

<u>APPLICATION NO:</u>	25/00677/FUL	<u>CASE OFFICER:</u>	Reece Black
<u>WARD:</u>	Whiston & Cronton	<u>PARISH:</u>	Cronton Parish Council
<u>LOCATION:</u>	4 Wheatfield Road, Cronton, Knowsley		
<u>PROPOSAL:</u>	ERECTION OF A SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION, LOFT CONVERSION WITH A FLAT ROOF REAR DORMER, CREATION OF 2 NO. FRONT DORMERS AND REPLACEMENT OF EXISTING GARAGE		

Site Description

The application site is located at 4 Wheatfield Road, Cronton and is situated within a Primarily Residential Area in the Development Plan. The application property is a semi-detached bungalow, served by a dual-pitched roof. The property benefits from a single storey rear extension and a modestly sized detached garage structure to the bottom of the rear garden.

The front garden area is hard surfaced with patio paving slabs to provide off-street parking for a single vehicle. At its shallowest (when measured from the rear elevation of the existing rear extension) the garden has a depth of 16.8m. The plot is an irregular rectangle in shape.

The application property sits within a (roughly) uniform building line, and the street scene is characterised by similar semi-detached bungalows, some of which have been extended. Immediately to the rear of the site is an unadopted access track which facilitates access to a set of detached garages and serves the rear gardens of properties in the street scene.

The site is identified as being located within a coal (low-risk) area.

Proposal

The proposal is for the erection of a single storey rear extension, loft conversion with a flat roof rear dormer and creation of 2 no. front dormers together and the replacement of the existing garage.

The proposed rear extension would projection of 4.1m from the original rear wall and be 7.2m wide. This would be served by a flat roof, with a height of 3m from ground level. This roof would include the installation of 3 no. roof lights, with a maximum height of 3.2m.

The proposed rear dormer projection would span a depth of 3.4m, with a width of 6.8m and a height of 2.2m. The rear dormer would be set-in from the roof edge by 0.4m and set-back from the rear elevation by 0.5m.

The proposed 2 no. front dormers would each project in depth by 3.1m, with a width of 1.3m and a height of 2.2m. These dormers would be set-in from the roof edge, by 1m and set-back from the front elevation by 1m.

The proposed replacement garage would be sited to the rear of the garden and would measure 7.3m by 3.2m and occupy a footprint of 23.3sqm. This external store would be served by a flat roof, with a very shallow pitch and at its tallest measure 2.6m in height.

The existing rear extension and detached garage structure would be demolished to make way for the proposed development.

The application has seen amendments; however, these amendments are minor in nature or do not result in any greater material impact than originally submitted and therefore, it was not considered necessary for any additional neighbour notification or publicity.

Consultations

Highway Authority: – No objections.

Cronton Parish Council: – No comments received.

Representations

This application has been publicised by letters sent to 10 neighbours and by site notice. No representations have been received.

Planning History

No relevant recorded planning history.

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.

The site is identified as a site allocated for housing development in the adopted Unitary Development Plan. As such, a domestic extension to the existing residential property is considered acceptable in principle, subject to compliance with local planning policy and guidance.

KNOWSLEY LOCAL PLAN: CORE STRATEGY

CS2 - Development Principles

CS19 - Design Quality and Accessibility in New Development

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

H5 - Development within Primarily Residential Areas

H8 - Extensions and Alterations to Residential Properties

SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENTS (SPDs)

Householder Development (2016)

New Residential Development SPD (2018)

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

Saved Policy H8 in the Replacement Unitary Development Plan states that proposals for extensions to dwellings will be permitted provided that:

- a) The proposals would not (due to their scale and massing) result in a disproportionate addition to the original dwelling
- b) The design and materials used would reflect those used on the original dwelling
- c) The proposal would not adversely affect the amenity or privacy of occupiers of adjacent dwellings
- d) The proposal would not create potential hazards for highway users by obstructing visibility for pedestrians or drivers of motor vehicles; and
- e) Adequate parking and garden space would remain in use by the residents of the extended property

6.19 of the Householder Development SPD states that *extensions must adequately protect your neighbours' right to enjoy their own home. Extensions must not overshadow or have an overbearing impact on neighbouring dwellings to an unacceptable degree.*

DESIGN AND RESIDENTIAL AMENITY

Rear extension:

The Householder Development SPD states that *rear extensions should be designed to avoid causing overshadowing, loss of outlook or loss of privacy to the neighbours, or appear unduly dominant to neighbours. A single storey rear extension located on or immediately adjacent to the party boundary with a neighbouring dwelling will normally be acceptable if it does not project more than 4m from the rear elevation of the existing dwelling.*

The proposed rear extension would project from the original rear elevation by 4.1m, which would be a very minor 0.1m surplus of this policy requirement, this small excess would not be appreciable and would raise no residential amenity concerns.

The proposed rear extension would be set-in from the party boundary shared with No.2 Wheatfield Road by 0.4m and would only surpass the rear extension of No.2 by 1.5m. Therefore, it is considered that the proposed rear extension would not result in any significant impact to the living conditions and residential amenities of No.2.

