



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 November 2019

by M Seaton DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 29 November 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/Z4310/D/19/3239378

30 Manderston Drive, West Derby, Liverpool, L12 4DA

- 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 Robert Cox against the decision of Liverpool City Council.
 - The application Ref 19H/2090, dated 22 July 2019, was refused by notice dated 30 September 2019.
 - The development proposed is to erect 1st floor extension, dormer extension to rear, and increase the height of the existing roof.
-

Procedural Matter

1. There is a certain degree of variation in the description of development as proposed by the appellant on the planning application forms, and by the Council in the Notice of Decision. Whilst the appellant's description of development is quite correct insofar as it goes, the Council's description is preferable as it more accurately makes specific reference to the raising of the existing roof height, and I have therefore utilised this version of the description in identifying the proposed development.

Decision

2. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted to erect 1st floor extension, dormer extension to rear, and increase the height of the existing roof at 30 Manderston Drive, west Derby, Liverpool, L12 4DA in accordance with the application Ref. 19H/2090 dated 22 July 2019, and subject to the following conditions;
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the approved drawing numbers: Site Location Plan, 01 – Existing Plans & Elevations (July 2019) & 02 – Proposed Plans and Elevations (July 2019).
 - 3) 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.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed extensions on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is occupied by a two-storey detached dwelling which is situated on a short unadopted section of Manderston Drive and set within a comparatively new-build development. Whilst there is a clear design rationale linking the various properties across the wider development, there is also a reasonable level of variety in design terms with some individual properties incorporating gable features, as well as varying roof heights and forms.
5. The appeal proposals comprise works to extend the first floor to the front of the property to provide an enlarged 4th bedroom, as well as to provide additional accommodation within the existing roof storey, facilitated by the raising of the existing main ridge height of the roof to a level consistent with the front gable feature and the introduction of a new side gable end to replace the hipped section of the roof, and the erection of a rear roof dormer extension.
6. The Council has indicated that the proposed rear dormer extension would not be visible within the street scene, and that despite its bulkiness it would appear as a subservient addition to the dwelling. On the basis of my observations I am satisfied that this conclusion is reasonable.
7. The Council's concerns focus on the impact and relationship of the extensions with the existing front gable roof feature, and in particular with regards the overall height. I have carefully considered the Council's submissions in this regard and have noted the reference to the guidance as set out within the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance Note 1: House Extensions (SPG 1), regarding the need for extensions to have a subordinate relationship to the existing dwelling.
8. I accept that the raising of the existing ridge height of the remainder of the dwelling and addition of a gable end to the south-west elevation at the same raised height would not appear as subservient to the existing ridge height of the gable, and that in this respect the proposal would not accord with SPG1. However, whilst the use of a gable feature appears as a constant in the design rationale of the development, the prominence and importance of that feature varies, and as the Council accepts in their submissions the immediate area does exhibit a good degree of variety in the design of properties.
9. In this regard, I observed in addition to the differing approaches to the gable feature, that there was also some apparent variation in the overall ridge height as well as the use of hipped and gable elements to roofs in the area. Having regard to the wider design character, the conversion of the hipped element of the roof to a gable would not appear as an uncharacteristic design approach within the vicinity, and the raising of the ridge height by the amount proposed would not result in an obtrusive or incongruous alteration to the detached dwelling. Furthermore, I am satisfied that despite the absence of subservience as presented by the proposed alterations to the roof and first floor extensions in the terms of SPG 1, the proposed development would result in an overall coherent design which would not be visually harmful to the appearance of the host dwelling, or within the street scene and area.
10. For the reasons as set out, the proposed development would not result in an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling or the area. Whilst there would be some conflict with SPG 1, I am satisfied that the proposal would not be harmful and would therefore accord with Policies H8 and

HD18 of the Liverpool Unitary Development Plan 2002, which seek to ensure a high quality of design with the scale and massing of proposed development including extensions relating well to its locality, and respecting the character of the existing dwelling and adjacent properties.

Conditions

11. In addition to conditions regarding the commencement for development and the identification of plans, the Council has suggested a condition related to the use of matching materials for all external surfaces of the development. I am satisfied that such a condition would be necessary in the interests of the character and appearance of the dwelling and the area.
12. I have also carefully considered the suggestion of a condition requiring the window to the proposed en-suite bathroom to bedroom 5 to be obscurely glazed. However, I am mindful that there are no concerns raised regarding overlooking or loss of privacy as a consequence of the adjacent rear-facing windows to Bedroom 5, and whilst it may ultimately be the personal preference of the occupiers of the property to install obscured glazing, it is not required to make the proposed development acceptable in terms of the effect on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers. I have therefore omitted the condition.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above, the appeal is allowed subject to the imposition of the conditions as listed.

Martin Seaton

INSPECTOR