



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 January 2023

by D J Barnes MBA BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16 February 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/Z4310/D/22/3310600

31 South Mossley Hill Road, Liverpool L19 3PY

- 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 MC Architecture + Design Ltd against the decision of Liverpool City Council.
 - The application Ref 22H/1406, dated 10 May 2022, was refused by notice dated 20 October 2022.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a two storey side extension, single storey rear and side extension, rear bay window alteration, solar photovoltaic panels and raised patio to rear garden.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Application for costs

2. An application for costs was made by Mr Mike Crewdson against Liverpool City Council. This application is the subject of a separate Decision.

Main Issue

3. It is considered that the main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the streetscene.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a 2-storey semi-detached dwelling of traditional design located within a predominantly residential area of similarly designed dwellings. By reason of siting at a bend in the road the property is a noticeable building in views along Mossley Hill Road from the south. The proposed development includes a 2-storey side extension of contemporary design. The choice of proposed external materials would also be contemporary in their nature rather than echo the predominance of brick or rendered walls and tiled roofs.
5. As identified by the appellant, some of the dwellings fronting South Mossley Hill Road have been altered. From what was observed, No. 8 has a single storey rather than 2-storey side/rear extension. The design of the 2-storey side extension at No. 33, in particular the flat roof element, does not positively contribute to the character and appearance of either this dwelling or the streetscene. Although the appellant has identified other dwellings which have been altered within the wider area, their detailed planning circumstances have

not been provided. For these reasons, the appeal scheme has been assessed on its own planning circumstances.

6. Although a large extension to the host property, because of its relationship to No. 33 at the bend in the road, the size of the plot and the proposed side extension utilising the original footprint of the garage, the scale of the appeal scheme would neither unacceptably detract from the rhythm of the semi-detached dwellings which characterise the streetscene nor represent an overdevelopment of the plot. The width and setting back of the proposed extension from the property's frontage would mean it would not physically dominate the appearance of the host dwelling by reason of its scale.
7. However, the contemporary design and massing of the proposed development, in particular the flat roof and fenestration of the side extension, together with the choice of external materials, even as offered to be amended by the appellant, would fail to complement the more traditional character, appearance and materials of the host property and other dwellings fronting the road. For these reasons, the design of the proposed 2-storey side extension would be an incongruous form of development and would be a visually discordant addition to this noticeable property when viewed along the road from the south.
8. For the reasons given, it is concluded that the proposed development would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the host property and the streetscene and, as such, it would conflict with Policies H8 and UD1 of the Liverpool Local Plan. Although these policies do not require a traditional style of design they do, amongst other matters, require house extensions to be of a high quality of design that matches or complements the style of the dwelling and the surrounding area, and for the materials to be in keeping with the original dwelling and the characteristics of the surrounding area. Accordingly, it is concluded that this appeal should be dismissed.

D J Barnes

INSPECTOR