



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 March 2023

by Elaine Moulton BA (Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24 March 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/Z4310/D/23/3314639

Orrest, Hillfoot Road, Liverpool, L25 0NB

- 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 Doyle against the decision of Liverpool City Council.
 - The application Ref 22H/2275, dated 22 August 2022, was refused by notice dated 2 December 2022.
 - The development proposed is a double storey side extension with single storey to the rear.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a double storey side extension with single storey to the rear at Orrest, Hillfoot Road, Liverpool L25 0NB in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 22H/2275, dated 22 August 2022, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:
 - Existing and proposed site and location plans;
 - Proposed floor plans; and
 - Proposed elevations.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal proposal is a detached two storey dwelling externally finished in white, textured render. The site lies on a corner plot fronting onto Hillfoot Road and side onto Waylands Drive. Hillfoot Road comprises dwellings of various sizes and designs, and does not have a defined building line. Waylands Drive has a consistent building line and comprises semi-detached dwellings which are uniform in appearance.

4. The proposal would result in a two-storey extension to the side of the property and a single storey extension. The Council have raised no objections to the single storey rear extension and from my observations I have no reason to disagree.
5. The introduction of a second gable feature on the front elevation as proposed would reflect the appearance of the existing house resulting in a front elevation with a broadly symmetrical form. The proposed extension would be well designed and appropriately proportioned, notwithstanding that it would not appear as a subservient addition to the original dwelling. Accordingly, the character and appearance of the host dwelling would not be harmed.
6. The two-storey extension would sit forward of the building line on Waylands Drive and would thereby increase the prominence of dwelling within this corner plot. Nonetheless, it would be set well in from the side boundary of the property ensuring separation from the public highway. Consequently, it would not appear overly dominant in the street scene including in views along Waylands Drive where it would be seen against the backdrop of the dwellings on Hillfoot Road. Overall, I consider that the proposal would not be detrimental to the character and appearance of the area.
7. I am mindful that the Council's adopted House Extensions Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) suggests that two storey extensions on corner plots shall not normally extend beyond the established building line to the return street frontage. This is in part to ensure that the development does not detract from the street scene. For the reasons above I consider that the proposal would not cause visual harm to the area. As such it would not conflict with the SPG, which is guidance and is not prescriptive in this regard.
8. Therefore, the development does not have an unacceptable effect on the character and appearance of the area. It would thereby accord with Policy H8 of the Liverpool Local Plan 2013-2023 which requires, amongst other things, that extensions are of a high quality of design and of a size scale and materials that are in keeping with the original dwelling and the surrounding area. In addition, it would not conflict with the guidance in the SPG as set out above.

Conditions

9. In addition to the standard condition which limits the lifespan of the planning permission I have specified the approved plans for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning. A condition relating to matching materials is also necessary to ensure that the appearance of the new development would be satisfactory.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above, having regard to the development plan as a whole and all relevant material considerations, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Elaine Moulton

INSPECTOR