



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 31 March 2022

by R Morgan BSc (Hons) MCD MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25 April 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/Z4310/D/21/3283731

Beechwood, Glenrose Road, Liverpool, L25 5JT

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a failure to give notice within the prescribed period of a decision on an application for planning permission
 - The appeal is made by Mr Paul Geoghegan against Liverpool City Council.
 - The application Ref 20H/2525, is dated 25 September 2020.
 - The development proposed is single storey extension to rear and extend existing dormer.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed and planning permission is refused.

Procedural Matters

2. The planning officer's statement identifies Policies HD18 and H8 of the Liverpool Unitary Development Plan 2002 (UDP) as being particularly relevant to the appeal. However, since the statement was submitted, the Council has adopted the Liverpool Local Plan, which now forms the development plan for the area. Policies HD18 and H8 of the UDP have been replaced, and the Council has confirmed that the pertinent policy within the new Local Plan is H8. The appellant has provided comments on the implications of this change in policy context, which I have taken into account.
3. The House Extensions Supplementary Planning Guidance Note (SPG) refers to the now replaced UDP, but still provides useful guidance for considering proposals for this type of development. I have therefore had regard to its contents in determining this appeal.

Main Issue

4. Although it did not determine the application, the Council has provided an assessment of the proposal and has indicated the grounds on which it would have refused the application. Based on the information provided, the main issue is the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of the occupiers of Casa Nuestro and Calcot, having particular regard to outlook, light and privacy.

Reasons

5. Beechwood is an L-shaped bungalow with a large rear garden, located in a residential area. The adjacent bungalows Calcot and Casa Nuestro, both of which front onto Acrefield Road, have rear gardens which back onto to the side of the appeal site. I was able to assess the proposal from all three properties, and saw that both Casa Nuestro and Calcot have wide plots but fairly short

- back gardens. These neighbouring properties are situated at a lower level than Beechwood, and their back gardens step up towards the shared boundary.
6. Beechwood occupies almost the full width of its plot. Its side elevation, which incorporates a dormer feature, runs alongside, and very close to, the shared boundary with Calcot, for most of the width of that neighbouring garden. Although Beechwood is a bungalow, the proximity to the boundary with Calcot, combined with the difference in ground levels, means that the appeal property forms a dominant feature when viewed from the rear garden of Calcot.
 7. The appeal property already provides a significant degree of enclosure to the foreshortened garden of Calcot, but the existing hip at the end of the roof provides relief and a view towards trees in the distance. Although the proposed rear extension would be no higher than the existing dwelling, the loss of the hip and continuation of the existing roof would increase the sense of enclosure experienced by the occupiers of the neighbouring property.
 8. The existing dormer is set within the roof plane, but when viewed from the garden of Calcot below, it appears to be higher than the main ridge of the roof. The dormer is already a prominent feature, but only occupies a fairly small proportion of the roof. By extending the dormer as proposed, a greater section of the roof, which currently slopes away from Calcot, would be replaced by the vertical side of the dormer. This would significantly increase the dominance of the dormer, contributing to the impression of a two-storey house in very close proximity to the shared boundary with Calcot.
 9. Due to the relative orientation of the buildings, the proposed alterations would not cause significant overshadowing or loss of sunlight to Calcot, and the additional window in the dormer would be obscure glazed so would not result in loss of privacy. However, the combination of the proposed dormer extension and loss of the hipped roof would increase the sense of enclosure, and would result in the appeal property appearing overly dominant and overbearing when viewed from the rear garden area of Calcot.
 10. The proposed extension would extend along part of the shared boundary with Casa Nuestro, but only for a short part of this wide plot, away from the most sensitive living areas. The overall height of the appeal property would not increase, and the existing hedge, on the Casa Nuestro side, is sufficiently high to provide effective screening for the proposed extension. The extension would be sited close to the shared boundary, but only the top of the ridge would be visible from this neighbouring property. Owing to these factors, the proposed extension would not result in overshadowing or overbearing impact on Casa Nuestro, and for similar reasons there would be no undue loss of privacy.
 11. The proposed extension would be acceptable in terms of its footprint and external appearance, and would provide additional living and bedroom space which would be a significant benefit for the appellant's family. The impact on Casa Nuestra would be acceptable. However, these factors are not sufficient to outweigh the harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of Calcot.
 12. I conclude that the proposal would fail to provide satisfactory living conditions for the occupiers of Calcot, with particular regard to outlook. The proposal would conflict with Local Plan Policy H8, which specifies that extensions must not result in an overbearing or over-dominant effect on the habitable rooms or outdoor amenity space of neighbouring properties.

Conclusion

13. The proposal does not comply with the development plan, and there are no other factors which outweigh this finding. For the reasons set out, the appeal is dismissed and planning permission refused.

R Morgan

INSPECTOR