



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 February 2023

by K Winnard LL.B (Hons) Solicitor

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27th February 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/M4320/D/22/3310555

1 Crescent Road Birkdale Sefton PR8 4SR

- 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 Dave Colville against the decision of Sefton Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref DC/2022/01819, dated 14 September 2022, was refused by notice dated 26 October 2022.
 - The development proposed is a single storey extension to front of dwellinghouse (Alternative to DC/2022/01069).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. I have adopted the Council's description of the development within the banner heading above. I note too that this description has been adopted by the agent in the appeal form.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area and the streetscene.

Reasons

4. 1 Crescent Road is a two storey dwelling which together with its attached neighbouring properties, Nos 1a Crescent Road and 92 Liverpool Road, form a substantial building, sited on a spacious plot in a prominent corner location at a crossroads junction. Similarly large buildings set back from the road occupy the other generous corner plots at this junction and there is an overall sense of rhythm and coherence in this location. The proposed extension would be built across most of the front elevation of the dwelling extending into the front garden. It would significantly exceed the maximum depth of front extensions recommended in the Sefton Council House Extensions Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). This provides that extensions beyond 1.5 metres will only be permitted provided they do not, amongst other matters, cause harm to the character of the area.
5. Whilst the front garden attached to the appeal dwelling is spacious and the proposed extension would be set back from the highway, it would nonetheless

be a significant feature within the streetscene. It would introduce an overly long uncharacteristic front projection which would be highly visible, significantly distracting from the uniformity of the area and the generous corner plots found in this location. Nor would the existing planting and trees, even when in full leaf, adequately mitigate against the harm that would be caused. As such the proposal would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the area.

6. I accept that there are consistent building lines along Liverpool Road and Crescent Road. However, as a corner plot, it is not uncommon to find a building positioned differently and to have a different relationship with the street. The proposed extension would not be forward of the building lines found on Liverpool Road and Crescent Road. It would nonetheless be sited forward of the front elevation of its attached property, 1a Crescent Road and as such would appear as an incongruous feature within the streetscene.
7. I acknowledge that the guidance within the SPD is not prescriptive. However, its overall aim in line with Policy HC4 of the Sefton Council -A Local Plan for Sefton (2017) (Local Plan) is to set out principles to prevent harm to the character of the area. I also appreciate the desire for an extension to create additional room in the dwelling and that this cannot in this case be achieved by means of a rear extension. However I am not convinced that a less harmful scheme could not achieve similar aims. I therefore give these matters limited weight. The appellant's agent also highlights that the appeal property is not within a Conservation Area, and is not listed. I also note that the lack of objections to the proposal and that the Council welcomed some of the changes to the design of the extension from a previous scheme. However, these factors would have a neutral effect and do not weigh in favour of the proposal.
8. Accordingly, I conclude that the proposal would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the area and would be an incongruous feature within the streetscene. As such it would fail to comply with Policies HC4 and EQ2 of the Local Plan and guidance within the SPD. Together these policies require development to respond positively to the character, local distinctiveness, and form of its surroundings. The proposal would also be in conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework which seeks to promote development sympathetic to local character.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons above and taking account of all matters raised, I hereby dismiss the appeal.

K Winnard

INSPECTOR