



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 July 2022

by S Brook BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23rd August 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/Z4310/W/22/3293920

19 Park Way, Liverpool L8 1TS

- 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 I Hoskins against the decision of Liverpool City Council.
 - The application Ref 21F/2359, dated 7 September 2021, was refused by notice dated 3 February 2022.
 - The development proposed is described as 'To erect second storey extension to rear and install roof lights to front side and rear'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of the area, which includes the Princes Road Conservation Area (PRCA) and the setting of heritage assets.

Reasons

3. The proposed development relates to a three-storey end terraced property. These large, terraced properties share a uniformity in their design and materials, with some intricate architectural detailing. Their form and height provide a continuation of the terraced properties that flank nearby Princes Avenue/Princes Road, which is a wide, tree-lined approach from Princes Park towards the city centre. The form, size and architectural quality of many of these terraced properties set along this approach, give the area a sense of grandeur. The layout, uniformity, and architectural quality of the terraces on Park Way therefore contribute positively to the significance of the PRCA.
4. As Park Way branches off Park Avenue/Princes Road, several cultural and religious buildings are positioned to the north-west, some of which are listed. Combined, all these elements provide historic value in understanding the prosperous economic development of this maritime city.
5. The proposed rear extension would include a gabled design that breaks the eaves height of the terrace, requiring the removal of a small chimney. This design would be a marked contrast from other rear projections visible on Park Way, which have a single pitched roof running parallel to the main roof, sitting subordinately below eaves height. The proposed development would therefore appear discordant, upsetting the rhythm and uniformity of the terrace at the rear, and would fail to appear subordinate. As such, it would result in harm to the character and appearance of the property itself and the terrace.

Furthermore, given the visibility of the rear elevation from Harrowby Street and Selborne Street, for the same reasons, the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the PRCA.

6. I saw other examples of rear projections during my site visit, including those at the rear of Princes Avenue facing Northbrook Street. However, none of these appeared to include a gable design which breaks the eaves height in the same way as the proposed development, thus they do not add any weight in favour of the proposal.
7. The proposed development would also introduce 5 rooflights in differing sizes. To the front and side roof plane, the rooflights would not align with other window fenestration within the property and the rooflight to the side roof plane would appear large in relation to the size of the roof itself. I appreciate that due to the height of these terraces, views of the roof are limited when stood in close proximity. However, the roofscape is visible from further along nearby roads. I also noted the presence of some small rooflights within this and the neighbouring terrace. Nevertheless, given the number, the differing sizes, and the positioning of the rooflights, they would detract from the overall simplicity of the roof plane and uniformity of the terrace. This would result in further harm to the character and appearance of the host property, the terrace, and consequently, to the character and appearance of the PRCA.
8. The proposed use of flush fitting 'heritage' style rooflights, along with sash windows and matching materials, would not be sufficient to outweigh the harm arising from the proposed development.
9. My attention has been drawn to other development within the area. Some show contemporary design sitting alongside more historic properties. Others show less sensitive development within and around the Conservation Area. The examples given do not justify any further erosion of the character and appearance of the PRCA. As such, these examples do not weigh in favour of the proposal and do not lead me away from my earlier findings.
10. Whilst not specifically referenced in the decision notice, the Officer's Report (OR) refers to the Grade II listed Former Chapel of the Deaf to the opposite side of Park Way. The adjacent roads of Park Way and Selborne Street provide a physical separation and degree of openness around this building, marking its status as a prominent religious/cultural building. The terraced properties of Park Way frame this building to the east, thereby contributing to its setting. Given the nature and small scale of the works proposed to the property frontage, the proposed development would have a neutral effect on the contribution this property makes to the setting of this listed building and the significance deriving from it.
11. Nevertheless, the harm identified to the character and appearance of the PRCA would have a negative effect on the significance of this heritage asset. Given the scale and nature of the proposed development, the harm to the significance of the PRCA would be 'less than substantial'. Considerable importance and weight is to be given to the desirability of preserving heritage assets, irrespective of the level of harm. Policy HD1 of the Liverpool Local Plan 2013 – 2033, Adopted January 2022 (LP) requires that less than substantial harm is balanced against any public benefits. I shall turn to this matter below.

12. The plans include the reinstatement of an original window opening to the side elevation with traditional sash frames. Given the small-scale nature of this work, whilst it would make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the PRCA, it would be of limited benefit and therefore attracts limited weight. There are no other public benefits identified that would attract any further weight. These limited benefits would not outweigh the identified harm.
13. To conclude, I have found that the proposal would result in harm to the character and appearance of the property itself and the terrace, failing to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the PRCA, causing less than substantial harm to its significance as a heritage asset. This harm has not been justified by public benefits that outweigh that harm. The proposed development therefore conflicts with LP Policy HD1 which requires proposals to preserve or enhance the historic environment and the significance of heritage assets, and LP Policy H8 which requires high quality design that complements the style of a dwelling and the surrounding area. Nor does it comply with the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework in terms of achieving high quality design and conserving heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance.

Other Matters

14. I note that the proposed development has not attracted any neighbour objections and, the intention that the property is to be owner occupied for the first time in a considerable number of years. However, these other matters do not outweigh the harm that I have identified in relation to the main issue.

Conclusion

15. For the reasons outlined above, having had regard to the development plan as a whole and all other matters raised, the appeal should be dismissed.

S Brook

INSPECTOR