



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 March 2023

by S Brook BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28 March 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/Z4310/W/22/3299909

25A Wivenhoe House, The Spinnakers, Liverpool L19 3RZ

- 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 Mrs Janet Beattie of Evolve Design Develop against the decision of Liverpool City Council.
 - The application Ref 21F/2467, dated 20 August 2021, was refused by notice dated 11 April 2022.
 - The development proposed is 'To erect Juliette balconies to front'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. I have taken the description of the development from the Council's decision notice which correlates with the appellant's appeal questionnaire. This is on the basis that it more accurately reflects the proposed development as shown on the submitted plans for two balconies to the front of Wivenhoe House, whereas the application form only refers to balcony in the singular and so does not correspond with these plans.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of the building itself and the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal scheme relates to a 4-storey block of apartments within a purpose built complex of apartment buildings, set amongst landscaped grounds, including private parking. The apartment buildings within The Spinnakers have a symmetry and consistency in height, design and materials, that contributes positively to the appearance of the development. Each block has a dual pitched and hipped roof design, with two sets of double dormer windows, either side of a central gable feature. Two storey bay windows provide further articulation to the front elevations of each block. The surrounding area is in residential use, comprising a mix of building styles.
5. The proposal would replace the existing dormer windows within the frontage of Wivenhoe House with double doors and a balcony, enclosed by a glass balustrade. The proposed alterations would enlarge the appearance of these roof features, resulting in a top-heavy and disproportionate addition to the roof, that would be at odds with the scale and proportions of the existing

fenestration. As such, the proposal would be an incongruous addition to the roof that would harm the character and appearance of the building itself.

6. Whilst the proposed development would retain the symmetry to this apartment block, it would disrupt the consistency of design across this wider, planned development, which has been otherwise largely retained. As this consistency of design adds positively to the appearance of the development, the proposal would also result in harm to the character and appearance of the wider complex, which is clearly visible from public vantage points along Riversdale Road. Whilst I appreciate that each proposal must be considered on its individual planning merits, allowing development that would undermine this consistency in design, could make it more difficult for the Council to resist future proposals with a similar impact, thereby resulting in a gradual erosion of this quality of the existing development.
7. To conclude on this main issue, the proposal would result in harm to the character and appearance of the building itself and the area. The proposal would therefore conflict with Policies UD1, UD2 and UD7 of the Liverpool Local Plan 2013 – 2033, Adopted January 2022 (LP). Amongst other matters, these policies seek to ensure that new development is of high design quality, taking appropriate account of form, scale, massing, proportions and roofscape in the context of the existing building and the wider area. Whilst I note the decision notice also cites LP Policy H8, this relates to house extensions and is not directly relevant to this proposal.
8. Further, the proposal would not meet the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) in terms of ensuring visually attractive development that adds to the overall quality of the area.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above, having regard to the development plan as a whole and any other relevant material considerations including the NPPF, the appeal should be dismissed.

S Brook

INSPECTOR