



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 October 2020 by L Wilson BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

Decision by Chris Preston BA (Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 5 November 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/Z4310/D/20/3257133

2 Leybourne Road, Gateacre L25 4SW

- 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 Michael Wilcox against the decision of Liverpool City Council.
 - The application Ref 20H/0119, dated 2 January 2020, was refused by notice dated 27 July 2020.
 - The development proposed is two storey pitched roof side extension, and front porch.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed insofar as it relates to the two-storey side extension. The appeal is allowed insofar as it relates to the front porch and planning permission is granted for the front porch at 2 Leybourne Road, Gateacre L25 4SW in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 20H/0119, dated 2 January 2020, insofar as it relates to that part of the development hereby permitted, and subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Location Plan (Ordnance Survey map reference SJ4288NW, dated 7 January 2020) and 02 (dated December 2019), insofar as it relates to the porch only.
 - 3) The external materials to be used in the construction of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Procedural Matters

3. The reasons for refusal relate to Policy H8 of the Liverpool Local Plan 2013-2033 which has been submitted to the Planning Inspectorate for examination. As this plan has not been formally adopted, I have given it limited weight, in line with paragraph 48 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

4. The first reason for refusal refers to Malton Road. However, it is clear from the Officer's Report that this is an error and it should instead refer to Hathaway Close.

Main Issue

5. The Council raised no objection to the proposed front porch, and I see no reason to disagree with that assessment. The porch is clearly severable from the two-storey side extension. Consequently, having regard to local and national planning policies, I see no reason why planning permission should not be granted for that element of the scheme.
6. The Council's main objection relates to the two-storey side extension. Therefore, the main issue is the effect of the proposed two-storey extension upon the character and appearance of the host building and the surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

7. The appeal relates to a semi-detached dwelling situated on a prominent corner plot at the junction with Leybourne Road and Hathaway Close. The area is characterised by two-storey, semi-detached residential properties set back from the highway.
8. Supplementary Planning Guidance Note 1 (SPG) provides guidance for two-storey side extensions. It states that such extensions to semi-detached properties should not exceed half the width of the existing house. In addition, two-storey side extensions to dwellings on corner plots shall not normally extend beyond the established building line to the return street frontage.
9. The Council state that the two-storey extension would have a width of approximately 4 metres and the existing property has a width of 6.1m. The appellant has not disputed these measurements. Hence, the scheme would not comply with the SPD as the extension would exceed half the width of the existing house.
10. The proposed first floor set back and the lower ridge line would result in the extension achieving some degree of subservience. Nevertheless, having regard to the lack of set back to the ground floor and the uncharacteristic width of the extension, the scheme would represent an overly dominant addition that would not respect the proportions of the host property. The harm arising would be conspicuous from the highway due to the site comprising a corner plot.
11. Although the existing boundary fence has to some degree altered the openness to the side of the property, the gap to the side makes a positive contribution to the area and results in a sense of spaciousness. The dwelling already projects forward of the building line of Hathaway Close to the rear. The properties on this side of Hathaway Close have been designed so that the building line is equally staggered which creates a regular rhythm.
12. The proposed extension would result in No. 2 siting further forward of the properties to the rear and would not respect the staggered building line. The proposal would therefore have a poor relationship with Hathaway Close and would erode the open nature of the corner plot. Accordingly, the proposed development would compromise the character and appearance of the host

property and surrounding area. It would result in a dominant addition on account of its design, siting and massing.

13. The appellant has drawn my attention to the extensions at No. 12 and 14 Leybourne Road. I agree that these extensions are similar to the scheme before me, in terms of their width in relation to the host property and relationship with the building line to the return street frontage. However, I do not know the circumstances of those cases in terms of when planning permission was granted or the local policy position at that time. Those extensions appear to be more than half the width of the original dwelling which would not conform to the current SPG. In any event, the appeal site is more conspicuous than these plots as it is located at the end of Leybourne Road. I do not consider that these developments have set a precedent because two-storey side extensions in the local area generally respect the width of the original property and building lines, in line with current local guidance. The presence of those extensions does not represent justification for harmful development at the appeal site. Each application must be determined on its individual merits and these extensions do not lead me to alter my recommendation.
14. The appellant highlights that the proposed extension would not block the view of the house opposite. Whilst I do not disagree, this matter does not outweigh the harm identified.
15. For these reasons, the proposed development would be visually harmful to the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area. Consequently, the scheme would conflict with Policy H8 of The City of Liverpool Unitary Development Plan (2002) and the SPG which seek to ensure extensions respect the character of the existing dwelling and adjacent properties.

Conditions (porch)

16. In addition to ensuring adherence to the approved plan, a condition securing the use of matching materials is necessary in the interests of the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion and Recommendation

17. For the reasons given above I recommend that the appeal should be allowed insofar as it relates to the porch and dismissed insofar as it relates to the two-storey side extension.

L M Wilson

APPEALS PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

18. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report, and, on that basis, I agree and conclude that the appeal should be allowed insofar as it relates to the porch and dismissed insofar as it relates to the two-storey side extension.

Chris Preston

INSPECTOR

