

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 May 2017

by F Rafiq BSc (Hons), MCD, MRTPI

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

Decision date: 02 June 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Z4310/D/17/3170908

56 Cooper Avenue North, Liverpool, L18 4PQ

- 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 Miss Sandra Cummins against the decision of Liverpool City Council.
 - The application Ref 17H/0002 dated 26 December 2016 was refused by notice dated 10 February 2017.
 - The development proposed is side and rear extensions to property.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two-storey semi-detached property on a corner plot, which is situated in a predominately residential area. Many of the properties located in the vicinity of the appeal site are semi-detached dwellings, although there is variation in their style and built form. The properties are however generally set back from the highway, behind front garden and parking areas. This, alongside the presence of wide grass verges and street trees, gives the area a pleasant, spacious setting.
 4. The proposal seeks permission for a two-storey side extension and a single storey extension to the rear. The first-floor element of the side extension would have a set back from the front elevation of the existing dwelling and the plans indicate that the side extension as a whole would be set away from the side boundary by at least 1m. This extension would however project beyond the building line along Rangemore Road and would substantially reduce the gap between the building and the road. Whilst I recognise the difference in levels along Rangemore Road and the set back of the appeal property from Cooper Avenue North, the proposal would nevertheless appear prominent in views along Rangemore Road. The appellant has also stated that the side extension would bring symmetry with the adjoining property at No. 58, but this would not negate the harm I have identified, where the reduction in openness at this corner location, would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area.
-

5. I therefore conclude that the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area. It would conflict with Policy H8 of The City of Liverpool Unitary Development Plan and Supplementary Planning Guidance Note 1 *House Extensions* (SPG), which seek, amongst other matters, to respect the character of residential areas.
6. A number of other properties within the area have been referenced where two storey extensions have been constructed close, or up to the boundary wall, with some having flat roofs. However, I do not know the full circumstances of those extensions, which may have been approved prior to the introduction of the SPG. In any event, whilst I acknowledge there should be consistency in decision-making, each case must be considered on its own merits. The presence of those extensions would not justify the harmful development on the appeal site.
7. I note the appellant is seeking to extend the property to meet her family's needs who have lived in the area for a long time. Whilst I sympathise with the appellant in this respect and recognise the need for 4 bedrooms, this does not however outweigh the harm that would be caused to the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons given above and having considered all other matters raised, including the appellant's reference to support from some neighbours and the acceptability of the single storey rear extension, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

F Rafiq

INSPECTOR