
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 December 2021

by R Bartlett PGDip URP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21st January 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/Z4310/D/21/3281162

38 Hillside Drive, Liverpool, L25 5NS

- 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 O'Brien against the decision of Liverpool City Council.
 - The application Ref 21H/0514, dated 7 January 2021, was refused by notice dated 30 July 2021.
 - The development proposed is to erect first floor extension to side including a hip roof and alterations to existing ground floor roof extensions at front and rear.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for first floor extension to side including a hip roof and alterations to existing ground floor roof extensions at front and rear at 38 Hillside Drive, Liverpool, L25 5NS, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 21H/0514, dated 7 January 2021, 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, Site Plan, Proposed Elevations and Plans (as amended with hipped roof) Drawing No. 4.
 - 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.

Preliminary Matter

2. During the course of the application amended plans were submitted and the description of development was amended accordingly. My decision is based upon the amended plans and description.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The site comprises a semi-detached house, which has been extended and altered over time. A loft conversion has been added, incorporating: a hip to gable roof extension, 2 front roof lights and a large flat roof box dormer across the rear. There is also a ground floor wrap around extension with a hipped

roof, incorporating: a front porch, a garage and utility room to the side and a large dining kitchen across the rear. The appeal property and the adjoining semi-detached house are finished in different coloured render and have different coloured roof tiles.

5. As a result of the previous extensions and alterations to both the appeal property and the adjoining house, the original pair of semi-detached houses has already lost its uniformity. Likewise, other pairs of semi-detached houses along this part of Hillside Drive have been altered and extended over time and whilst remaining broadly similar, have lost their original uniformity. The wider surrounding area comprises a mixture of dwelling and roof types with a variety of alterations and extensions, all of which form part of the current character and appearance of the area.
6. The proposed extension, in its amended form, would re-introduce the hipped roof design, which is prevalent in the area. Although it would not match exactly the pitch of the adjoining house the same applies to no 34 Hillside Drive and this is not particularly noticeable. A continuous front wall and ridge line, like at numbers 34 and 50 Hillside Drive, would have been preferable as in cases such as this, setting the extension back and the ridgeline down only accentuates the differences and loss of uniformity, particularly to the roof line. However, I acknowledge that this is something which most LPA Officers and LPA householder extension design guides tend to encourage in an attempt to ensure that extensions are subordinate to host dwellings, regardless of whether or not this is the best design solution for the property and its surroundings.
7. Hillside Drive slopes uphill from its junction with Hunts Cross Avenue. As such number 38 is higher than the neighbouring row of houses to the north east and its existing gable wall is more visible in the street scene than it would be in a flat location. The existing gable wall and roof do detract, albeit not harmfully, from the hipped roof side elevations of adjacent properties. The proposal to re-introduce a hipped roof to the side of the dwelling would therefore be an improvement.
8. Having regard to the existing imbalance of the appeal property, its adjoining neighbour and of adjacent pairs of semi-detached houses in the immediate area, the proposal would not in my view be harmful to the character and appearance of the dwelling or its surroundings. Consequently the development would accord with policy H8 of The City of Liverpool Unitary Development Plan 2002, which states that planning permission will be granted for house extensions that respect the character of the existing dwelling and adjacent properties in terms of scale, design, orientation and materials.
9. The council's decision notice also makes reference to Policy H8 of the Liverpool Local Plan 2013-2033 (Pre-submission draft – January 2018). I have not been provided with a copy of this policy or advised that it has been adopted. However, based upon the extract within the council's report, I find no conflict with this policy, which is little different to the council's existing policy and guidance relating to house extensions.
10. The council's Supplementary Planning Guide (SPG) Note 1, which is very general guidance and advice, not policy, recommends amongst other things that extensions should be subordinate in scale to the building which is to be extended and should have matching materials and fenestration detailing. It explains why in some cases a set back would be beneficial and suggests that two-

storey extensions should always include pitched roofs to match the original house. I find no conflict with the general aims of this guidance.

Conditions

11. In addition to the standard condition which limits the lifespan of the planning permission I have specified the approved plans for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning. A condition relating to matching materials is necessary to ensure that the appearance of the new development would be satisfactory.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Rachael Bartlett

INSPECTOR