
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 September 2020

by R Morgan MCD MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25 September 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/Z4310/D/3253419

59 Charterhouse Road, Liverpool L25 8ST

- 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 Ian Grindley against the decision of Liverpool City Council.
 - The application Ref 20H/0304, dated 27 January 2020, was refused by notice dated 9 March 2020.
 - The development proposed is two storey side and single storey rear extensions and rear roof dormer.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for two storey side and single storey rear extensions and rear roof dormer at 59 Charterhouse Road, Liverpool L25 8ST, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 20H/0304, dated 27 January 2020, and the plans submitted with it.

Main Issue

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

Procedural Matters

3. The extensions have already been erected and, at the time of my site visit, the external works had been substantially completed. I am therefore considering this appeal retrospectively.
4. The Council has referred to Policy H8 of the emerging Liverpool Local Plan (draft Local Plan), which relates to house extensions. The draft Local Plan is still being prepared and its policies cannot be given full weight in decision making. However, the detail included in draft Policy H8 reflects that in the Supplementary Planning Guidance note on House Extensions (SPG), which is relevant to this appeal.

Reasons

5. The appeal property is a semi-detached house in a residential area which is characterised by similar properties, a number of which have been extended in various ways. The site is located on a corner plot, and the side and rear of the property are visible from Stonyhurst Road. However, there are a number of corner properties occurring along Charterhouse Road, and the appeal property does not appear particularly prominent in the streetscene.

6. The SPG sets out a number of principles for house extensions, which includes the need for extensions to be subordinate in scale to the original house. By continuing the lines of the front elevation and hipped roof, with no set back or reduction in height, the two storey side extension does not meet this requirement.
7. However, the side extension does not exceed half the width of the original dwelling and does not appear overly dominant or excessive in scale. Furthermore, its corner position means that the appeal property is viewed in the context of the adjoining side street, rather than another pair of semis, so the lack of a set-back does not result in any terracing effect or loss of separation between houses.
8. The appeal property has been finished with light coloured render across the whole of the front elevation, which is not uncommon in the surrounding area, particularly where the houses have been recently extended or renovated. It is this contrast in finishes which is the most visually striking difference between the pair of houses, rather than any imbalance resulting from the appeal proposal.
9. The hipped form of the roof and the style of the fenestration on the front elevation respects that of the original house and the adjoining property. The potential problem of bonding old and new brickwork on the prominent elevations, which can appear visually awkward and is one of the reasons for a set back, has been avoided through the use of render. The porch, although slightly larger than that which could be erected under permitted development rights, does not appear incongruous or excessively large. There is no dispute that the rear dormer and single storey extensions are acceptable.
10. I agree that the two storey side extension does not fully meet the guidance in the SPG, and that it would be preferable if it had been set back slightly from the front elevation and the roof line dropped, so as to provide a degree of visual subordination. However, in this particular case, the harm to the character and appearance of the area is limited, and does not justify the significant disruption for the family, including the four children, which would result from the works necessary to alter the property in this way.
11. I conclude that the proposal does not cause undue harm to the character and appearance of the area. It is consistent with the requirements of Saved UDP Policy H8, and although it does not reflect the guidance in the House Extensions SPG relating to subordination, the other material considerations referred to are of greater weight. Therefore, the proposal should be determined in accordance with the development plan.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given, the appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted.

R Morgan

INSPECTOR