



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 November 2019

by Beverley Wilders BA (Hons) PgDurp MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13th December 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/Z4310/D/19/3236578

56 Paignton Road, Childwall, Liverpool L16 4PW

- 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 Edmond Sherametaj against the decision of Liverpool City Council.
 - The application Ref 19H/1607, dated 7 May 2019, was refused by notice dated 27 August 2019.
 - The development proposed is two storey extension to side and rear with single storey extension to front and rear.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for two storey extension to side and rear with single storey extension to front and rear at 56 Paignton Road, Childwall, Liverpool L16 4PW in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 19H/1607, dated 7 May 2019, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall be begun not later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date of this permission.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following submitted plans: Drawing numbers 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 and 11.
 - 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

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

Reasons

3. The appeal site comprises a semi-detached, two storey dwelling located at the junction of Paignton Road and Rudston Road. The side elevation of the host building faces towards Rudston Road, opposite the front elevation of dwellings of a similar scale and type at Nos 80 & 82 Rudston Road. The position of the two storey side elevation of the host building is broadly in line with the front elevation of No 61 Rudston Road, though the rear garden of the host building

separates the two properties. The corner position of the appeal site means that the front, side and rear elevations of the host building are visible from surrounding roads, with the majority of the side garden of the host building being bordered by a solid timber fence along Rudston Road.

4. Although the proposed two storey side extension would project beyond the front building line of properties along the same side of Rudston Road, as stated, there is some distance between the host building and the nearest property at No 61. In addition, the front elevation of the first floor of the extension would be set back from the front elevation of the host building and the extension would have a lower ridge line meaning that it would appear subordinate. These factors together with the fact that a reasonable gap would remain between the side elevation of the extension and the side boundary with Rudston Road means that whilst the extension would be relatively prominent and visible within the streetscene it would not detract from it or be harmful.
5. The extension would be in keeping with the character and appearance of the host building and would not therefore be incongruent or inconsistent with nearby properties, albeit that it would be larger than others in the immediate vicinity. However, I am aware that there are examples of extensions of a similar scale nearby including on Rudston Road and in any event, for the reasons stated I do not consider the proposal to be harmful.
6. Taking the above matters into consideration, I conclude that the proposal would not have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the area. It therefore complies with Policy H8 of the Liverpool Unitary Development Plan adopted November 2002 which seeks to ensure that house extensions respect the character of the existing dwelling and adjacent properties. Although the proposal would not fully accord with guidance within the Council's House Extensions Supplementary Planning Guide in that it would extend beyond the building line of Rudston Road, in this instance, the breach of the guidelines would not be harmful for the reasons stated.

Conditions

7. I have had regard to the conditions suggested by the Council. I have imposed a condition specifying the approved plans as this provides certainty. I have also imposed a condition requiring the extension to be constructed in materials to match the host building. This is having regard to its scale and position and to ensure that the character and appearance of the area is protected.

Conclusion

8. For the above reasons and having regard to all matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Beverley Wilders

INSPECTOR