



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 August 2022 by N Unwin BSc (hons) MSc

Decision by K Taylor BSc (Hons) PGDip MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24 August 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/Z4310/D/22/3298391

30 Westway, Liverpool L15 7LX

- 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 Ms Melissa Unsworth against the decision of Liverpool City Council.
 - The application Ref 22H/0285, dated 31 January 2022, was refused by notice dated 26 April 2022.
 - The development proposed is a two storey side and rear extension and ground floor rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issues to be considered are the effect of the proposal on i) the character and appearance of the host property and wider area; and ii) the living conditions of the occupiers of no. 28 Westway and no. 32 Westway, with regard to outlook.

Reasons for the Recommendation

Character and Appearance

4. The area surrounding the appeal site is residential in character with the street scene formed mostly of semi-detached two storey dwellings. These pairs of semi-detached dwellings share a close spatial relationship with one another. It was evident from my site visit that many of these dwellings have been altered with single and two storey side extensions intensifying this close relationship. The two storey side extensions observed generally appear subservient to the original dwelling through the use of a lower ridge height and set back position from the front elevation. Due to the proximity of these dwellings to each other, little can be seen of the side elevations from the public realm with the principal elevation of these forming the street scene.
5. The appeal property is a two storey semi-detached dwelling of a similar scale and design to that of the surrounding dwellings. The appeal site forms a corner plot and as such is set at a slight angle to the neighbouring no. 32. There is an

attractive simplicity in the design and well-proportioned nature of the appeal property. An existing single storey extension is located to the rear of the host dwelling which by virtue of its scale remains subservient and preserves the character of the main body of the dwelling.

6. The proposal would involve a two storey side extension which would follow the eaves of the existing dwelling, however the ridge height would be lower and the front elevation set back from that of the host dwelling. The two storey side extension would continue well beyond the rear elevation of the existing single storey extension, forming a substantial elevation to the rear. The existing single storey rear extension would be altered to have a flat roof and project slightly further into the rear garden, finishing approximately parallel with the conservatory of the adjoining no. 28.
7. The continuation of the proposed two storey extension substantially beyond the existing rear elevation of the host dwelling would appear as an awkward addition, undermining the modest and understated form of the appeal property. The proposed rear two-storey end elevation would be a substantial feature and compete with the host dwelling further harming its existing character and appearance.
8. The side and rear elevations of the proposal would be largely screened from the public realm and so the length of the extension would not be prominent from this vantage point. When viewed from the street, the front of the proposed two storey side extension, by virtue of its set back nature and lower ridge line, would appear subservient to the host dwelling. As such the proposal would not significantly affect the street scene in itself.
9. Although the single storey rear extension would project slightly beyond the existing rear extension, by virtue of its scale and form, it would remain subservient and in keeping with the character of the host dwelling. However, the lack of harm to the street scene and the acceptability of the single storey element of the scheme would not mitigate the harmful effect that would arise to the character of the host property from the scale of the two storey rear projection.
10. For the above reasons I conclude that the proposed development would result in an unacceptable impact on the character and appearance of the host property. Accordingly, I find the proposal would conflict with the objectives of Policies H8 and UD7 of the Liverpool Local Plan (2022) which require extensions to be in keeping with the size, scale, and form of the host dwelling.

Living Conditions

11. The appeal property adjoins no. 28 Westway, a two storey dwelling of a similar scale with a single storey rear conservatory. Despite the distance of the proposed two storey rear extension from the boundary with no. 28, due to its scale and significant projection beyond the existing rear conservatory, it would appear overbearing when viewed from the rear garden of no. 28.
12. Due to the appeal property's siting, set at an angle to no. 32, there is a greater distance between the dwellings as you progress to their rear elevations. A flat roofed single storey side and rear extension of no. 32 adjoins the boundary of the appeal site. The proposal would create an expansive side elevation with an absence of openings or architectural detailing within the second storey

resulting in a dominant and oppressive form. This built form would project closer to the boundary with no. 32 and would appear overbearing when viewed from the rear garden.

13. The proposed single storey rear extension would adjoin the boundary with no. 28. However, it would not extend beyond the rear elevation of the existing conservatory and therefore this element is not considered to unduly impact the outlook of the occupants of no. 28. The lack of harm from this element of the proposal would not mitigate the harm identified above.
14. Based on the above, I conclude that the proposed development would have an unacceptable impact on the living conditions of the occupiers of no. 28 Westway and no. 32 Westway, with particular regard to outlook. Accordingly, I find the proposal would conflict with the objectives of Policies H8 and UD7 of the Liverpool Local Plan (2022) which require extensions to minimise and not significantly impact the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers.

Other Matters

15. I acknowledge that the appeal site benefits from a previous planning approval (ref: 21H/2269). Nevertheless, the proposal would represent an increase in built form beyond that scheme and therefore the fallback position would not bring about the same harmful impacts as this proposal.

Conclusion and Recommendation

16. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

N Unwin

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

17. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

K Taylor

INSPECTOR