

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 October 2016

by S D Harley BSc(Hons) MPhil MRTPI ARICS

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 20 October 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/M4320/D/16/3154635

30 Hunt Road, Maghull L31 6BW

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
- The appeal is made by Mr David Matthew Roche against the decision of Sefton Council.
- The application Ref DC/2016/00623, dated 1 April 2016, was refused by notice dated 24 May 2016.
- The development proposed as set out on the planning application form is "two storey side extension and a single storey rear extension. The two storey side extension measures on the ground floor as 4.827m in width and 10.02m in length. The first floor is set in from the ground floor and measures 3.355m in width and 8.00m (approximately) in length. The ground floor element shows a pitched roof all around and a door and window to the rear. There is also a window shown on the side elevation. This is shown to be a garage, with a typical up and over garage door shown on the front elevation. There is access shown onto Hunt Road. The first floor element also has a pitched roof, with a window to the front and rear. In relation to the single storey rear extension, this is shown to project 3.140m from the existing rear extension and measure 5.9m in width. This is shown as a flat roof, which measures 2.8m from the ground level. There is a sky lantern and roof lights shown in the roof. There is an existing garage to the rear, which is to be demolished and the access crossing will be reinstated with a footway.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the street scene taking particular account of the position, size, mass and scale of the two storey extension.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is situated on a corner in an area of mainly semi-detached houses most of which are of similar design with projecting two storey bay windows. The houses on Hunt Road have a broadly uniform building line although many have single storey extensions to the front. The two storey side walls of Nos 32/30 and Nos 27/25 Hillary Crescent are in line with the two storey side walls of the appeal property and No 28 Hunt Road respectively. The houses further along Hillary Crescent are set back/angled around the curve of the Crescent.
 4. The side wall of the proposed two storey extension would be set back from the front wall of the host property and the ridge line of the proposed extension would be lower than the main roof ridgeline. In this way the proposed two
-

storey extension would appear subordinate to the host property and the adjoining semi-detached house at No 32 Hunt Road.

5. However, the proposed two storey extension would project significantly in front of the front walls of Nos 32/30 Hillary Crescent and would include a hipped roof projection beyond the rear wall of the host property. Although set in from the pavement edge by a maximum of about 2.7m, the proposed two storey side extension due to its position, size, scale and mass would intrude into the street scene and detract from the open character of this prominent corner location. This would be the case even though there is no uniform building line further along Hillary Crescent.
6. For the reasons set out above I conclude that the proposed two storey extension would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the street scene. Accordingly the proposal would not comply with Saved Policy MD1(a) and (d) of the Sefton Unitary Development Plan 2006, Part 6 A, B, C or E of the House Extensions Supplementary Planning Document 2016 (the SPD) or those principles of the National Planning Policy Framework that require good design that respects the character of the local area. Therefore, although the proposed development would accord with parts (b)(c) and (e) of Saved Policy MD1 in respect of materials, architectural detailing, parking and effect on the living conditions of neighbours, and Part 6 D of the SPD in respect of setback, it would not conform to the development plan taken as a whole.
7. I have carefully considered the examples of two storey extensions at other properties supplied by the appellant. From what I have seen none of these have the same combination of size, scale, mass and rear hipped roof projection on such a prominent corner location as the appeal before me. Accordingly these examples, and the two storey extension at 50 Hunt Road (not a corner plot), have not led me to any different conclusion.

Other matters

8. I acknowledge the personal circumstances of the appellant and his family; the desire for additional living accommodation and the lack of objections raised by neighbours. However, these matters do not outweigh the concerns I have identified.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons set out above, and taking into account all other relevant matters raised, I conclude the appeal should not succeed.

SDHarley

INSPECTOR