would extend out at the top and slope down to the side wall and be hipped at the front and back. There would be approximately 4.4m from the side elevation of the extension to the party boundary with 61 Chapel Lane.

The front extension to the front of the existing single storey side element of the house would be approximately 4m wide and 1.2m deep, the depth of the existing porch. It would be approximately 2.7m to eaves, as the existing structure, and the roof would be realigned to slope down to the front of this small extension.

The proposed alterations to the roof would infill between the valley caused by the existing double ridge roof and run across from slope to slope (like a cut off gable roof) and the central part would be approximately 6.1m height and the same as the existing front ridge. The altered roof would slope up from the front, run across the centre part and slope down at the rear. On the back plane of the roof would be two small dormers with pitched roof. The dormers would have a width of approximately 1.9m and a height to the 'eaves' of approximately 1.2m with the pitched roof giving an overall height of approximately 2.1m. The dormers would be set in from the sides of the roof approximately 1.7m. Two roof lights would be fitted to the front slope of the roof.

The single storey rear extension would adjoin the existing single storey kitchen and 'square off' this element of the rear elevation of the house. The extension would have a width of approximately 4.7m and a depth of approximately 3.3m. The existing shallow sloping roof of the kitchen would be removed and a flat roof installed across the proposed and existing single storey element of the rear with a height of approximately 3.1m.

Consultations

Highway Authority – No objections.

Arboriculture – No objections subject to the tree report and appendices be approved documents and the recommendations implemented, including protective fencing.

Cronton Parish Council - No Comments Received

Representations

This application has been publicised by letters sent to 11 neighbours. It has also been advertised by site notice.

There has been 1 letter of support. The representations are summarised as follows: -

The author's objection and concern regarding the previous application has been overcome by removing side windows overlooking their property and therefore the author declares their support for a well thought out and designed revised application.

Planning History

K/APP/1609 - ERECTION OF ATTACHED GARAGE. Granted: 22.07.1976.

K/APP/6257 – FRONT PORCH. Granted: 22.09.1981.

25/00094/FUL - ERECTION OF A TWO STOREY SIDE, SINGLE STOREY REAR AND FRONT ROOF EXTENSION TO FORM SINGLE GARAGE TOGETHER WITH A NEW PITCHED ROOF AND ADDITIONAL PARKING PROVISION. Refused: 14.05.2025.

A Building Regulations application for a kitchen extension was approved 11.06.1976 (S76/0366).

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

CS21 – Greenspaces and Trees

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

DQ4 – Trees and Development

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 proposed extensions and works relate to an existing house and are acceptable in principle.

Green Belt Policy Consideration

Paragraph 143 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states the following:

Green Belt serves 5 purposes:

- (a) to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas;
- (b) to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another;

- (c) to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment;
- (d) to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; and
- (e) to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.

The proposal has been assessed against NPPF para. 153 and 154, Policies CS2, CS5, CS19 and CS21 of the Local Plan Core Strategy (2016) and Saved Policies G7, H8 and DQ4 of the Replacement Unitary Development Plan (2006), together with the Householder Development SPD (2016). These policies and guidance require that new development does not constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt or affect the openness of the Green Belt and instead demonstrates a high standard of design which does not adversely affect the character of the property or street scene; maintains a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants; avoiding overlooking and overshadowing, as well as not having an unacceptable overbearing impact; and that adequate parking and garden space would remain for use by residents of the extended property. Policies CS21 of the Core Strategy and DQ4 of the Replacement UDP relates trees and development.

NPPF para 153 states:

When considering any planning application, local planning authorities should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm to the Green Belt, including harm to its openness. Inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. 'Very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm resulting from the proposal, is clearly outweighed by other considerations.

NPPF para 154 states that development in the Green Belt is inappropriate and lists exceptions to that. One of the listed exceptions is '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.'

Saved Policy G7 of the UDP relates to alterations and extensions to existing dwellings within the Green Belt. The policy stipulates that extensions and alterations within the Green Belt will generally be permitted providing they meet certain criteria. The form and materials of the development should respect the appearance of the existing dwelling and preserve the openness of the Green Belt. In relation to the size of extensions in the Green Belt, the explanation goes on to state that enlargements of over 50 % will normally be classes as disproportionate. The size of the 'original dwelling' is defined as 'That which existed on 1 July 1948, or the dwelling as originally built if this is later'. Para 9.2 of the Householder Development SPD clarifies that this limit of 50% relates to volume.

The property has no architectural or historic significance or merits.

