
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 February 2021 by Hannah Ellison BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

Decision by R C Kirby BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 1 March 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/W4325/D/20/3263686

11A Bettisfield Avenue, Eastham CH62 6DU

- 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 Adam Jones against the decision of Wirral Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref APP/20/01240, dated 2 September 2020, was refused by notice dated 28 October 2020.
 - The development proposed is a two storey front, side and rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a two storey front, side and rear extension at 11A Bettisfield Avenue, Eastham CH62 6DU, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref APP/20/01240, 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 permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 2020 104 001 Revision 01, 2020 104 002 Revision 02.

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.

Main Issue

3. The effect of the proposal on the living conditions of occupiers at 15 Bettisfield Avenue, with particular regard to outlook and light.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a two-storey detached dwelling located within a predominantly residential area. The proposed first floor front extension would be positioned close to the side boundary with No 15, which has a transparent window at first floor level serving a habitable room.
5. Whilst the two dwellings are within close proximity to each other and the proposal would project forward of No 15, the concerned window is of a generous size and the main outlook from it would predominantly be directly

outwards across the street, rather than at an obscure angle towards the appeal dwelling. I have no doubt that the proposed front extension would be partly visible from certain points within the room and from the window itself. However, it would not be so overbearing as to severely harm the living conditions within that room due to its limited projection beyond No 15 and given the size of the window and the good outlook it provides.

6. Furthermore, as the window is south east facing it would provide the room with good amounts of light throughout much of the day. Given its positioning and limited projection, any additional degree of overshadowing caused by the proposed front extension to No 15 would be marginal when compared to the existing relationship and would only be for a limited time during the evening and in certain months throughout the year. As such, the proposal would not significantly reduce the amount of light reaching the room. It is unlikely that the room would be less pleasant to use as a result of the proposal.
7. Consequently, for the above reasons, the proposed development would not result in a harmful effect on the living conditions of occupiers at 15 Bettisfield Avenue. It is therefore consistent with Policy HS11 of the Wirral Unitary Development Plan (February 2000) and the Supplementary Planning Guidance House Extensions (July 2004), which collectively seek to ensure that extensions are not so extensive so as to be unneighbourly in terms of the effect on outlook and light.

Conditions

8. Other than the standard time limit and approved plans conditions, the Council has suggested a condition requiring the external materials of the proposal to match those of the existing building. However, the proposed materials are identified on the submitted plans and include the use of render to the elevations. The Council has not raised any concerns with this part of the development and I note there is a variety of materials in the locality. Consequently, a condition restricting the materials to match the existing building would be unnecessary.

Conclusion and Recommendation

9. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal is allowed.

H Ellison

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

10. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is allowed.

RC Kirby

INSPECTOR