

APPLICATION NO: 26/00073/FUL

CASE OFFICER: Kate Pickles

WARD: Halewood South

PARISH: Halewood Town Council

LOCATION: 47 Higher Road, Halewood, Knowsley, L26 1TA

PROPOSAL: RETENTION OF A REAR CONSERVATORY

Site description

The application property is a two-storey, detached dwellinghouse set within a rectangular plot fronting on to Higher Road. The dwelling is in a Primarily Residential Area, and the wider area is characterised by semi-detached and detached dwellings with Halewood Park Triangle and the railway line to the rear.

Proposal

Permission is sought for the retention of the existing conservatory to the rear. The existing conservatory was erected in August 2025 following the demolition of a former conservatory in July 2025.

The property features a protruding single storey rear elevation, which has a projection of 3.4m.

The former conservatory had a projection of 3.7m and a height of 2.5m to eaves and 3.1m to ridge. The overall projection of the extension and the conservatory was 7.1m.

This conservatory brings the total projection of the left hand, single storey rear elevation to 6.3m. The conservatory has a projection of 2.9m, is 3.2m in width and is served by a lean to roof with a maximum height of 3m and an eaves height of 2.6m.

Consultations

None required.

Representations

This application was publicised by way of site notice and through letters sent to 5 neighbours. No representations have been received as a result of this publicity.

Planning history

05/00636/FUL:- RETENTION OF CONSERVATORY TO REAR

Decision: Refused 11/08/2005

Reasons for refusal:

- Over extended appearance which is not in keeping with the scale and character of the dwelling.
- Loss of visual amenity and loss of privacy to the occupiers of 49 Higher Road.

The application was allowed on appeal 30/01/2006.

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that accord with an up-to-date development plan without delay; or where the development plan is absent, silent or out of date planning permission should be granted unless the application of policies in the NPPF that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a clear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

CS19 – Design Quality and Accessibility in New development

SAVED POLICIES – KNOWSLEY REPLACEMENT UNITARY DEVELOPMENT PLAN

H5 – Development within Primarily Residential Areas

H8 – Extensions and Alterations to Residential Properties

SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENTS

Householder Development SPD

Design Quality in New Development SPD

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 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

Scale, design and residential amenity

The Householder Development SPD advises that 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 conservatory does not comply with this guidance as the property features an existing protruding single-storey rear projection, and the addition of the conservatory results in the left-hand side rear elevation adjacent to No.49 projecting 6.3m in total. This is considered acceptable given that the previous conservatory had a projection of 3.7m and, when taken together with the existing rear projection, resulted in an overall projection of approximately 7.1m. As such, the proposal reduces the extent of built form previously present on the site and is not considered to result in any greater impact upon the occupiers of No. 49. On balance, whilst the development departs from the SPD guidance, the degree of harm arising from the increased projection is limited and the proposal is considered acceptable in terms of its effect on neighbouring residential amenity.

The Householder Development SPD advises that extensions should not have an unacceptable impact on residential amenity by way of overshadowing, loss of outlook, loss of light or loss of privacy. The proposal complies with this guidance as the conservatory itself has a modest projection of 2.9m which minimises the impact of the development by ensuring it does not appear unduly dominant. The conservatory is also offset from the boundary of No.49 by 1.2m and there are no immediately adjacent neighbours to the opposite side of No.47. This offset from the boundary, when considered with the modest projection of the conservatory, is sufficient to ensure that the development does not result in an unacceptable overbearing impact or material loss of outlook to neighbouring occupiers.

The glass paned walls and roof of the conservatory further reduce concerns around residential amenity with regards to loss of light. The paned nature of the conservatory mitigates its perceived bulk and massing, allowing light to pass through the structure and reducing the sense of enclosure. The conservatory does not give rise to privacy concerns due to the obscurely glazed side windows, which reduce opportunities for overlooking or the perception of overlooking. The unobscured windows to the rear do

not give rise to any privacy concerns due to their ground floor siting, existing boundary treatments and the lack of immediately adjacent rear neighbours. The proposal is therefore considered acceptable in terms of residential amenity.

The Householder Development SPD further advises that extensions should use materials that are generally the same or similar as on the main dwelling. The white UPVC used on the conservatory and rainwater goods match those of the existing dwelling. No brickwork features as part of the conservatory. The existing front porch is of a similar conservatory design, and the rear conservatory is largely in keeping with the existing property and has a negligible impact on visual amenity. The lean-to roof is typical of conservatory design and, by virtue of its simple form and lower height, reinforces the subordinate appearance of the structure. Although it differs from the hipped roof of the main dwelling, it is not considered visually harmful given the existing varied roof types of the dwelling.

Highways

The erected conservatory is at the rear of the property and therefore does not impact the existing parking arrangement. The conservatory also does not function as an additional bedroom and therefore does not increase the demand for off street parking within the curtilage of the property. As such, the current parking arrangements are considered sufficient in serving the property minimising overspill on to the highway. The proposal is therefore acceptable in terms of highway safety and parking.

Conclusion

The proposal is considered acceptable in terms of scale, design, residential amenity and highway safety and is therefore recommended for approval subject to conditions/

Recommendation

That planning permission be granted subject to the following conditions:-

1. 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

Schedule 1

Date received	Drawing. No	Revision	Drawing/Document Title
02/06/2026	047-ASD-B1-00-DR-A-00-1003	P01	Proposed elevations

Knowsley Council
Regeneration and Economic Development Directorate.
Delegated Planning Report

02/06/2026	047-ASD-B1-00-DR-A-00-0003	P02	Proposed Plans
------------	----------------------------	-----	----------------

Signed Case Officer: Kate Pickles

Signed Authorising Officer: Jo Sheridan

Date: 29/07/2026

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

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