Taking the small outbuilding to the side of the building as being pre-1948 and approximately 71m³ and with the existing side extension being approximately 146m³ the net increase is approximately 75m². The proposed extension to this part of the dwelling would be approximately 15.1m³. The porch is approximately 9.7m³. Taking the kitchen extension as post 1948 based on the building regulations approval in 1976 the single storey extension (existing kitchen to be converted and the proposed extension) would be approximately 98m³. The proposed increase in volume to the roof would be approximately 59.7m³, with the dormers equating to approximately 9.2m³. The proposed side extension would be approximately 146m³. Therefore,, the

total increase above the original dwelling would be approximately 266.7m³. The original house, as covered by the double ridged roof, is approximately 533m³. If the outbuilding shown next to the house was post-1948 (as on 'volume calculations' submissiearliertaking that and all extensions into account, there would be an increase of approximately 63.4%; taking that building as pre-1948 and taking into account the previous extensions and the proposed there would be an approximate increase of 50%.

The rear extension would have little impact on the openness of the Green Belt as it would only be visible in reality from the field to the rear of the property with glimpses from adjacent sites whilst fencing would largely shield it from what would be restricted views from the public footway at the front. The proposed extension would just square of the extension already there across the rear elevation rather than it forming an 'outrigger' as at present. Likewise, the front extension to the existing side extension would be minimal, similar in scale to a large porch. Add to that that this would have the existing structure as backdrop and the impact on the openness of the Green Belt would be minimal. The roof alterations whilst unconventional (with the 'cut of gable' analogy) would be acceptable in the street scene and the 'cut off' has been proposed to minimise the height and the impact. It does provide a degree of rationalisation to the current double ridged, valley situation ad it is considered would not impact on the openness of the Green Belt to any significant degree. The installation of two small dormers on the rear would have little impact on the openness of the Green Belt and would not be readily available from public vantage points, maybe the side of the dormers could be visible from such if really seeking such out.

There is a large side garden where the proposed single storey side extension would be sited and 4.4m would be retained from the extension to the boundary. It is considered that with this distance still retained the erection of the side extension to an existing house would not adversely affect the openness of the Green Belt, with such extensions being common to houses in the Green Belt, and often with much less distance to the boundary.

As such and taking the lack of architectural merit of any worth of the existing house, and taking account the locations and mitigating designs incorporated, it is considered that the proposals taken with the existing would not result in unduly dominant extensions which would be result in disproportionate additions to it. It is considered therefore that the proposal would not fail to protect the openness of the Green Belt and therefore cause harm to the Green Belt. This view is taken with both scenarios, whether if 50% increase (in which case it would comply with policy) or the 63.4% increase, which would be 13.4% over the policy increase which is considered acceptable taking into account the mitigating considerations.

As such it is considered that with either scenario the aims of the Green Belt are not breached and would not fail to preserve openness.

Accordingly it is considered that the proposal overall complies with NPPF paragraphs 153 and 154, and Policy CS5 of the Core Strategy CS5 and Saved Policy H8 of the UDP, with the increase above 50% noted in Policy G7 justified and therefore not in conflict with that policy.

Design and Visual Amenity Considerations

The proposal has be designed so that there would not be a disproportionate impact on the dwelling and to minimise impact on the Green Belt.

The proposed single storey flat roofed rear extension and the tying in with the existing extension and the removal of the shallow roof of that extension to make the full rear extension flat roofed is acceptable in design and would be largely shielded from view other than from the field due to the main part of the house shielding it largely, the distance from the public highway and boundary fencing. It would not be detrimental to visual outlook or the visual amenity of the area.

The front extension to the existing side structure would tie in with that structure and be modest in scale. The extension design is acceptable, and the extension would not impact on the outlook of any neighbouring and would not be detrimental to visual amenity.

The revised roof of the main building, whilst unconventional with the proposed flat top middle area, would be acceptable in appearance, appearing as a gable without the point top from the side and with little noticeable difference from the existing roof viewed from the front. Viewed from the rear the roof would have a higher slope than the existing lower ridge rear roof and appear as a single slope rather than the two slope two ridge roof at present. The rear dormers with pitched roofs are acceptable in design and would be modest in scale. The change to the roof and the installation of the rear dormers would not be detrimental to the street scene or the visual amenity of the area.

The proposed side extension would be similar to the existing extension on the opposite side of the house in terms of overall design and appearance. The design of the extension is acceptable, and the extension would not impact on the outlook of neighbouring properties and would not be detrimental to the visual amenity of the area.

The proposals would comply with Policies CS2 and CS19 of the Core Strategy and saved Policies G7 and H8 of the UDP.

Residential Amenity Considerations

The proposals are to extend a house and as such raise no residential amenity concerns. The proposals would not lead to overlooking or loss of privacy issues. The application complies with Policies CS2 and CS19 of the Core Strategy and Saved Policy H8 of the UDP.

Highways Considerations

The proposed garage would be slightly less in length than usual at 4.9m internal depth and as such would not be useable for the average car, used more likely as storage. However there would be a hard surfaced parking area in the front suitable for three cars, meeting Council parking standards for dwellings of 4 bedrooms or more. The access would remain as existing. The Council Highways Engineer has confirmed that as there would be adequate parking and the access is existing no objections are raised. No other highways issues are raised.

