
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 April 2023

by Gary Deane BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10th May 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/Z4310/D/23/3317872
32 Woburn Hill, Liverpool L13 6RL

- 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 Neil Pennington against the decision of Liverpool City Council.
 - The application Ref 21H/1730, dated 20 June 2021, was refused by notice dated 12 December 2022.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a roof extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for the erection of a roof extension at 32 Woburn Hill, Liverpool L13 6RL in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 21H/1730, dated 20 June 2021, subject to the conditions set out in the schedule to this decision.

Procedural matter

2. While the appellant has described the proposal as in the above heading, the submitted plans show that the development sought additionally includes a second-floor side addition; an extension to the existing rear dormer; alterations to a first-floor rear window; and new roof lights to be placed onto the extended front roof slope. I have assessed the appeal scheme on that basis.

Main issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host building and the local area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a 2-storey semi-detached dwelling of traditional style within a predominantly residential area, wherein buildings vary in design, age, scale, and general appearance. No 32 has living accommodation within the roof space that is served by a rear dormer and a roof light at the front. Attached at the side of the main house is a single storey garage behind which is a relatively narrow 2-storey projection that is set back from the main front wall and includes a mono-pitched roof that is set below the main ridgeline.
5. The proposal is to enlarge and alter the appeal dwelling primarily by extending the existing side projection upwards and continuing the dual pitched roof over the new addition. The existing dormer would also be elongated to cover part of the extended rear roof with new roof lights inserted at the front.

6. The appeal scheme would result in a larger property with extended front and rear elevations and a continuation of the ridgeline at the same height as the main dwelling. This arrangement would conflict with some of the advice within the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance Note 1: *House Extensions* (SPG), which, although somewhat dated, remains a relevant consideration. Specifically, the SPG notes that residential extensions should be subordinate in scale to ensure visual harmony with the existing building. To emphasise the reduced scale of the extension, the SPG also advises that the ridgeline of the extension must be correspondingly lowered in conjunction with a setback of at least 1-metre from the front wall of the original house.
7. To my mind, the proposal has been carefully designed to reflect the style of the main house. In particular, the continuation of the main ridgeline, as proposed, would respect the horizontal emphasis of the front façade, which is largely derived from its relatively wide frontage, visually strong roof lines and the linear pattern of the first-floor front windows. Given the considerable scale of the host building, the proposal would be a proportionate addition with matching external materials that would also unify the overall design. The set back of the extension from the main front wall would subdue its presence in the front façade and accentuate its subordination to the host building. As the proposal would blend seamlessly into the existing front and rear facades, it would not visually dominate the host building nor appear incongruous.
8. With the new built form in place, the side projection of No 32 would be larger than that of its attached counterpart and the main roof of the appeal dwelling would also appear longer because of the extended ridgeline. Even so, no visual disharmony would result between the principal elevations of these dwellings since the symmetry and balance between them as a matching pair has already been disrupted notably by the introduction of front dormers on the attached property. Other buildings along Woburn Hill vary in scale and design and I saw that several include sizeable extensions that are visible from the road. In that varied built context, the finished dwelling would not look out of place.
9. By complementing the scale and design of the host building and respecting the character and qualities of the local area, the proposal would achieve the visual harmony to which the SPG refers. Therefore, I find that a conflict with some of the guidance within the SPG is insufficient reason to withhold planning permission in this instance.
10. On balance, the Council appears to raise no objection to the remainder of the appeal scheme, which includes a rear dormer extension, new roof lights and a larger first floor rear window. I, too, find these elements of the appeal scheme acceptable in their design, scale and general appearance and there would be no discernible effect on the character and appearance of the streetscape.
11. On the main issue, I conclude that the proposed development would not cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the host building or the local area. As such, it does not conflict with Policies H8 and UD2 of the Liverpool Local Plan 2013-2033 or the Council's SPG. These policies and guidance aim to ensure that house extensions achieve a high quality of design that matches or complements the style of the dwelling and the local area.

Conditions

12. In addition to the standard time limit condition, it is necessary to impose a condition that requires the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans for certainty. To ensure the satisfactory appearance of the development, a condition is imposed to require that the external materials match those of the existing building, as proposed.

Conclusion

13. There are no material considerations that indicate the proposal should be determined other than in accordance with the development plan. For the reasons set out above, I therefore conclude that the appeal should be allowed subject to the conditions set out below.

Gary Deane

INSPECTOR

Schedule of conditions

- 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
- 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Refs 459.1/01 Revision B, 459.1/02 Revision C, 459.21 Revision D, 459.1/22 Revision E and the Ordnance Survey Plans, which both show the site edged red.
- 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.