

<u>APPLICATION NO:</u>	25/00094/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 TWO STOREY SIDE, SINGLE STOREY REAR AND FRONT ROOF EXTENSION TO FORM SINGLE GARAGE TOGETHER WITH A NEW PITCHED ROOF AND ADDITIONAL PARKING PROVISION.		

Site Description

The application site comprises a detached extended house with relatively large front and rear garden backing onto an agricultural field. There are two trees to the front garden, one of which is adjacent the access and in poor health. There is housing to the south, with the house to the north separated from the application site by a large garden.

Proposal

The proposal is to erect a two-storey extension to the side of the house comprising lounge and bedroom to the ground floor with 2 bedrooms both with en-suites above, and a kitchen extension to the rear enlarging the current kitchen extension and removing the sloping roof of the existing kitchen extension and raising the height of the walls and a flat roof to the extended kitchen. It is also proposed to erect a single storey extension to the front of the existing single storey side extension and convert this extension from two bedrooms to a utility room, study and garage. The roof over the front extension would be extended across to the existing porch, with the existing pitched roof of the porch being removed.

The front extension to the existing side extension would have a width of 4.1m and a depth of 1.2m with a sloping roof extending 2.1m and supported by brackets, the existing extension would have a new roof linked into the roof of the front extension. The garage conversion would have an internal depth of 5.1m with an internal depth of 3.7m, 3m at the rear to account for the swing of the door into the house. The study would be to the rear of the garage and the utility room to the rear of that.

The proposed extension to the existing kitchen extension would be to the side of that extension. The proposed kitchen extension would have a width of 4.75m and a depth of 3.3m (approximately 1m deeper than the existing kitchen extension due to a slight step back of the rear elevation on the side of the house where the proposed extension is to be sited). The extended kitchen would be flat roofed with a height of 3.1m, the existing kitchen would have the sloping roof removed and the walls heightened. A balcony is proposed on the rear of the two-storey extension at first floor level although the applicant has indicated that this could be removed.

The two-storey extension would have a depth of 12.6m and a width of 5.2. The extension would extend above the existing main roofs of the house and have a pitched roof with the ridge running at 90 degrees to the ridges of the existing main

roofs. There would be approximately 3.2 - 3.3m from the gable of the extension to the neighbouring property, with a fence and gate installed between the gables of each.

Consultations

Cronton Parish Council - No comments received

Representations

This application has been publicised by letters sent to 5 neighbours.

There have been 2 letters of objection, the representations are summarised as follows: -

1. The window to be installed in the side of the existing extension would cause loss of privacy to the neighbouring house and garden.
2. The proposed two storey extension would cause a loss of privacy and daylight to the rear garden of the neighbouring property to which it is closest.

Planning History

K/APP/1609 - ERECTION OF ATTACHED GARAGE. Granted: 22.07.1976.
K/APP/6257 – FRONT PORCH. Granted: 22.09.1981.

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 with the proposal and discussing those with the applicant. However, the issues are so fundamental to the proposal that it has not been possible to negotiate a satisfactory way forward and due to the harm which has been clearly identified within the reason for the refusal, approval has not been possible.

Assessment

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

Green Belt Policy Consideration

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.

There has been a number of applications relating to the site; these are for an attached garage to the side of the house approved in 1976, a kitchen extension on the rear of the house (permitted development) granted Building Regulations in 1976 and a front porch granted in 1981. There is no garage on the side of the house however there is a single storey construction on the side of the house which is assumed was converted from the garage (in 2000 this was as currently existing), and which has a volume of 118m³. The kitchen extension has a volume of 50.9m³ and the porch has a volume of 7.4m³.

Taking the extended kitchen as one extension, discounting the previous kitchen extension (as it would form 1 flat roofed kitchen extension, with the existing extension having the sloping roof removed and heightened walls and tying in with the proposed) the kitchen would be 91.9m³. The extension to the front of the side extension would be 8.9m³ (although the sloping roof would be extended across over to the porch which would have the pitched roof removed). The proposed 2 storey extension on the side of the house would be 370m³. In total all extensions would be 596.3m³. The volume of the original house is 558.5m³; therefore, the volume increase of the extensions over the dwelling would be 106%.

