

EXTERNAL EMAIL - This email was sent by a person from outside your organization. Exercise caution when clicking links, opening attachments or taking further action, before validating its authenticity.

Secured by Check Point

From: Graham Lamb <graham.lamb@pegasusgroup.co.uk>
Sent: 10 September 2026 06:29:38 UTC+01:00
To: "Quinn, Mark" <mark.quinn@knowsley.gov.uk>
Cc: "Anna Chew" <achew@hallamland.co.uk>; "Laura Garcia" <Laura.Garcia@pegasusgroup.co.uk>
Subject: 25/00486/OUT - Hallam, Knowsley Village - Applicant Heritage Rebuttal to latest Growth Lancashire Comments & Proposed 'Slate Roof' Condition 35
Attachments: 25-00486-OUT Land at Knowsley Estate additional comments 3.pdf

Dear Mark,

Applicant Heritage Rebuttal to latest Growth Lancashire Comments & Proposed 'Slate Roof' Condition 35
25/00486/OUT - Hallam, Knowsley Village

As promised, please find below further commentary from our heritage lead Laura Garcia responding to the latest Growth Lancashire comments (dated 17th July) and the new NPPF (published 17th August 2026); whilst also commenting on the proposed 'slate roof' condition 35, which we do not consider to be reasonable or necessary.

Growth Lancashire Response (17/07/2026)

It is noted that the response acknowledges changes have been made to the Scheme to mitigate harms – this is welcomed. Whilst it might be the opinion of Growth Lancashire that these amendments do not go as far as they may wish in reducing harm or addressing their concerns, it is the case that they acknowledge that changes have been made and reductions in harm have been achieved. This confirms the position of the applicant in that this Scheme has been through a number of iterations and design changes to try to address heritage concerns and the Scheme has materially changed since the very first layouts in direct response to heritage concerns. This is a Scheme which has made serious efforts to minimise heritage harm where possible.

The response states that the proposals remain largely reflective of the original scheme, with only limited amendments made to specific areas. The changes made were in direct response to the previous Growth Lancashire comments which really only focussed on the areas of the width of the buffer along the southern edge and the density of the housing in the northeastern portion of the Scheme – as such, the changes made were never intended to be a wholesale revision of the layout but, rather, changes focussed on the heritage comments and this focussed on the discrete areas identified and discussed with Growth Lancashire.

Growth Lancashire accept that the revisions have produced a lower density of housing in the northeastern corner. They state they still feel this will be harmful and highly notable within the setting of the Home Farm complex. On this, I would note the Home Farm complex is now known as the Stanley Grange Business Village, a modern business park surrounded by car parking. I would also state that we acknowledge and accept harm arising from this element of the Scheme – and so we are essentially agreed on this matter. Importantly, the changes in layout have gone towards minimising harm by lowering the density of the dwellings and creating a specific character area to reflect the sensitivity of this location in heritage terms.

Whilst it is stated by Growth Lancashire that the ‘scheme has not been amended to such an extent that it would materially reduce or alter the level of harm previously identified in my comments’, it is nevertheless the case that the Scheme has been amended. Growth Lancashire set out no meaningful discussion as to why these amendments do not satisfy their requirements, nor do they engage with any of the points made in the Planning and Heritage Statement submitted in June 2026 which made a number of important submissions on the harm to heritage assets.

*Nevertheless, and as stated in meetings and in our documentation, fundamentally we are in agreement with the Growth Lancashire position that the scheme will cause harm to designated heritage assets - previously less than substantial but in the terms of the 2026 NPPF we would likely agree this harm to be in the harm category as per **HE5.2c** and as such, this harm is required to be balanced (as per old NPPF but carried over into new NPPF) as per policy **HE6.4** where the public benefits are balanced against an appropriately weighted harm.*

I would just also point out in the conclusions of the response the erroneous direction for the decision-maker to have regard to S72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 – the Scheme is not in a Conservation Area and the statutory duty does not extend to setting of Conservation Areas.

Proposed ‘Slate Roof’ Condition 35

In terms of the proposed condition 35 specifying a requirement for natural slate roofs for dwellings closest to Croxteth Lodge and Home Farm, we consider that this level of detail in the condition is unnecessary at this stage. The discussion regarding materials can be had at the reserved matters stage and the condition can be worded such that it simply refers to matters relating to roofing materials to be agreed with the LPA. To specify natural slate roofing at this stage is both premature and disproportionate. The Scheme is not within a Conservation Area and located far enough away from Croxteth Lodge for there not to be any co-visibility where the roofing material is a clear and present element. Imitation materials are much improved in quality and visual appearance and are no longer the ‘poor relation’ of the natural materials but are instead a very good proxy. Again, these are discussions which can be had at the reserved matters stage where full consideration can be given to a range of materials.

I trust the above is clear and happy to discuss further with yourself/ Jo/ Alan as appropriate.

Kind regards,
Graham

Graham Lam

b

Senior Director - Planning

E graham.lamb@pegasusgroup.co.uk

M 07557 160596 | **T** 0161 393 339

9

Queens House | Queen Street | Manchester | M2 5H

T



Expertly Done. [LinkedIn](#) | [Instagram](#) | [Our Charity](#) | [Our Website](#)

Offices throughout the UK and Ireland. We are ISO certified 9001, 14001, 45001, 27001. Pegasus Group is the trading name of Pegasus Planning Group Ltd [07277000] registered in England and Wales. Registered Office: 33 Sheep Street, Cirencester, GL7 1RQ. This email and any associated files, is intended for the exclusive use of the addressee only. If you are not the intended recipient you should not use the contents nor disclose them to any other person. If you have received this message in error please notify us immediately. We have updated our Privacy Statement in line with GDPR; please click hereto view it.

Please exercise extreme caution with attachments and website links or instructions to undertake financial transactions.