
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 December 2016

by Andrew McGlone BSc MCD MRTPI

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

Decision date: 16 December 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/Z4310/D/16/3159761

4 Willingdon Road, Liverpool, L16 3NF

- 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 Mrs Jenny Savage against the decision of Liverpool City Council.
 - The application Ref 16H/1030, dated 27 March 2016, was refused by notice dated 15 July 2016.
 - The development proposed is a 2 storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the street scene within Willingdon Road and Inchcape Road.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is situated on the corner of Willingdon Road and Inchcape Road. The property is part of a semi-detached pairing in a residential area containing dwellings of a similar architectural style and design. Key features include the use of a hipped roof and a consistent building line.
 4. The proposed side extension would project well beyond the front building line of properties on Inchcape Road which is constant next to the site. As the appeal site is on a corner, it is in a prominent position. Thus, an extension of the scale and width proposed would not respect the character of the area and would substantially detract from the street scenes of Willingdon Road and Inchcape Road.
 5. Although the appellant is willing to alter their proposal to set the extension inwards and reduce its width, I must determine the scheme that is before me. In this regard, the side extension would be roughly 63% of the width of the original property and extend up to 1 metre from the flank boundary. Both points are contrary to paragraphs 10 and 11 of Supplementary Planning Guidance Note 1 House Extensions (SPG1). So, despite the setback of the first floor from the front elevation and a lower ridge, the proposal would be a dominant form of development that is far wider than the host property.
 6. I understand the appellant bought the house so that she could extend it and the proposed extension would accommodate her mum so that she can provide the necessary care for her. While it is suggested that a single storey extension
-

would not provide the necessary space, I am not persuaded that this would be the case given the depth of the rear garden. I am also not satisfied that the appellant's personal circumstances outweigh the harm that would be created in both of the aforementioned street scenes.

7. Nearby, 30 Inchcape Road benefits from a two storey side extension which extends significantly forward of the front building line of dwellings in Merthyr Grove. However I noted that the original flank elevations of No 30 and 32 Inchcape Road were already considerably beyond the building line of properties in Merthyr Grove. This is also the case with 106 Bowring Park Road which would have been, like 108 Bowring Park Road, already forward of properties in Gleneagles Road. In terms of 10 Chelwood Avenue and properties in Francis Way, the line of dwellings in Glenconner Road is not uniform and the sites are a considerable distance away in very different street scenes respectively. I do not therefore consider any of the examples cited to be directly comparable to the appeal scheme.
8. For these reasons, I therefore conclude that the proposal would significantly affect the street scene within Willingdon Road and Inchcape Road. The proposal would not accord with saved Policy H8 of The City of Liverpool Unitary Development Plan and SPG1; which together seek to ensure that house extensions are of an appropriate scale, width and location so that they do not detract from the street scene and they respect the character of the dwelling and those adjacent.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Andrew McGlone

INSPECTOR