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

Trees and BNG

There is a TPO tree within the property, in the south west corner at the boundary with 61 Chapel Lane. All trees within the property are to be retained with the exception of

a tree in poor health adjacent the access which will be removed. An Arboricultural Report has been submitted, including an impact study and method statement (as appendices). The report confirms that the trees (other than the tree to be removed due to poor condition) would be protected by protective fencing. It is considered that the removal of the poor condition tree is acceptable due to its condition. As the other trees are remaining and provide significant tree cover along the front boundary of the property, and the tree to be removed is due to the ill-health of the tree (and it could be hazardous if it naturally fell due to its health) it is considered that a replacement tree is unnecessary. The tree would need to be felled at some point due to its poor condition. The Council Arboriculturist has no objections to the proposal provided said tree report and appendices are approved documents and works are carried with the report recommendations implemented.

BNG is not a requirement with regards the proposal as the application is for extensions to a dwellinghouse and therefore exempt from BNG requirements.

The application, with mitigation for the tree loss, complies with Policies CS2 and CS21 of the Core Strategy and Saved Policy DQ4 of the UDP.

Conclusion

The proposals would not impact adversely on the openness of the Green Belt, are acceptable in design and with regards the appearance of the dwelling. The proposals would not be detrimental to visual outlook and visual amenity, or to the street scene. No residential amenity issues are raised, and the proposal would provide adequate parking. The loss of the tree is acceptable due to the poor health of the tree, and all other trees would remain. The proposal comply with planning policies, or do not conflict with such due to mitigation and justification, and the application is therefore recommended for approval.

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 roof works and extensions 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 Policies CS2 and CS19 of the Knowsley Local Plan Core Strategy adopted January 2016 and Saved Policy H8 of the Knowsley Replacement Unitary Development Plan adopted in June 2006.

- 4) The recommendations of the approved Arboricultural Report by IROS Arboriculture and the accompanying Arboriculture Appendices, shall be implemented at all times during construction works and the protective tree fencing identified shall be in place prior to works commencing and shall be retained as such at all times during construction works.

Reason: For the protection of trees and biodiversity, in the interests of visual amenity and to comply with Policies CS2, CS19 and CS21 of the Knowsley Local Plan Core Strategy adopted June 2016 and Saved Policy DQ4 of the Knowsley Replacement Unitary Development Plan adopted June 2006.

- 5) Five working days written notice shall be given to the Local Planning Authority before commencement of development of the works hereby granted.

Reason: To allow for inspection of the tree protection fencing required to be installed prior to commencement of development pursuant to condition 4 of this planning permission and to comply with Policies CS2 and CS21 of the Knowsley Local Plan Core Strategy adopted January 2016 and Saved Policy DQ4 of the Knowsley Replacement Unitary Development Plan

Reason: To allow the required protective tree protection fencing to be installed prior to commencement of works and inspected on site if deemed appropriate to comply with Policies CS2 and CS21 of the Knowsley Local Plan Core Strategy adopted January 2016 and Saved Policy DQ4 of the Knowsley Replacement Unitary Development Plan.

- 6) The parking provision shown on the approved drawing Proposed Site Plan - Drwg Nos. TCC/04 Rev B shall be installed prior to the first use of the side extension hereby permitted and shall be so retained as such thereafter. For the avoidance of doubt the hard surfaced parking area shall not drain onto the public highway and shall be of a permeable or porous material or drain to a porous or permeable area within the curtilage of the dwelling house.

Reason: In the interests of highway and pedestrian safety, to reduce surface water run-off and to ensure the development complies with Policies CS2 and CS19 of the Knowsley Local Plan Core Strategy adopted January 2016.

SCHEDULE 1

Date Received	Ref. No	Version	Drawing/Document Title
13/10/2025	-	-	LOCATION PLAN
09/10/2025	TCC03	A	PROPOSED ELEVATIONS
09/10/2025	TCC04	B	PROPOSED SITE PLAN
09/10/2025	-	-	ARBORICULTURAL REPORT (IROS ARBORICULTURE)
09/12/2025	APPENDIX 1	-	ARBORICULTURAL APPENDIX 1 - TREE SCHEDULE
09/12/2025	APPENDIX 2	-	ARBORICULTURAL APPENDIX 2 - EXISTING SITE PLAN

09/12/2026	APPENDIX 3	-	ARBORICULTURE APPENDIX 3 - TREE CONSTRAINTS PLAN
09/12/2025	APPENDIX 4	-	ARBORICULTURE APPENDIX 4 - IMPACT STUDY
09/12/2025	APPENDIX 5	-	ARBORICULTURE APENDIX 5 - METHOD STATEMENT

Signed Case Officer¹: **Lee Osborne**

**Signed Authorising
Officer²:** **Alan Kilroe**

Date: **12 December 2025**

Informatives

1. Any damage to the TPO protected tree or its roots is liable to enforcement action and prosecution.

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

