



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 May 2023

by A Veevers BA(Hons) DipBCon MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13th June 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/Z4310/D/23/3315514

28 Well Lane, Childwall, Liverpool L16 5ET

- 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 Paul Roberts against the decision of Liverpool City Council.
 - The application Ref 22H/2306, dated 30 August 2022, was refused by notice dated 20 January 2023.
 - The development proposed is a two storey extension at side and rear, single storey rear extension and detached double garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The Council confirm, within their delegated report, that the single storey rear extension and detached double garage are acceptable additions on their own merits. I have no evidence before me to conclude differently on these elements as a result of the submissions before me or my site visit. The decision notice confirms that the refusal reason is based upon the two storey side extension. For the avoidance of doubt my deliberations and decision are therefore focused solely upon this element.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed two storey side extension on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is within a predominantly residential area characterised by mostly two storey semi-detached properties. In the immediate vicinity of the appeal site, the properties on the north side of Well Lane are slightly staggered with minimal gaps between them. However, properties on the south side of Well Lane have a fairly consistent building line, set behind small front gardens and driveways with low front walls. These dwellings, for the most part, sit within spacious plots and are of a different age and design to those on the north side. Most have retained a traditional appearance incorporating gabled features with decorative bargeboards and finials.
5. The appeal property is located on the south side of Well Lane and the adjoining semi-detached dwelling, along with several other dwellings in the street, have been extended. Despite the extensions, the spaces in-between the properties on the south side of the street have largely been maintained. This consistency

- of scale and appearance as well as the appreciable spaces in-between contributes positively to the character and appearance of the area.
6. The proposed two storey extension would be set back from the main front wall of the existing dwelling and would have a roof height slightly below that on the main roof ridge. The development would be finished in materials to match the existing dwelling. However, the proposed two storey side extension would be a substantial width.
 7. The Council's House Extensions Supplementary Planning Guidance Note 1 indicates that 'two storey side extensions on semi-detached properties should not exceed half the width of the existing house'. The submitted plans denote the proposed extension would be significantly more than half the width of the existing property. Although the existing property is relatively narrow and the proposed extension would be set back from the main front wall and replicate the gabled feature on the front elevation, it would not appear subordinate. The excessive width would appear bulky, over-dominant and out of proportion with the host property to the detriment of the dwelling's façade. This would be further exacerbated by the proposed fenestration on the front elevation of the extension which, on the evidence before me, would be different to the existing fenestration.
 8. Additionally, the significant width of the proposed side extension would be at odds with the balance of the pair of semi-detached properties. Even though a gap would be retained between the side wall of the proposed extension and the adjacent property No. 30 Well Lane (No. 30), the disproportionate width of the proposed extension would appear an incongruous addition, harmful to the character and appearance of the host property and the immediate street scene.
 9. The appellant has referred to a number of two-storey side extensions that have been approved in the area which are more than half the width of the host property, in particular, at No. 30 and No. 32 Well Lane (No. 32). I have not been provided with the specific details or background of these examples. Nevertheless, I saw at my site visit that the side extension at No. 30 was part two storey and part single storey and is therefore not directly comparable to the appeal before me. Furthermore, the side extension at No. 32 includes an integral garage so is therefore a different design to the appeal proposal and also not directly comparable. In any event, I find that extension to be disproportionate. Therefore, whilst I acknowledge the generous plot width of the appeal property, I do not consider that the presence of these nearby extensions provides a justification for the appeal proposal.
 10. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the proposed two storey side extension would harm the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area. It would be contrary to Policy H8 and Policy UD1 of the Liverpool Local Plan 2013-2033 which together, amongst other things, seek to ensure extensions and alterations to houses are of high quality design that is in keeping with the original dwelling and the surrounding area and takes account of local grain, rhythms and patterns established by streets, spaces and built form.

Other Matters

11. I have had regard to matters raised by an interested party, including in regard to the location, size and use of the proposed detached double garage.

However, given the refusal reason, my conclusions on the main issue and that the appeal is dismissed, there is no need for me to address this in further detail.

Conclusion

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

A Veivers

INSPECTOR