



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 July 2019

by Alexander Walker MPlan MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11th July 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/W4325/D/19/3227380

251 Teehey Lane, Higher Bebington CH63 2JF

- 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 and Mrs Brierley against the decision of Wirral Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref APP/18/01644, dated 19 December 2018, was refused by notice dated 13 February 2019.
 - The development proposed is a two-storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a two-storey side extension at 251 Teehey Lane, Higher Bebington CH63 2JF in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref APP/18/01644, dated 19 December 2018, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans: LP1, EL1 A1, PS1 A1 and PL1 A1.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. Teehey Lane is a primarily residential road predominantly comprising two-storey, semi-detached dwellings. Whilst there is consistency in the scale of properties and their uniform building lines, there is great variety in building designs with a mixture of roof shapes, front gable projections and bay windows. The set-back position of properties, their open frontages, the spacing between them and the wide, tree-lined road provides an openness to the streetscene. The variety of designs and the openness of the road makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the area.
4. The appeal property has a mansard roof with a large gable element to the front. The design of the dwelling is similar to that of the adjoining property,

249 Teehey Lane, and the spacing between the dwelling and No 253 Teehey Lane is consistent with other properties on the road.

5. Saved Policy HS11 of the Unitary Development Plan for Wirral (UDP) 2000 states that in order to avoid the effect of terracing the first floor of a two-storey side extension should be set back by at least 1.5 from the common boundary; or, at least 1m back from the front elevation and 1m from the common boundary; or, at least 2m from the front elevation. This is supported by the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance: House Extensions (SPG), which states that two-storey side extensions should be set back from the front of the dwelling by 1m and should have a lower ridge height.
6. The proposed extension would be adjacent to the common boundary with No 253. The front elevation would be flush with the existing immediately adjoining front elevation. The ridgeline would also follow through with the existing, with no drop in ridge height, and would have a full gable end with no hip.
7. Notwithstanding this, the roof designs of the appeal property and No 253 are different. Due to the mansard design of the appeal property, the roof is set further back behind that of the eaves of No 253. Consequently, when viewed together, the different roof designs and the slightly stepped back roof of the appeal property from No 253 would ensure that a terracing effect is not created.
8. The front gable feature of the appeal property is the dominant feature on the front elevation. Whilst the proposal would widen the mansard roof element, due to it being set back behind the gable it would not dominate the front elevation of the dwelling and would retain its original design and would not unbalance the pair of dwellings.
9. Consequently, whilst the proposal would not comply with some of the requirements of saved Policy HS11 and the SPG, it would not significantly harm the character or appearance of the area. Therefore, taken as a whole, I do not consider that the proposal would conflict with the development plan.

Other Matters

10. I have had regard to the appellant's argument regarding the Council's lack of a five year supply of deliverable housing land. However, as I have found that the proposal would not conflict with the development plan, paragraph 11 d) of the National Planning Policy is not engaged.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above, the appeal is allowed.

Alexander Walker

INSPECTOR