



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 May 2022

by Martin H Seddon BSc MPhil DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16 November 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/Z4310/D/22/3296340

10 Logfield Drive, Liverpool L19 2RR

- 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 Speer against the decision of Liverpool City Council.
 - The application Ref: 20H/2804, dated 20 October 2020, was refused by notice dated 14 February 2022.
 - The development proposed is two storey side and single storey front and rear extensions – loft conversion incorporating rear dormer.
-

This decision is issued in accordance with Section 56(2) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended) and supersedes the decision issued on 17 June 2022.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues in this appeal are the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the building and surrounding area, and the effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of No.8 Logfield Drive in respect of outlook.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. No.10 Logfield Drive is a modern two-storey semi-detached dwelling located in a residential area. The other part of the semi-detached pair of No.12 has a two-storey side extension and a single storey rear extension. There is a staggered building line which results in the rear elevation of the neighbouring dwelling of No.8 Logfield Drive being set back from the rear elevation of the appeal building by around 6 m.
4. The Council has raised no objection to the proposed single storey front extension. I see no reason to disagree because it would comply with guidance in the Council's Supplementary Planning Note 1:House Extensions. The proposed two-storey side extension would be similar to the side extension at No.12 in terms of its proportions and set back from the front elevation and set down from the ridge line.
5. The proposed rear extension would project to the rear for the same distance as the rear extension at No.12. The proposed rear dormer would extend across the majority of the rear roof slope, including the rear roof slope of the

proposed side extension. The dormer would have minimal set back from the side of the roof and the boundary with No.12 and no set down from the ridgeline. It would appear over-dominant, contrary to advice in the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance 1: House Extensions. The appeal dwelling backs on to an industrial area rather than other dwellings. However, the roofs of immediately adjacent houses on this side of Logfield Drive do not have rear dormers and consequently a dormer of the scale and size proposed would appear unduly large and out of character when seen from the rear gardens of neighbouring dwellings.

6. The elements of the proposed development are not separable and taken as a whole they would have a significant harmful effect on the character and appearance of the building and surrounding area. The proposal would conflict with Liverpool Local Plan policies H7 and H8 which seek to protect the residential character of areas and ensure that the size and scale of extensions are in keeping with the original dwelling and surrounding area. It would also conflict with Local Plan policies UD1 and UD7 concerning local character and extensions to buildings.

Living conditions

7. No.8 Logfield Drive has a rear conservatory. There is a timber fence and shrubs along the boundary between No.8 and No.10 which provide a degree of screening between the rear gardens of the two properties. The outlook from the conservatory at No.8 is already reduced because of the boundary fence and shrubs.
8. The proposed rear extension would project around a further 3.29 m from the original rear wall of the building and alongside the boundary with No.8. This would only be slightly more than the 3 m limit in the council's guidance. However, I consider that the rear extension would have a harmful effect on the living conditions of neighbours when using their rear garden and conservatory in respect of increased loss of outlook because of its degree of projection, height and proximity to the boundary, and taking into account that No.8 is sited further back than No.10.
9. The proposal would therefore conflict with Liverpool Local Plan policies H7 and H8 which seek to protect the residential character of areas and ensure that the size and scale of extensions are in keeping with the original dwelling and surrounding area. It would also conflict with Local Plan policies UD1 and UD7 concerning local character and extensions to buildings which, amongst other things, seek to protect residential amenity.

Conclusion

10. I acknowledge the appellant's desire for additional accommodation and lack of objections from neighbours. I have taken all other matters raised into account, including the National Planning Policy Framework and the appellant's suggested use of conditions. However, for the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Martin H Seddon

INSPECTOR