



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 September 2019

by Robert Hitchcock BSc DipCD MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30th September 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/Z4310/D/19/3227896

21 Eaton Gardens, Liverpool L12 3HL

- 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 S Buckland against the decision of Liverpool City Council.
 - The application Ref 19H/0309, dated 14 January 2019, was refused by notice dated 28 March 2019.
 - The development proposed is loft conversion with dormer to rear and new gable wall to side.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. The Liverpool Local Plan (LLP), with particular reference to policies UD1 and H8 relating to local character and house extensions respectively, has not been formally adopted. The weight attributed to it in decision making is, as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework 2019 (the Framework), a function of its stage in preparation, the level of objections to the policy and the degree of consistency with the Framework itself.
3. As the plan is at public examination stage and the relevant policies are not the subject of objections, but reflect the Framework's aims of high quality places and good design, I conclude that considerable weight can be given to the content of policies UD1 and H8 of the LLP in the determination of this appeal.

Main Issue

4. The main issues is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the locality.

Reasons

5. No 21 Eaton Gardens is located on an orbital residential estate road of semi-detached dwellings of consistent styling and appearance providing a strong local character. Notwithstanding various forms of extensions to the houses, a high degree of consistency remains, primarily through the retention of the original hipped roof forms, plot regularity and design detailing.
6. Examples of two-storey side extensions in the locality have been restricted to flat or fully hipped roof configurations and the appeal site is one such property. This currently has a degree of symmetry with its semi-pair, both having flat

roofed two-storey side extensions. The proposal seeks to introduce a pitched roof over the side extension following the original forward roof plane and terminating at a newly formed side gable angled towards No 19 Eaton Gardens. The proposed rear aspect would appear as a large flat-roofed dormer extension built up to the lines of the original rear elevation and the extended side elevation. It would substantially cover the full width of the extended dwelling.

7. The formation of the gable-ended roof would create a forward roof area greater than twice that of the original and a ridge line more than four times the current length. In addition to adversely contrasting with the prevalent roof style, this would add significant visual bulk to the property and would significantly unbalance the existing sense of symmetry across the pair of semi-detached properties. Additional bulk would also arise from the side gable in conjunction with the outside cheek of the dormer which would be readily visible along Eaton Gardens on approach from The Causeway estate entry road.
8. There are few examples of dormer roof additions within the estate: those that are visible are substantially more modest in scale. Although only the side would be visible from Eaton Gardens full views of the entire extent of the dormer would be apparent from Meadowcroft Park. Due to its scale and the extent of coverage of the rear roof slope, this would present as a three storey elevation, appearing top-heavy and therefore at odds with the character of both Eaton Gardens and Meadowcroft Park.
9. The resultant roof style and scale would strongly contrast with the consistency of roof forms within the Eaton Gardens estate. The addition of the rear dormer would add further bulk and together they would appear as an incongruous form of development in the locality to the detriment of the local street scene and that of Meadowcroft Park. I conclude that the development would fail to preserve the character and appearance of the locality and would therefore conflict with saved policies H8 and HD18 of the City of Liverpool Unitary Development Plan and policies UD1 and H8 of the LLP.

Conclusion

10. For the above reasons, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

R Hitchcock

Inspector