

Regeneration and Economic Development Department

APPLICATION NO: 21/00848/FUL **APPLICANT:** Mr David Hughes

WARD AFFECTED: Halewood North

DEVELOPMENT: ERECTION OF A TWO STOREY SIDE AND REAR EXTENSION

LOCATION OF SITE: Newpale Farm, Whitefield Lane, Tarbock Green, Knowsley, L35 1QX,

KNOWSLEY LOCAL PLAN ALLOCATION –

RELEVANT POLICIES

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)

H8 - Extensions and Alterations to Residential Properties

G7 - Alteration, Extension or Replacement of Existing Dwellings in the Green Belt

TECHNICAL CONSULTATIONS:

Tarbock Parish Council - No comments received.

NEIGHBOUR NOTIFICATION:

This application has been publicised by letters sent to 6 neighbours. No representations have been received.

ARTICLE 35

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.

ISSUES AND ASSESSMENT:

PROPOSAL

This application is for the erection of a two-storey side and rear extension to the southern side and rear of this rendered detached house off Whitefield Lane and in the Green Belt. It would partly replace an existing single storey element built as part of the original dwelling to the side. The dwelling was approved in 2003 as a replacement farmhouse (03/01110/FUL). Permission was granted in 2006 (06/00416/FUL) for a first-floor side extension above the existing single-storey element but this was not implemented. A further part two storey and part first floor extension to the side and rear of the house was approved in 2008 (08/00518/FUL) which was not implemented.

The current application is similar as the 2008 approval in terms of footprint/volume. The current proposal would comprise an open plan dining room/living room area, with a 'morning study' area at the front. To the first floor would be a master bedroom with dressing room off, landing with linen store and a bathroom at the front. The ground floor would be set back approximately 2m from the front of the house and would project 2.7m at the rear, with a width of 6.05m at the front and a width of approximately 9.9m at the rear. The existing side extension comprises an office at the rear, together with a utility room and W.C, plus an entrance and corridor. There is an access door from the office into the main house. utility

Document Reference	Document Issue Number	Document Issue Date
PS/DC/OP04/05	003	23/9/02

room and W.C would remain but would be remodelled with the utility room at the front and W.C behind. The office would be incorporated into the proposed extension, which is why the propose extension is wider at the rear than the front.

The proposed bathroom would be above the utility room and W.C adjoining the front of the house. The roof would be sloping and tied into the roof of the house, and approximately 0.86m lower. The bathroom window would project approximately 0.5m above eaves and have a back sloping roof tying back into the main roof of this part of the extension, similar to other first floor widows of the existing house. The remainder of the extension would have a pitched roof tied into the main roof of the house and would be approximately 0.46m lower. The front window of the proposed bedroom would project approximately 0.52m above eaves with a back sloping roof tying back into the main roof of this part of the extension. The roof of the rear of the extension would comprise two pitched roofs piking back into the main roof of this part of the extension.

Facing materials are to match the existing house.

POLICY CONSIDERATIONS

The application complies with the above noted planning polices.

Saved Policy G7 of the UDP indicates that proposals to extend an existing dwelling or for the construction of detached buildings within 5 m of the existing dwelling should not result in a disproportionate addition over and above the size of the original dwelling. This reflects national guidance in the NPPF which states that this would be inappropriate development that should only be approved if the harm caused to the Green Belt and any other harm is clearly outweighed by 'Very Special Circumstances'.

The written explanation to policy G7 states that extensions to dwellings in the Green Belt can be appropriate provided that they do not change the fundamental character and scale of the original dwelling. It further states that as a general guideline enlargements (either through extension or replacement of the dwelling) of over 50% will not be allowed. The size of the "original dwelling" is defined as "That which existed on 1 July 1948 or the dwelling as originally built if this was later". Extensions should remain clearly subordinate in scale and design and the original property should remain the dominant element.

This application proposes an extension which would be approximately 62% of the original dwelling and is therefore inappropriate development in the Green Belt which should only be approved if there are Very Special Circumstances.

