

<u>APPLICATION NO:</u>	26/00306/FUL	<u>CASE OFFICER:</u>	Andrew Hunt
<u>WARD:</u>	Whiston & Cronton	<u>PARISH:</u>	Whiston Town Council
<u>LOCATION:</u>	Land To The North Of Unit 1, Symmetry Logistics Park, Merseyside, Colliery Way, Cronton, Knowsley, L35 3AA		
<u>PROPOSAL:</u>	ERECTION OF A CLOSE BOARD TIMBER FENCE TO THE NORTH OF UNIT 1 SYMMETRY PARK		

Site Description

The application site consists of a thin narrow strip of land to the north of the car park adjacent to unit 1 of symmetry park. To the north is a private road, with 3 dwellings beyond this (including the listed Old Halsnead), whilst there are trees to the south and the private road to the east. To the west is currently undeveloped land. The site is part of the wider symmetry business park and sustainable urban extension of Land South of the M62.

Proposal

The proposal is for the erection of a close boarded timber fence to the north of unit 1 symmetry park. The fence has a maximum height of 5 metres and would be 11.8 metres long from end to end measured directly. The length of the fence is slightly longer as it curves rather than being a straight line.

Consultations

Conservation – The fence would cause a low to moderate degree of harm to the setting of the Old Halsnead Grade II listed building.

Environmental Health – No objection. Environmental Health have received complaints in relation to vehicle lighting shining into the residential properties behind the development, associated with cars travelling along Symmetry Park Road up to the Yodel car park. With the erection of the close board timber fence the lighting issue would be resolved.

Representations

This application has been publicised by letters sent to 4 neighbours and by a site and press notice. No representations have been received.

Planning History

23/01679/ADV - ADVERTISEMENT CONSENT FOR THE DISPLAY OF SIGNAGE

CONSISTING OF 1NO. LOGO, 3NO. FASCIA BOARDS AND 3NO.
FREESTANDING INTERNALLY ILLUMINATED TOTEM SIGNAGE - 20.10.2023

Relevant Policy

Policy S3 (Presumption in favour of sustainable development) of the NPPF states that

1. Decisions on development proposals should apply a presumption in favour of sustainable development. This means:

a. Policy S4 in this Framework should be applied when considering development proposals within settlements;

b. Outside settlements, policy S5 should be applied; and

c. In all locations, development proposals that accord with both an up-to-date development plan and the decision-making policies in this Framework should be approved without delay.

Policy S4: Principle of development within settlements states that:

1. Development proposals within settlements should be approved unless the benefits of doing so would be substantially outweighed by any adverse effects, when assessed against the national decision-making policies in this Framework.

KNOWSLEY LOCAL PLAN: CORE STRATEGY

CS2 - Development Principles

CS19 - Design Quality and Accessibility in New Development

CS20 - Managing the Borough's Historic Environment

SUE2c - Sustainable Urban Extension – South of Whiston and Land South of M62

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

ENV3 – Light Pollution

NPPF (2026)

HE4: Securing the conservation of heritage assets

HE6: Proposals affecting designated heritage assets

P3: Living conditions and pollution

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

Heritage

The Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act) requires local planning authorities (LPAs) to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the architectural or historic interest of listed buildings, including their setting. The Act states LPAs should pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of conservation areas. LPAs should, in coming to decisions, consider the principal Act, which directly states the following:

Listed buildings – Section 66 (1)

In considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting, the local planning authority shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.

Policy HE4:2 of the NPPF states that any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset (including from development within its setting) should have a clear and convincing justification.

Policy HE6:4 of the NPPF allows LPAs to consider the level of harm against the public benefits generated by a proposal.

“4. Where a development proposal would harm the significance of a designated heritage asset the effect on the asset and its significance should be weighed against any public benefits resulting from the proposal. Important public benefits can include securing the long-term reuse of a vacant or underused listed building, and enabling energy efficiency and low carbon heating measures to be employed”.

The proposal would involve the erection of a 5m high fence, 40 metres away from Old Halsnead (at the nearest point of the outrigger). Old Halsnead is a Grade II listed building erected in 1680.

In relation to impacts of the proposal, the fence would be partially obscured by tall trees and hedges along the drive of Old Halsnead and would be seen against the backdrop of tall trees along the boundary with the business park and the tall unit 1 building beyond this. The fence would also be on the southern side of the private road. As a result, it is considered that there would be a low degree of harm to the setting of Old Halsnead.

