



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 February 2022

by Martin H Seddon BSc MPhil DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22ND March 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/H4315/D/22/3290671

35 Markfield Crescent, St. Helens, Merseyside WA11 9LB

- 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 and Mrs Scott and Suzanne Matthews against the decision of St. Helens Council.
- The application Ref: P/2021/0756/HHFP, dated 2 August 2021, was refused by notice dated 22 October 2021.
- The development proposed is part single storey, part two storey side extension, single storey forward extension with canopy roof across.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for part single storey, part two storey side extension, single storey forward extension with canopy roof across at 35 Markfield Crescent, St. Helens, Merseyside WA11 9LB in accordance with the terms of the application ref: P/2021/0756/HHFP, dated 2 August 2021 and subject to the conditions in the schedule at the end of this document.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the building and street scene.

Reasons

3. The appeal building is a two-storey detached dwelling located at the junction of Markfield Crescent and Wyken Grove. The building is within a residential area which includes two-storey detached and semi-detached dwellings, some of which have extended to the side.
4. The Council refers to single storey extensions at Markfield Crescent leaving gaps at first floor level between properties providing a noticeable and welcome relief to the built form. The appeal building is in line with two pairs of semi-detached dwellings. However, there is some variation in the layout of other development around the appeal site.
5. I found at my site visit that, although the appeal building is in a corner position, with land to the front and side, it does not appear particularly open in character. The side and rear part of the plot is enclosed by a boundary wall with a timber boarded fence above. The remainder of the plot has a low wall and timber fence with a laurel hedge to its rear. Trees and shrubs also provide screening for the building.

6. The semi-detached dwelling at the opposite side of Wyken Grove (No.26) is also in a corner position and partly screened by a fence and hedging when viewed from Markfield Crescent. This property was granted permission in 2015 for a 5.8 m wide single storey extension to form a double garage and a 3 m wide first floor extension. The appeal proposal would involve some similarity with that development by constructing a single storey extension to form a garage and extension to the rear, around 5.4 m in width, and with a two-storey extension around 3.5 m wide, with linking front canopy. The two-storey element would be set in from the flank elevation of the proposed garage, thereby reducing its visual impact in the street scene. The Council advises that the extensions would project well over guidance in its supplementary planning document: *Householder Development*, at ground and first floor levels. I consider that the existence of the development at No.26 is a significant material consideration because of its proximity and the form and scale of its extensions. I also note that the development was approved after the Council's supplementary planning document: *Householder Development* was adopted in 2011.
7. I find that although there would be some conflict with the Council's supplementary planning document for house extensions, the appeal proposal would have no significant detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the building and street scene. It would therefore comply with St. Helens Core Strategy policy CP1 which aims to maintain or enhance the overall character and appearance of the local environment. It would not conflict with St. Helens Unitary Development Plan policy GEN 8 which seeks to ensure that proposals respect the scale, design character and appearance of the original dwelling as well as the character of its neighbours and local setting. It would also comply with paragraph 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework which indicates, amongst other things, that development should be sympathetic to local character including the surrounding built environment.

Other Matters

8. The appellant has referred to examples of house extensions in the area. The circumstances of these are different to those of the appeal proposal. Nevertheless, the development at No.26 Wyken Grove forms part of the immediate setting for the appeal site.

Conditions

9. In addition to the standard condition for the timescale of development I have included a condition to confirm the approved plans. A condition is also imposed to ensure that the external materials used in the development match those in the existing building, in the interest of maintaining the character and appearance of the development and surrounding area.

Conclusion

10. I have taken all other matters raised into account. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed subject to conditions.

Martin H Seddon

INSPECTOR

Schedule of Conditions

- 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
- 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: site location plan and 1283/SK/201 existing and proposed plans and elevations.
- 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.