The proposed rear extension would be set-off the party boundary shared with No.6 Wheatfield Road by 1m and a distance of 2.2m from No.6's side elevation. The existing boundary treatment between the two properties comprises of a low 1m tall brick boundary wall. Notwithstanding this however, as the proposal is only 0.1m beyond the policy requirement and its impact further offset due to the fact the properties are detached with a separation distance of 2.2m retained, it is considered that the proposed rear extension would not result in any significant harm to residential amenities by way of presenting unduly dominant or enlarged and would not cast any significant overshadowing. The side elevation of the rear extension of No.6 contains a door, however, as the proposed rear extension contains no side windows (with any openings concentrated to the rear elevation), no concerns of overlooking or visual intrusion are raised.

Whilst the proposed rear extension would be served by a flat roof, which the Householder Development SPD, generally advises against, it is considered that given the proposal is for a single storey rear extension, it would not be readily visible from the street scene and contained to the private rear garden area. Therefore, the design of a flat roof would be acceptable in this instance.

Rear dormer:

The Householder Development SPD outlines that *a dormer extension must not project above the ridgeline of the dwelling and that a dormer should normally be set back at least 1m from the main elevation if relates to, when measured on the horizontal line and 0.5m from the roof edge on either side, to prevent it having an overbearing effect on the street scene and adjoining dwellings.*

The proposed rear dormer extension would have an acceptable scale and not appear unduly dominant or enlarged on the roofscape due to incorporating design breaks such as the set-backs and set-ins. Whilst the proposed rear dormer would not fully comply with the SPD guidance, as it would be set-back 0.5m and set-in of 0.3m (to the edge of the roof) and therefore have a shortfall of 0.5m and 0.2, on this occasion however, it is considered that the shortfall would be acceptable. This is because the proposal has been reduced in its scale, during the assessment phase of the application, to ensure it would more closely accord with the guidance. As originally

submitted, both the set-in and set-back was 0.1m. Therefore, the amendments secured would reduce any visual impact from the scale and size of the dormer.

Moreover, the proposed dormer would be sited to the rear and therefore not be readily visible and generally concealed from the street scene. Also, given that it would be set 0.2m below the ridgeline of the original dwelling, it would further ensure that the proposal would be a subordinate addition to the dwelling. For these reasons, it is considered that the proposed rear dormer would be acceptable in scale, form and massing. The proposed dormer would be faced in stained timber boarding, whilst this would not be entirely in keeping with the existing materials of the dwelling, the use of this material is not an unconventional choice for dormers, and as found to other rear dormers in the street scene. Given this dormer would not be on a prominent elevation, (given it is sited to the rear elevation) it would not result in any significant design issues or harm to the street scene.

Regarding outlook from the rear dormer, there are no residential properties immediately beyond the application site in direct views. The proposed dormer would result in a higher vantage point to the rear elevation which would facilitate elevated views into the rear gardens, however, this would predominantly be focused to the bottom of the rear gardens given any openings are concentrated to the rear elevation. Moreover, given the low boundary treatments along the boundary, it would not be considered that the proposed rear dormer would facilitate any significantly greater views into the adjacent rear gardens than the existing relationship.

Front dormers:

The Householder Development SPD stipulates that front dormers should be avoided unless they are characteristic of the building or locality. Where front dormers are proposed, particular attention needs to be given to design. A number of smaller dormers, as appropriate to the scale of the building, may be more successful than one large dormer. Dormers should be faced in materials which match the original roof coverings. Flat roof dormers will not be acceptable on front elevations or any elevation clearly visible from a public vantage point.

The proposed 2 no. front dormer projections would be pedimented dormers in design, which would be acceptable to their location and demonstrates particular consideration for their design. The proposed pedimented dormers would be small in scale and bulk, and in line with the policy guidance, by being small dormer window projections, conserve the roofscape and character of the dwelling by avoiding one enlarged and homogeneous dormer to a prominent elevation in the street scene. Moreover, other dwellings in the street scene, namely No's 24, 27 and 28 contain small, pedimented dormers to their front elevations and therefore are established as characteristic of the locality. The proposed front dormers would be externally faced in vertical hanging tile to match the existing front roof slope and also served by pitched roofs. This would further ensure that their design is in character to the dwelling and enhance this prominent (front) elevation. Therefore, the proposed 2 no. front dormers would positively integrate with the locality and not detract from the wider character of the street scene.

The New Residential Development SPD, Appedix 4: Interface Distances and Private Amenity, Criterion 1 outlines that *development should retain 22 metre interface distances between existing rear principal rear elevations and proposed principal elevations for two storey properties. Where proposed properties are higher than 2 storeys (including significant level changes), an extra 3 metres per floor should be added.*

The front elevation of the property is orientated to face the front elevation of No.3 Wheatfield Road at an existing interface distance of 22m. The proposed development would be set-back from the front elevation of the application property by 1m and therefore would ensure that an interface distance of 23m is retained, which would ensure that adequate levels of residential amenities and privacy to the occupiers of No.3 would be protected.

