
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 October 2017

by A A Phillips BA (Hons) DipTP MTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 26 October 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Z4310/D/17/3179745
22 South Way Liverpool L15 7JA

- 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 Lawton against the decision of Liverpool City Council.
 - The application Ref 17H/1097, dated 19 April 2017, was refused by notice dated 14 June 2017.
 - The development proposed is the replacement of the front door with a Solidor laminated timber composite door (residence 9 conservation).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is whether the proposal preserves or enhances the character or appearance of the Conservation Area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two storey semi-detached residential dwelling situated within a mainly residential part of Liverpool and in the Wavertree Garden Suburb Conservation Area. At present the property has a white UPVC door which would be replaced by a laminated timber composite door. At my site visit I observed that many properties in the vicinity of the appeal site have UPVC and other non-original doors although some, including Nos 25 and 26 South Way appear to have original doors featuring a window in the top half of the door split into 3 x 3 panes. I also noted that the appeal property appears to have its original windows.
4. The Conservation Area has a formal layout with each property set in its own garden. Properties generally face the highway and are laid out in pairs of semi-detached properties or larger terraces. Many properties have attractive unifying features including rendered walls, red tiled roofs and chimneys and the appeal property and its adjoining property have attractive double projecting bay features on corners.
5. Therefore, in accordance with Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) in determining this appeal I attach great weight to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the Conservation Area within which the site is located.

6. Policy HD10 of the City of Liverpool Unitary Development Plan November 2002 (the UDP) relates to alterations to non-listed buildings in Conservation Areas and states that consent will not be granted for external alterations which adversely affect the overall character and appearance of the conservation area; or for any works that are not fully justified and accompanied by the full information necessary to assess the impact on the conservation area. Special attention will be paid to the retention, replacement or restoration of historic features and details.
7. I have noted that the door in question is a side door which is partly screened by its relationship to the highway and boundary trees and shrubs. It does not front the highway and as such is not particularly prominent in the street scene. It is currently white UPVC and its style and design does not reflect the original traditional timber doors with an arrangement of window panes as described above. I observed at my site visit that the overall character and appearance of the Conservation Area has been compromised by the accumulation of replacement doors of different styles, designs and materials. In determining the current appeal it is therefore important to consider whether the proposal has been fully justified and sufficient information submitted to allow its impact to be assessed fully.
8. In this particular case the level of detail submitted with the application is poor comprising manufacturer's specifications only with few details of the door itself at the appropriate detailed scale. Furthermore, there is a lack of detailed justification for the works in the context of the host property and its sensitive historic surroundings. I have noted that the appellant has submitted further details of the door with the appeal. However, the appeal process should not be used to evolve a scheme and it is important that what is considered by me at this stage is essentially what was considered by the local planning authority and on which interested parties' views were sought.
9. The details of the door are difficult to determine from the submitted drawings and as such I find that there is insufficient information to fully assess the effect of the proposal on the Conservation Area and, in particular, whether the proposal would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Conservation Area.
10. As such I conclude on the basis of the application presented that the proposal would fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Conservation Area. As such it would conflict with Policy HD10 of the UDP and the Framework.

Conclusion

11. Therefore, for the reasons given above and taking into account other matters raised I conclude that the proposal conflicts with the development plan taken as a whole and that the appeal should be dismissed.

Alastair Phillips

INSPECTOR