
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 September 2019

by R Morgan MCD MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20 November 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/Z4310/D/19/3232328

4 Hallside Close, Grassendale, Liverpool L19 9ED

- 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 Samuel Myers against the decision of Liverpool City Council.
 - The application Ref 19H/0757, dated 8 March 2019, was refused by notice dated 10 May 2019.
 - The development proposed is a two storey extension at the side.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a semi-detached property located at the head of Hallside Close which is a short cul-de-sac. No 4 Hallside Close (No 4) is set back from the road and positioned at an angle to the neighbouring property, No 5 Hallside Close (No 5). Their siting around the turning circle means that the appeal property and its two immediate neighbours have plots which are narrower on the road frontage and widen towards the rear.
4. No 4 has a detached garage to the side of the house and I note that other similar properties in the street have been extended to the side. The proposed two storey side extension would replace the existing garage and would have a stepped increase in width towards the rear of the plot which would closely follow the boundary with No 5.
5. The Council's guidance says that two storey extensions on semi-detached properties should not exceed half of the width of the existing house. This is to ensure that extensions respect the proportions of the original house and do not appear out of scale or overly large. This consideration relates to the scale of the extension in relation to the main dwelling and how it would appear in the street.
6. In this case, the front section of the extension would be around two thirds of the width of the main house and as a result would appear dominant and out of proportion to the host dwelling. It would be set back slightly from the front elevation and the ridge reduced in height, but this would not be sufficient to

make the extension appear subservient to the main house. The position of the garage door, which would be offset to the side rather than centrally positioned beneath the window, would appear awkward. For these reasons the proposed extension would look incongruous in relation to the existing house and the wider street-scene.

7. The proposed extension would maximise the space available in the plot but as a result would be sited very close to the boundary with No 5. I note the appellant's comments that the relative angles of the two properties and the set back of the existing and proposed extensions from the front elevation would help to prevent a terracing effect. However, the close proximity to the shared boundary of both the proposed extension and the extension at No 5 would make the little pitched roofs over the garages appear very close each other when viewed from the street, which would appear awkward and cluttered.
8. I appreciate that No 5's two storey side extension has a similar stepped layout and design to the appeal proposal. However, the front element of that extension is not as wide in relation to the host dwelling and it has a greater set-back at first floor level. Therefore, the two extensions are not quite the same but in any event, the existence of that extension does not justify the proposed harmful development.
9. For the above reasons I conclude that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the area. It would conflict with Policy H8 of the Liverpool Unitary Development Plan 2002 and the House Extensions Supplementary Planning Guidance.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given the appeal is dismissed.

Rosie Morgan

INSPECTOR