It is considered that the proposal would ultimately result in additions to the dwelling which would be uncharacteristic of the original house and disproportionate to it. UDP Policy G7 advises that an extension of up to 50 % may be considered appropriate. However, this proposal would result in additional built form more than twice the 50 % allowance and which would fail to preserve the openness of the Green Belt. As such the application would fail to comply with NPPF paras 153 and 154, Policies CS2, CS5 and CS19 of the UDP and the Householder Development SPD.

Design and Visual Amenity Considerations

The design of the various elements is considered acceptable in principle, rather it is the cumulative impacts of the extensions and the overall size of the two-storey extension which is considered inappropriate in the context of the Green Belt location and the character of the dwelling as noted above. The materials would match the existing dwelling. It is not considered that the proposals would detrimentally affect the outlook of neighbouring properties. However, the proposals would substantially affect the appearance of the dwelling and by substantially closing the gap between the application house and 61 Chapel Lane, making the houses significantly closer together and as a result detrimentally impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the street scene.

The proposed application therefore conflicts with Policies CS2, CS5 and CS19 of the Core Strategy and Saved Policies H8 and G7 of the UDP together with the Householder Development SPD.

Residential Amenity Considerations

The neighbouring dwelling, 61 Chapel Lane, sits to the south of the property. The proposals would not impact detrimentally upon the residential amenity of that dwelling. Concern has been raised that the 2-storey extension (including the balcony) would give rise to loss of privacy of the rear garden of 61 Chapel Lane. The extension gable would be just over 3m from that neighbouring property, and there are some trees on the boundary which would offer some shielding during the summer months and the proposal would not be significantly detrimental to the privacy of the neighbouring garden (which would further be lessened if the omission of the balcony which was alluded to by the applicant). Due to the orientation and juxtaposition of the dwellings it is considered that the proposal would not have undue impact on the light to the rear garden of the neighbouring house.

Concern has been raised with regards the proposal to put the window in to allow light for the study, with loss of privacy to the adjacent garden and neighbouring house to the north cited. Such a window could be installed at present. The applicant has indicated that light to the study could be achieved by rooflight, or it could be conditioned that the window be obscure glaze and high opening which would overcome such concerns.

In terms of residential amenity impacts it is considered that the application complies with Policies CS2 and CS19 of the Core Strategy and saved Policies G7 and H8 of the UDP, and with the Householder Development SPD.

Highways Considerations

The existing access would be used, with the existing tree adjacent the access removed. However, the hardstanding would be extended into a hammerhead to allow 3 parking bays which would allow cars to enter and leave in forward gear, improving safety when exiting the property.

The proposal complies with Policies CS2 and CS19 of the Core Strategy and saved Policies G7 and H8 of the UDP.

Trees

There are 4 trees within the property. Three of the trees are A – C in terms of quality and health and are to be retained. However, the horse chestnut tree adjacent the access is decayed and in poor condition and this tree is to be removed. The tree does not offer significant amenity and it is considered acceptable for removal; the trees in decent health are to be retained. If approved a replacement tree or trees as replacement could be conditioned.

It is considered that the application in terms of the trees complies with Policies CS2 and CS21 of the Core Strategy and Saved Policy DQ4 of the UDP.

Conclusion

The proposed extensions, together with previous extensions, would result in a volume increase of approximately 106% over the original dwelling, exceeding the general 50% allowance as specified by the written explanation of Saved Policy G7 and considered uncharacteristic and disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original dwelling. As such, the proposal would constitute inappropriate development and would be detrimental to the openness of the Green Belt; it would be contrary to national and local planning policies and is therefore recommended for refusal.

Recommendation

That Planning Permission be refused for the following reason(s):-

- 1) The proposed development by of its size, mass and scale would not accord with Policy CS5 of the Knowsley Local Plan Core Strategy adopted January 2016 and Saved Policy G7 of the Knowsley Replacement Unitary Development Plan adopted June 2006. As such the proposals would result in a uncharacteristic and disproportional change to the appearance of the dwelling as existing, would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt and have a detrimental impact on the openness of the Greenbelt.

Signed Case Officer¹: Lee Osborne

Signed Authorising Officer²: Alan Kilroe

Date: 14 May 2025

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

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