
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/21/3287087

15 Daresfield Road, Liverpool L16 0JR

- 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 Ian Strachan against the decision of Liverpool City Council.
 - The application Ref 21H/1195, dated 6 April 2021, was refused by notice dated 13 September 2021.
 - The development proposed is a single storey side, front and rear extension and detached garden room.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed in so far as it relates to the proposed single storey side, front and rear extension.
2. The appeal is allowed in so far as it relates to the detached garden room at 15 Daresfield Road, Liverpool L16 0JR and planning permission is granted in accordance with the terms of application, Ref. 21H/1195, dated 6 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 Drawing Number 20 FZ Rev A dated March 21 (in so far as it relates to the detached garden room).
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the detached garden room shall match those of the main dwelling.

Procedural Matter

3. Since the application was determined, the Liverpool Local Plan (LP) has been adopted and supersedes the Liverpool Unitary Development Plan (UDP). My decision takes this into account.

Main Issue

4. The Council is satisfied that the proposed detached garden room is of an acceptable design and would not adversely affect the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring properties. I have no reason to disagree.
-

5. Accordingly, the main issue in this case is the effect of the side, front and rear extension on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the street scene within which it sits.

Reasons

6. The appeal relates to a traditional semi-detached property which sits on a bend in a road which is home to similar dwellings. The appeal property has a wide frontage and garden and a detached garage sits to the side of the dwelling.
7. The proposed single storey extension would sit slightly forward of the main body of the host dwelling and it would 'wrap around' the side and rear. At its widest point, the extension would actually be wider than the host dwelling. This would be in direct conflict with the guidance contained within the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance Note 1 titled '*House Extensions*' (SPG), which advises that side extensions should not exceed half of the width of the existing house. Whilst I note the SPG was adopted in 1996 and pre-dates the change to permitted development rights, this remains a sound design principle in my view.
8. I am mindful that an adequately sized rear garden would remain and the extension would be set further off the boundary with No. 11 Daresfield Road than the existing garage. Nevertheless, I am of the view that it would be excessively wide and although only single storey, it would be disproportionate to the traditional form and modest width of the original dwelling. As a result, the proposed extension would appear as a somewhat awkward and unsympathetic addition and it would imbalance the overall form of this pair of semi-detached dwellings.
9. Views of the proposed extension from the south would be partially screened by the mature vegetation at the front of No. 11 Daresfield Road. However, given the position of the property on a bend, the visual harm would be widely visible from other points along this road and it would detract from what is an otherwise well ordered street scene.
10. For the above reasons, I find that the proposed extension would harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and that of the street scene within which it sits. In such terms, it conflicts with policy H8 of the LP and the SPG which promote high quality design and seek to ensure that extensions are of a size and scale that is in keeping with the original dwelling and the surrounding area.
11. The Appellant asserts that enclosing the space between the existing garage and the house would improve security. I have no reason to dispute this, but in the absence of any compelling evidence to the contrary, I consider that security could be improved in other ways. The Appellant also asserts that the additional space is required to enable working from home and to accommodate an elderly parent. Whilst I sympathise with this position, nothing I have seen or read persuades me that additional accommodation could not be provided in a more visually acceptable manner.
12. Finally, the Appellant refers to other extensions within the local area. However, I do not know the precise planning circumstances behind the examples referred to. Moreover, I have considered the appeal proposal on its

individual merits, taking into account the specific context within which it would be located.

13. Accordingly, these factors do not outweigh the harm I have found in relation to the extension and the associated policy conflict. As a result, this element of the appeal does not succeed.
14. As explained, the garden room is considered to be acceptable in all respects. As this element of the scheme is physically and functionally separate from the proposed extension, a split decision can be issued in this case.

Conditions

15. In addition to the standard conditions which limit the lifespan of the planning permission and direct that the development takes place in accordance with the approved plans, the Council has suggested one other condition in the event the appeal succeeds. I agree that the external finish of the garden room should match that of the host dwelling in order to ensure a visually acceptable development. I will impose these conditions in allowing this element of the appeal.

David Fitzsimon

INSPECTOR