

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 March 2022

by David Fitzsimon MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21st March 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/Z4310/D/21/3284470

17 Kings Close, Liverpool L17 9QS

- 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 Terence McDonough against the decision of Liverpool City Council.
 - The application Ref 21H/1509, dated 10 May 2021, was refused by notice dated 29 September 2021.
 - The development proposed is to erect a single storey extension to side and rear and porch to front.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. I have taken the description of the proposed development from the Council's Decision Notice rather than the Application Form as it is more concise.
3. Since the application was determined, the Liverpool Local Plan has been formally adopted and supersedes the Liverpool Unitary Development Plan. My decision takes this into account.

Main Issues

4. The main issues in this case are as follows:
 - the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the street scene;
 - its effect on the living conditions of the occupier(s) of No. 16 Kings Close with particular regard to outlook; and
 - whether adequate private car parking would remain.

Reasons

5. The appeal relates to semi-detached bungalow. It sits within a modern cul-de-sac which is home to dwellings of a range of sizes and styles. The proposal seeks to add a single storey extension to the side and rear of the host dwelling along with a porch to the front elevation.
-

Character and appearance

6. The proposed side extension would continue the existing ridge and eaves of the bungalow. It would be set slightly off the side boundary and it would be finished in matching external materials. The proposed porch would project some 1250mm from the main front elevation of the dwelling. It would have a gable feature with a ridge that would sit much lower than the main ridge.
7. The proposed side extension would connect with the rear extension, effectively 'wrapping around the bungalow'. The plot is a reasonable size and could comfortably accommodate this addition. However, the Council asserts that the proposed side extension and porch would erode the current symmetry with the attached bungalow, No. 16 Kings Close.
8. This pair of semi-detached dwellings exhibit symmetry in terms of their overall form and scale. However, they are not symmetrical in terms of their fenestration. No. 16 has a door and a standard window to the front elevation whereas the appeal dwelling has a door and an elongated window which spans from eaves to floor. The proposal would change this elongated window to a standard window and change the door to a standard window, bricking up the space below. The proposed porch would have two doors to the front elevation with one serving a bin store and the other serving a newly created hallway within the side extension.
9. I consider that the design and scale of the proposed side extension and porch would sit comfortably alongside the host dwelling. I accept that the proposed extension would lead to a loss of symmetry in terms of the overall form of this pair of semi-detached bungalows. However, many of the pairs of semi-detached dwellings within Kings Close have been extended and altered on an individual basis, with similar losses of symmetry. This is quite a noticeable feature of the overall character and appearance of Kings Close and it leads me to the view that the loss of symmetry as a result of the appeal proposal would be acceptable in this particular context.
10. I therefore find that the proposal would not harm the character or appearance of the host dwelling or that of the street scene within which it sits. In such terms, I find no conflict with the overall aims of policies H8, UD1 and UD7 of the adopted Liverpool Local Plan (LP).

Living conditions

11. The proposed single storey rear section of the extension would run close along the boundary with the attached dwelling, No. 16 Kings Close and it would project some 4.8 metres from their main rear elevations. Although the pitched roof of the proposed extension would rise away from the shared boundary, the eaves of the extension would be much taller than the existing boundary fence.
12. The extent of rearward projection would be considerable and would significantly exceed the maximum 3 metres recommended by the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance Note 1 titled '*House Extensions*' (SPG). When combined with the overall height of the proposed extension and its position running close along the boundary, I am of the opinion that it would appear overly dominant and unduly oppressive when viewed from the nearest

room at the rear of No. 16 which I understand is used as a bedroom and from its patio area.

13. I therefore find that the proposal would unacceptably harm the outlook from No 16 Kings Close, contrary to policy H8 of the LP and the SPD.

Car parking

14. The proposed side extension would result in the loss of the garage and car parking space at the side of the dwelling. However, kerbside car parking within the cul-de-sac was in plentiful supply at the time of my visit. Furthermore, the Appellant has suggested that the front garden would be put to hardstanding in order to provide private car parking. As other properties within the immediate vicinity have done this, it would not appear out of keeping. I am also satisfied that it could be secured by a suitably worded planning condition in the event that the appeal was successful.
15. On this basis, I find that adequate private car parking space could be retained therefore the development need not conflict with policy TP8 of the LP.

Other matters

16. The Appellant argues that the proposal would create a home for life, future proofing the property for old age. Whilst I appreciate the benefits of this, nothing I have seen or read persuades me that it could not be achieved without unduly compromising the outlook from the attached dwelling.

Overall Conclusions

17. I conclude that although the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the street scene and need not lead to an unacceptable loss of private parking, it would have an unacceptable impact on the outlook from the rear of No. 16 Kings Close.
18. The arguments advanced by the Appellant do not outweigh this harm and the associated policy conflict therefore the appeal does not succeed.

David Fitzsimon

INSPECTOR