
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 February 2022

by Katie McDonald MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 February 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/M4320/D/21/3284892

7 Claremont Avenue, Maghull L31 8AD

- 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 Mrs Jane Maloney against the decision of Sefton Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref DC/2021/01099, dated 26 April 2021, was refused by notice dated 4 August 2021.
 - The development proposed is a single storey front, two storey side, and first floor side and rear extensions to dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for is a single storey front, two storey side, and first floor side and rear extensions to dwelling at 7 Claremont Avenue, Maghull L31 8AD in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref DC/2021/01099, dated 26 April 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 plan: 21012/01.
 - 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.

Main Issue

2. This is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The property is a 2 storey semi-detached house located on a tree lined residential street, containing predominantly 2 storey semi-detached houses of varying styles. The proposal is for a 2 storey side and rear extension with a single storey front extension. The 2 storey side extension would maintain a gap of around 750mm from the boundary with the neighbouring dwelling, projecting around 1.8m from the side wall. The gap retained between properties would ensure a modest separation, taking account of the spacing between buildings. Thus, the gap would safeguard against the linking of properties or a "terracing effect".

4. Additionally, whilst the proposal does not include a reduction in the ridge height or a set back, as advocated by the guidance in the House Extensions Supplementary Planning Document (June 2018) (SPD), it would be unnecessary in this instance. This is because the projection to the side is small and subservient in comparison to the dwelling, such that there is no requirement to reduce the impact of the extension. The angle and shape of the roof would match the existing property, resulting in a simple, congruent and sympathetic addition to the original dwelling and surrounding street. Also, there would be no issue with bonding of materials, given the proposal would be rendered at the first floor to match the existing walls.
5. Moreover, several dwellings in the street have 2 storey side extensions of varying designs, most containing a set back from the front elevation. Of these however, many project to the side boundary, resulting in several adjoining 2 storey side extensions with awkward roof junctions in places. This means that there is no gap between properties, and despite the Council's assertions, these conjoined extensions inevitably create a terracing effect. The gap to the side boundary in this proposal would prevent this from occurring.
6. Consequently, the proposal would have an acceptable effect on the character and appearance of the area. This would be compliant with Policies HC4 and EQ2 of A Local Plan for Sefton (April 2017), and Policy MAG 4 of the Maghull Neighbourhood Plan 2017-2037 (January 2019). Together these policies require the size and scale of extensions to be in keeping with the original dwelling and surrounding area and that developments make a positive contribution to their surroundings through the quality of their design, respecting the distinctive characteristics.
7. Furthermore, there would be compliance with the Framework which seeks to ensure that developments are sympathetic to local character and history. Lastly, there would be overall compliance with the SPD, which sets out principles and standards that house extensions should meet to prevent harm to the character of the area.
8. The appeal decisions detailed in the officer report provides little information about the specific design of the other proposals, and I have considered this case upon its merits only.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Katie McDonald

INSPECTOR