



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 January 2022

by Alison Partington BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28th January 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/H4315/D/21/3280625

1 Aynsley Court, St. Helens, WA9 5GE

- 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 & Mrs Khan against the decision of St Helens Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref P/2021/0481/HHFP, dated 14 May 2021, was refused by notice dated 9 July 2021.
 - The development proposed is a single storey link extension, incorporating the replacement of the existing side boundary wall, between the existing dwelling and detached double garage (converted).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey link extension, incorporating the replacement of the existing side boundary wall, between the existing dwelling and detached double garage (converted) at 1 Aynsley Court, St. Helens, WA9 5GE in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P/2021/0481/HHFP, dated 14 May 2021, subject to the following condition:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall accord with the following approved plans: Location Plan 082_SP_002; Existing Site Plan 082_SP_005; Proposed Site Plan 082_SP_010; Proposed Side Elevation A 082_SP_011; Proposed Side Elevation A 082_SP_012; Proposed Side Elevation B 082_SP_014; Existing Side Elevation B 082_SP_015; Proposed Rear Elevation 082_SP_016; Existing Rear Elevation 082_SP_017; and Existing/Proposed Front Elevation 082_SP_019.

Procedural Matters

2. The link extension has already been constructed at the host property and I have determined the appeal on this basis.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in the appeal is the effect of the extension on the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a large, detached house located on the corner of Aynsley Court and Coalport Walk. It has a detached garage, that has been converted to living accommodation to the side / rear that is close to the boundary with Coalport Walk. A curved boundary wall, set back some distance from the road, ran between the former garage and the rear elevation of the

- house and provided privacy to the rear garden. This has been replaced with a long narrow flat roof single storey extension that links the former garage to the main dwelling.
5. The wall of the extension that faces Coalport Walk is higher than the previous boundary wall and has a fascia board along the top, which indicates it is not just a boundary wall. However, due to its position in relation to the single storey side extension on the house and the former garage, there is little visibility of it other than when passing the actual site. It is therefore, not a dominant feature in the street scene, and is far less prominent than other walls enclosing rear gardens on corner plots, including the two either side of the junction of Wedgewood Gardens and Coalport Walk. To most people passing by I consider the fact that this was in fact an extension rather than a boundary wall would go unnoticed.
 6. The *Householder Development Supplementary Planning Document (adopted June 2011)* (SPD) indicates that single storey rear extensions should not normally project more than 4m from the rear elevation of the host property and should not have flat roofs. The reason given for limiting the length to 4m is to ensure the extension would not have an adverse impact on neighbours. The SPD also indicates that larger extensions may be acceptable on detached houses with spacious gardens.
 7. The extension projects over 9m from the rear elevation of the original house which is significantly greater than the 4m projection allowed in the SPD. However, despite this, it would have no adverse impact on the living conditions of occupiers of the neighbouring property, due to the boundary treatment and distance between them. Moreover, its limited width, height and floorspace means that it is a subservient addition to the main dwelling.
 8. The host property already has a single storey rear element that projects from the main rear elevation which has a flat roof. Given this, when viewed within the rear garden the flat roof of the link extension does not appear an incongruous feature. Furthermore, the flat roof ensures that there is no visibility of the extension, other than the external wall that replicates the former boundary wall. As a result, the flat roof nature of the extension does not have an adverse visual impact on the street scene.
 9. All in all, I consider that the extension does not harm the character and appearance of the host property or the surrounding area. Therefore, although it does not follow the guidance in the SPD, it would not conflict with Policy GEN8 of the *St Helens Unitary Development Plan (adopted July 1998)* which requires developments to respect the scale, design, character and appearance of the original dwelling and local area.

Conclusion and Conditions

10. For the reasons set out above, I conclude the appeal should be allowed. As the building has already been constructed, I consider the only condition necessary is a plans condition which is required to provide certainty.

Alison Partington

INSPECTOR