As set out in this report, a two-storey extension was previously approved which had a volume of approximately 50% more than the original building. The current scheme is largely the same as the previous approval in terms of overall scale and mass, but it has a greater volume because of changes to the roof design at the rear with pitched roofs piked into the main roof, and with the gable end rather than the mansard style end previously approved.

It is not considered that the changes to the roof have a significantly greater impact on the openness or purposes of including land in the Green Belt and there has been no material change in Green Belt policy relating to household extensions since permission was granted in 2008.

The extension would be largely shielded by a large industrial/commercial type shed to the front of it, whilst the house is set a considerable distance from Whitefield Lane and there is a solid 2m high boundary treatment with solid electric gate across the front of the business yard area which the house is sited to the rear of. The extension would only be readily visible from Whitefield Lane travelling from the raised part which is over the M62 motorway southwards towards Netherley Road and Tarbock.

As such the amended roof would not be readily visible and on balance given the site's planning history it is considered that the previous permission, changes to the extension and its limited visibility constitute very special circumstances that outweigh the harm caused to the Green Belt and complies with Policy G7.

Document Reference	Document Issue Number	Document Issue Date
PS/DC/OP04/05	003	23/9/02

DESIGN, ACCESS AND CRIME PREVENTION

The design of the proposal is acceptable and broadly in character with the existing house. It is a wide extension at 9.6m wide, with the house being 12.4m wide not taking into account the existing single storey side element. However, the front elevation is partially screened from the front by the large shed building at the front and impact is also lessened by the distance from the highway and the solid high boundary fencing/gates across the front of the commercial part of the site which the house is situated at the rear of, and the high wall to the rear and side boundary of the curtilage of the house. The roof of the extension would be set down below the existing building and would appear subordinate to it. As such it is considered that it is not a disproportionate extension, and it is in keeping with the existing building with design and materials. It would not detract from the visual appearance of the house or be detrimental to the visual amenity of the area and would not harm the Green Belt or its openness. The proposal raises no crime or anti-social and the development is considered to comply with

HIGHWAYS

There is a large parking area in front of the curtilage of the house that also serves the commercial area between the front of the house and Whitefield Drive, including the large industrial type building (05/00890/COU - retention of use of building for blind manufacture, car hire storage and stone manufacture. Granted: November 2005 although in 2008 the building was signed as a furniture clearance centre. There are no other highway issues.

RESIDENTIAL AMENITY

The house stands away from other residential properties, with the closest being 84 Whitefield Lane. This house is adjacent the carriageway footway and over 50m from the nearest point of the existing house with the industrial/commercial building between. As such the proposal would not affect the residential amenity of any dwellings.

CONCLUSION

The proposal would be acceptable in design and would not be detrimental to visual amenity or impact on residential amenity. The proposal would have acceptable impacts on the Green Belt and its openness. It would be acceptable in terms of the character and appearance of the area and raises no highway issues. The proposal is very similar to an extension approved in 2008 albeit with a different roof design. The proposal 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) Notwithstanding any submitted details 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.

Document Reference	Document Issue Number	Document Issue Date
PS/DC/OP04/05	003	23/9/02

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) Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any Order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification) No extensions/buildings under Schedule 2, Part 1 Classes A, B or E shall be erected unless on application to the Local Planning Authority, planning permission for such development has been granted.

Reason: To safeguard the character of the extension and the openness of the Green Belt to comply with Policies CS2, CS5 and CS19 of the Knowsley Local Plan Core Strategy adopted January 2016 and saved Policies G7 and H8 of the Knowsley Replacement Unitary Development Plan adopted June 2006.

SCHEDULE 1

Date Received	Ref. No	Version	Drawing/Document Title
05/11/2021	-	-	Location Plan
05/11/2021	01481/SK/01	-	Proposed Site Plan
28/10/2021	01481/SK/02	-	Existing and Proposed Floor Plans and Elevations

Lee Osborne

14 March 2022

Alan Kilroe

15 March 2022

Document Reference	Document Issue Number	Document Issue Date
PS/DC/OP04/05	003	23/9/02