

---

# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 September 2017

**by Thomas Hatfield BA (Hons) MA MRTPI**

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

**Decision date: 7<sup>th</sup> September 2017**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/W4325/D/17/3176843**

**11 Wroxham Drive, Upton, CH49 0TS**

- 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 Phil Leyland against the decision of Wirral Metropolitan Borough Council.
  - The application Ref APP/17/00287, dated 10 March 2017, was refused by notice dated 5 May 2017.
  - The development proposed is described as "Double height side extension and loft conversion - resubmission of application 16/01472 - reduction in height of ridge and front elevation set back".
- 

## Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

## Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of both the host property and the surrounding area.

## Reasons

3. The appeal property is a semi-detached house on the southern side of Wroxham Drive. It is constructed in a traditional style and forms an attractive frontage with the other properties along this side of the street. Nos 9 and 11 have been designed with a front gable and roof overhang feature that cuts across the front elevations of these dwellings.
4. The development would represent a significant addition to the property, and would extend it almost to the boundary with No 13. The ridge line of the extension would be only slightly set down from that of the main property. Similarly, the extension would have only a small setback from the main front elevation of the dwelling. In combination, these features would create an excessively dominant extension that would relate poorly to the host property. It would also unbalance the appearance of the pair of semi-detached properties when viewed from the street. Whilst the neighbouring properties at Nos 13-19 each have 2-storey side outriggers, these appear to be original features that are appropriately recessed from the front elevations and ridge lines of those properties. In contrast, the design of the appeal extension would contribute to a terracing effect between Nos 11 and 13 that would be at odds with the relatively generous spacing along this side of the street.

5. Nos 9 and 11 have a different design to the adjoining properties and incorporate a gable / canopy. However, this feature would not assist in creating a subservient appearance in the proposed extension, nor would it significantly mitigate the harm I have identified above. Moreover, whilst No 13 has a hipped roof shape and a setback outrigger that is not a justification to omit similar design features in this case.
6. The appellant states that the development is intended to accommodate his elderly parents who will be able to receive care from family members in later life. I have sympathy with the appellant's situation, and this is clearly a matter of some importance. However, there is only limited evidence before me regarding the extent to which the current design is necessary in order to accommodate these requirements. It is also unclear whether other, less harmful, solutions have been explored. These uncertainties reduce the weight I can attach to the appellant's personal circumstances in this case.
7. For the above reasons, I conclude that the development would significantly harm the character and appearance of both the host property and the surrounding area. It would therefore be contrary to Policy HS11 of the Wirral Unitary Development Plan (2000), and Supplementary Planning Guidance 11: House Extensions (2004). This policy and guidance seek to ensure, amongst other things, that new extensions are appropriately designed. The development would also be at odds with the National Planning Policy Framework, which requires good design.

#### **Other Matter**

8. Whilst the development would not significantly harm the amenities of the adjoining properties, this represents an absence of harm in relation to this matter rather than a positive benefit.

#### **Conclusion**

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

*Thomas Hatfield*

INSPECTOR