



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 July 2019

by Karen Taylor MSC URP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17th July 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/Z4310/D/19/3226617

28 Kendal Park, Liverpool L12 9LS

- 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 Donnelly against the decision of Liverpool City Council.
 - The application Ref 19/H/0036, dated 17 December 2018, was refused by notice dated 19 March 2019.
 - The development proposed is to incorporate a small projection to part front elevation to form two storey extension to part front elevation – alternative to 18H/2034.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted to incorporate a small projection to part front elevation to form two storey extension to part front elevation – alternative to 18H/2034 at 28 Kendal Park, Liverpool L12 9LS in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 19/H/0036, dated 17 December 2018, and the plans submitted with it, 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 development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Block Plan, Dec 18; Sheet 1, Sheet 2, and Sheet 3
 - 3) The external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the construction of the existing building.

Procedure Matters

2. I have used the description of the proposal from the Council's decision notice. It provides a clearer and more succinct description of the proposed development than that on the application form.
3. The Council has referred to Policies H7 and H8 from the emerging Liverpool Local Plan 2013-2033 (LLP) which was examined in 2018 and requires further modification. Given the stage of the plan preparation, these policies have only limited weight. Nevertheless, they are broadly in line with the adopted development plan policies upon which the Council also relies.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the development upon the character and appearance of the host dwelling and wider area.

Reasons

5. Kendal Park is a residential street forming a wider estate characterised by a mix of large detached two storey houses and bungalows. The properties vary considerably in their individual characteristics and form with many having projecting two storey front gables and other additions. As a result, their frontages do not always appear symmetrical in the street scene.
6. The appeal property is positioned at the end of a cul-de-sac and is setback considerably from the road within a substantially large plot. The two storey extension would be similar in design terms to the height and window pattern of the approved frontage. It would also resemble properties nearby with projecting front gables. There is a disagreement between the Council and the appellant in terms of where the front projection has been measured from. I have therefore taken the approach that even if I were to take the Council's position that the extension would exceed the guidance figures, given the scale of the building overall and the relatively discrete location of the frontage in the street scene, this addition would not undermine the principles set out in the supplementary planning guidance, SPG1.
7. For these reasons I find that the two storey extension would not have an excessive projection resulting in an overdevelopment of the site. Its relatively modest size means that it would not appear as a prominent addition to the detriment of the existing character and appearance of the property and the wider street scene. Therefore, it would accord with Saved Policy H8 of the Liverpool Unitary Development Plan (2002), which requires house extensions to respect the design and character of existing and adjacent properties, and the supplementary planning guidance, SPG1 House extensions.
8. The property features both two storey and single storey hipped and pitched roofs, thus the proposed single storey would not appear unsymmetrical on the frontage. It would be linked to the main house but would be seen as comparable to the existing single storey along the southern boundary. The property features existing stepped building lines and this extension would be well designed using matching materials. As such it would not appear excessive, or alien to its surroundings particularly as the property is set back in its corner position. Thus, even if there is a breach of guidance on front extensions, the proposal would still accord with the overall aims of achieving high quality design set out in Saved Policies HD18 and H8 of the Liverpool Unitary Development Plan (2002).

Conditions

9. A condition specifying the time limit and approved plans is necessary as this provides certainty. I have imposed a condition specifying materials are to match the existing building in order to safeguard the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above and taking into account all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Karen Taylor

INSPECTOR