Detached garage:

The Householder Development SPD outlines that *the overall scale of the development should not look out of place in the street scene or other immediate environment*. Specifically for the assessment of this application, the SPD asserts that *garages, sheds and other detached buildings should normally be behind the building line or be well screened by hedging or similar landscape treatment*.

The proposed detached garage would be located to the bottom of the rear garden and therefore not be readily visible from the street scene. The proposal would be located to the same location as the existing, albeit, the proposed replacement garage would be reorientated to span the width of the rear of the plot. The proposed building would occupy a footprint of 23.3sqm whilst the (extended) dwellinghouse would occupy a footprint of 86sqm. Therefore, in terms of the footprint of the proposed building, it would be incidental in scale, furthered by the fact that it is single storey, which would ensure it retains a subordinate scale, both to the application dwelling and the other properties in the locality.

Moreover, the immediate character of the area comprises of detached garages and outbuildings, within rear gardens of properties. The proposed building would ensure that adequate space would be retained between itself and the application dwelling, along with suitable available garden space retained in between, to prevent a cramped appearance within the plot and ensure that no overdevelopment would occur. The proposal would be acceptable in the locality and would not appear incongruous seen in context with other outbuildings / garages.

The proposal would be finished with off-white render to the walls, dark grey single-ply roof membrane and white P-vcu window and door. The east facing elevation (which facilitates access to the access track behind the site) would contain a standard white aluminium 'up-and-over' garage door. These materials would be acceptable for the proposed garage building and not raise any design or visual amenity concerns.

HIGHWAYS

The Householder Development SPD outlines that 2-3 bedroomed properties should be able to accommodate 2 no. vehicles within the curtilage of the dwelling.

The NPPF (Paragraph 116) states *development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network, following mitigation, would be severe, taking into account all reasonable future scenarios*.

The existing dwelling contains 2 no. bedrooms to the ground floor. Whilst the proposed development would introduce a third bedroom to the property with the loft conversion, the ground floor would be internally reconfigured with 'bedroom 2' on the existing floor plan being removed to allow for a kitchen extension. The existing parking provisions at the application property consist of a singular off-street parking

space to the front of the property. Therefore, the proposal would not materially increase the number of bedrooms at the property and consequently, the application would not require any additional or replacement in-plot parking provision as the proposal would not be considered to generate any significant demand for additional parking or cause any highway safety issues.

The proposed garage building was slightly amended in its siting and location and brought forward by 0.6m to ensure that there would be no conflict with the detached garages at the end of the access track which runs behind the application site, which as originally submitted, may have caused conflict opening the garage door and accessing the garage closest to the proposed building. Since the amendments have been secured, it is considered that no such conflict would now occur due to the fact that the proposed building being located so it no part would now obstruct the front elevation of the adjacent garages.

This view is supported by the Local Highway Authority (LHA) who were consulted on the application and raise no objections to the proposal. The Highways consultation also recommended an informative pertaining to '*damage to the highway*' from works during construction, however, given the scale of the proposal, it would not be considered necessary to include such an informative. Therefore, the proposal would not raise any adverse highway safety or inadequate parking concerns.

OTHER ISSUES

COAL CONSULTATION ZONE

The application property is located within a coal consultation zone (low-risk area). For the benefit of the applicant, a standard informative will be included with some standing advice on this.

ENCROACHMENT

The proposed garage building comes within 0.15m from the party boundary shared with No.2 Wheatfield Road. The agent has confirmed that no part of the proposed development will encroach (by way of gutter or roof overhang, or the foundation spread) onto land outside of the ownership of the application site. For the benefit of the applicant, however, given the close proximity to the boundary, an informative will be included for their benefit.

Conclusion

The proposal would be acceptable in terms of design, residential amenity and highways. The proposal also complies with the relevant Core Strategy, Replacement UDP policies and guidance in the NPPF and is therefore recommended for approval subject to conditions.

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 proposed extensions and detached garage, hereby permitted, shall match those of the existing building in type, size, colour and texture, unless otherwise agreed by the agreed details approved on the plans contained within Schedule 1.

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
16/03/2026	25-032_PL-06	REV B	PROPOSED GROUND FLOOR PLAN
16/02/2026	25-032_PL-07	REV A	PROPOSED FIRST FLOOR PLAN
16/03/2026	25-032_PL-13	REV A	PROPOSED EXTERNAL STORE ELEVATIONS
16/02/2026	25-032_PL-12	REV A	PROPOSED STORE SITE PLAN
24/02/2026	-	-	LOCATION PLAN
17/03/2026	25-032_PL-08	REV A	PROPOSED FRONT ELEVATION
23/03/2026	25-032_PL-09	REV B	PROPOSED REAR ELEVATION
23/03/2026	25-032_PL-10	REV D	PROPOSED SIDE ELEVATION
17/03/2026	25-032_PL-14	REV C	EXISTING AND PROPOSED SITE AND ROOF PLANS

Signed Case Officer¹: Reece Black

Signed Authorising Officer²: Jo Sheridan

Date: 24/03/2026

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

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

- 2 The granting of planning permission does not confer consent to encroach on any neighbours land and would be a civil matter between the affected parties. Consideration should be given to this in respect of any gutters potentially overhanging over shared boundaries.