



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 April 2023

by Sarah Colebourne MA, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25th April 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/Z4310/D/23/3313821 36 Glentrees Road, Liverpool, L12 5EU

- 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 John Welsh against the decision of Liverpool City Council.
 - The application Ref 22H/1979, dated 17 July 2022, was refused by notice dated 30 September 2022.
 - The development proposed is described as 'two storey side extension, single storey rear extension, through-coloured render of whole property, new windows throughout & full new roof'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Reasons

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the dwelling and the street scene. The development plan includes policy H8 of the Liverpool Local Plan (2013-2033) (adopted 2022) which seeks to ensure that proposals are of a high design quality that matches the style of the dwelling and surrounding area and that the size, scale and materials are in keeping. National policy in the Planning Policy Framework ('the Framework') also seeks to encourage high quality design.
3. The appeal site comprises a hipped roof semi-detached dwelling within a residential area of similar properties likely to have been built in the 1930's. It occupies a corner plot and like other dwellings on corner plots in the area, faces towards the junction. Several of the other corner plot dwellings have been extended with two storey side extensions over the years. Where such extensions have not taken place as at this site and its adjoining neighbour, the pair of dwellings are broadly balanced and the spaces around the dwellings gives a sense of openness. This contributes positively to the suburban character and appearance of the street scene.
4. The proposed development would extend the dwelling to the side with a part two storey, part single storey extension. It would replace an existing front porch and single storey side and rear extensions. The plans show that the hipped roof side extension would be set back from the main front wall by some 0.5m and would be set down from the main ridge by a similar distance. The single storey element would have a lean to roof and would wrap around the dwelling with a single storey extension across the rear elevation. I have noted

that the Council has not objected to the rear part of the extension and from what I have seen that would be acceptable.

5. In regards to the side element of the proposal, I have noted that the Council's decision does not refer to its Supplementary Planning Guidance Note 1 'House Extensions' (SPG1) (adopted 1996) which does not form part of the development plan and is not referred to in policy H8 or in policy UD1 on local character and distinctiveness quoted by the appellant. However, it is a material consideration in this appeal because it was referred to in the officer's report, has been subject to a Cabinet decision that it remains in force and has not been withdrawn by the Council. Whilst it carries only limited weight due to its age and adoption prior to changes to permitted development rights, it nevertheless provides some useful guidance in assessing such extensions against policy H8. SPG1 requires that side extensions do not occupy more than half of the width of the dwelling. Whilst there can be flexibility in applying this, as this requirement does not conflict with the development plan or the Framework and the principle seeks to reduce the impact of extensions requiring planning permission on the existing dwelling and the street scene, it is relevant in this case.
6. At some 3m in width, the proposed two storey element would occupy only half of the 6m width of the dwelling (incorrectly referred to as 3m in the officer's report). This would make it sufficiently subservient in terms of width and would reduce its impact. In that respect, it would be similar to the approved two storey side extensions on corner plots very nearby and seen from Glentrees Road at 65 Marlton Road, 54 and 67 Lydford Road. Those dwellings are of a similar age and character to the appeal dwelling with a similar relationship to their neighbours. On this basis, there are no material differences between those extensions and the two storey element proposed here and I find, therefore, that it would be acceptable.
7. However, the single storey element would result in additional width and in this respect the proposal differs materially from the other approved extensions. As such, on the basis of the plans and from what I saw at my visit taking into account the circumstances of the site, it would be disproportionate to the scale of the existing dwelling. This would severely visually unbalance both the dwelling and the pair and it would be unduly dominant in the street scene, particularly when seen from the junction with Lingmell Road. As the extended dwelling at 75 Lingmell Road is not on a corner plot and is sited at the end of a cul-de-sac it is not directly comparable with the appeal site and does not provide a precedent for this proposal.
8. SPG1 also requires that such extensions are set back behind the building line of the neighbouring dwelling. The proposal would extend forward of the building line of no 34 Glentrees Road by some 2m. I have had regard to the appeal decision for a two storey side extension at 1 Berkley Avenue, Liverpool (ref APP/Z4310/D/21/3285682). As that relates to a more modern type of dwelling which is sited with its gable end parallel to the return street and has a different relationship to its neighbours and the street scene than in this case, it does not provide any additional support for the appellant's case.
9. However, the proposal would be similar to the other approved extensions referred to in paragraph 6 in terms of the interruption of the building line. Although those were approved prior to the adoption of the current local plan,

SPG1 was in place at that time. The Council has not demonstrated any significant difference between those examples and this proposal in regards to the two storey element and from what I have seen, they are very similar. It seems to me that the Council was therefore inconsistent in refusing the proposal in regards to the breaching of the building line.

10. As the two storey element would be set back from the main front wall of the dwelling and would be set down from the main ridge by a similar degree to some of the other examples, it would be sufficiently subservient and this would minimise adequately the impact on the pair of dwellings. There is sufficient distance between the proposed two storey element and the side boundary for it to sit comfortably in the street scene without appearing overly dominant.
11. However, as the single storey element to the side is not clearly severable from the two storey side and single storey rear parts of the extension, I am unable to issue a split decision in favour of those elements.
12. I conclude then that by reason of the overall width of the side extension, the proposal would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the dwelling and the street scene, contrary to development plan policy H8 referred to earlier.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given, I conclude that the appeal would be contrary to the development plan and should be dismissed. There are no material considerations that justify determining the appeal otherwise.

Sarah Colebourne

Inspector