The low level of the harm to the setting of Old Halsnead is considered to be

outweighed by the public benefits of the scheme, specifically the significant reduction in light pollution to the 3 dwellings to the north which currently experience severe light pollution from cars using headlights parking at unit 1 to the south.

This is supported by Environmental Health who have received complaints in relation to vehicle lighting shining into the residential properties behind the development, associated with cars travelling along Symmetry Park Road up to the Yodel car park. The current level of lighting pollution is considered to result in unacceptable light pollution impacts and to be significantly detrimental to residential amenity.

The erection of the close board timber fence, would resolve the lighting issue and would restore acceptable living conditions for neighbours.

There is no feasible alternative proposal which would have a lesser impact on the heritage asset, as if the fence were set back further, it would need to be much taller to achieve the same light reduction, cancelling out any reduced impact of being further away and being more visually prominent.

Overall, the proposal will result in a low level of harm to the setting of Old Halsnead listed building which is outweighed by the public benefits of the scheme which reduces unacceptable light pollution impacts on neighbours.

Street Scene

Part 1 of Core Strategy Policy CS19 (Design Quality and Accessibility in New Development) states that:

“To enhance the local distinctiveness, identity and accessibility of places, new development within Knowsley will be expected to:

a) Respond to and integrate positive characteristics of immediate surroundings, including local materials, scale, mass, form, layout, alignment and density of the existing built environment”;

The fence would be taller than most fences at up to 5 metres, but would not be readily visible from the south due to the tall trees on the boundary and the large building which would partly obscure views. To the north, the fence would be visible from a private road, but this is inaccessible to the public and set back from the street scene. The fence would therefore not be prominent in any publicly accessible viewpoints and would therefore not cause harm to the streetscene.

Overall, there would be no harm to the street scene from the proposal and it complies with Core Strategy Policy CS19.

Neighbour Amenity

Part 2 of Core Strategy Policy CS19 (Design Quality and Accessibility in New Development) states that:

“To maintain a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of

land and buildings, development proposals will be required to:

a) Avoid unacceptable impacts on existing residents, business occupiers, and future occupiers”;

UDP policy ENV3 (Light Pollution) states that:

“Development requiring external lighting must satisfy the following criteria:

d) There will be no unacceptable loss of residential amenity”

NPPF Policy P3: (Living conditions and pollution) states that:

“2. Within this context development proposals should:

a. Provide healthy living conditions for occupiers and users in terms of adequate access to light and avoiding exposure to levels of air, noise, artificial light or other sources of pollution which could have an unacceptable adverse effect on health and the quality of life. Where necessary suitable mitigation measures should be incorporated to secure acceptable living conditions;

b. Not give rise to, or contribute to, an unacceptable level of access to daylight and sunlight for neighbouring residents and occupiers, or unacceptable levels of air, noise, artificial light, water, soil or other forms of pollution on or beyond the site. Adverse impacts of this nature should be avoided where possible, or else mitigated to an acceptable degree. Where possible, opportunities should be taken to reduce pollution affecting the wider area (such as through traffic and travel management or improved external lighting”);

The current lighting on the wider site from cars using the car park, causes significant harm to amenity through unacceptable artificial lighting levels shining directly into properties. The proposal will substantially reduce the lighting impacts on neighbours to the north from cars on the car park, significantly improving their amenity and general living conditions. This is considered to be an important public benefit of the scheme.

In terms of loss of light or outlook, the fence will be sufficiently far away (located 25 metres away from the nearest property to the north) that it will not cause loss of light or outlook. The fence will also not impact on the amenity of the occupiers of unit 1 of the business park.

Overall, there would be a significant improvement to neighbour amenity from the proposal and it complies with Core Strategy Policy CS19.

Conclusion

The proposal would not result in a low level of harm in relation to heritage that would be outweighed by the positive impacts on neighbour amenity by reducing severe light pollution. The proposal would not adversely affect the street scene. The application complies with local planning policies and is 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) Plans

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.

Signed Case Officer¹: **Andrew Hunt**

Signed Authorising **Jo Sheridan**
Officer²: _____

Date: **12/10/2026**

SCHEDULE 1

Date Received	Ref. No	Version	Drawing/Document Title
24/06/2026	21588 THP XX XX DR A 1023	-	Proposed Fence Typical Details
24/06/2026	21588 THP XX XX DR A 1022	-	Proposed Site Plan
24/06/2026	21588 THP XX XX DR A 1020	-	Location Plan
24/06/2026	11-01 REV P04	-	Additional fence to northern boundary

Informatives

1 N/A

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