The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 December 2016

by Thomas Hatfield BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

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

Decision date: 17th January 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Z4310/W/16/3158400
2 Whitehedge Road, Liverpool, L19 1RY

- 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 Malcolm Desmond against the decision of Liverpool City Council.
- The application Ref 16F/1319, dated 17 May 2016, was refused by notice dated 26 July 2016.
- The development proposed is a new two storey dwelling to the side of number 2 Whitehedge Road.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the development, firstly, on the character and appearance of the area and, secondly, on the living conditions of No 2a Whitehedge Road and No 5 Stomont Road with regard to a loss of outlook.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. No 2 Whitehedge Road is an end terrace property located close to the junction with the A561. The terrace has a relatively uniform design, and the properties have consistent widths, window sizes, and ground floor bay windows. No 2 is set within a wider plot than other properties in the terrace, and it currently has a small single storey side extension to its south west elevation.

4. The development would introduce a new dwelling to the end of the terrace. This would be significantly narrower than other properties in the row and it would sit within a much smaller plot, with limited outdoor space to the rear. Its size and width would not be in keeping with the remainder of the terrace and it would appear unduly cramped in the local context. The design of the new dwelling would also be at odds with the rest of the terrace. In particular, the first floor window would be centrally positioned and the small ground floor window and door would also relate poorly to the adjacent property. This would not reflect the design of the other properties in the row.

5. Whilst the plot to No 2 is slightly larger than others along the terrace, that does not justify a development with these shortcomings. In addition, whilst the

dwelling would following the existing building line and would make use of matching materials, this does alter the harm I have identified above.

6. I conclude that the development would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the area. It would therefore be contrary to Policies H5 and HD18 of the Liverpool Unitary Development Plan (2002). These policies seek to ensure that new development respects the design, and character of the surrounding area.

Living conditions

7. The flank wall of the proposed dwelling would face onto bedroom windows in the side elevation of No 2a Whitehedge Road. In addition, the rear windows of the proposed dwelling would be positioned opposite rear facing windows in No 5 Stomont Road.

8. The new dwelling would replicate the existing interface between the rear of the terraces fronting both Stomont Road and Whitehedge Road. Whilst this interface is longstanding, No 5 Stomont Road currently has a more open rear aspect. The development would intrude into this at a separation distance of around 11-12 metres. This would be significantly below the Council's minimum separation distances and would cause a harmful loss of outlook to No 5.

9. With regards to No 2a Whitehedge road, the gap to the current flank wall is already below the Council's minimum separation distances. The development would narrow this gap further, which would lead to a harmful deterioration of the outlook from the bedroom windows in No 2a. In addition, the proposed side window to the lounge area would be directly visible from the first floor bedroom windows, which would harm the privacy of both properties.

10. For the above reasons, I conclude that the development would unacceptably harm the living conditions of No 2a Whitehedge Road and No 5 Stomont Road with regard to a loss of outlook. It would therefore be contrary to Policies H4, H5 and HD18 of the Liverpool Unitary Development Plan (2002), and guidance contained in Supplementary Planning Guidance Note 10: New Residential Development (1996). These policies and guidance seek to protect residential amenity.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Thomas Hatfield

INSPECTOR