



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 March 2023

by J D Clark BA (Hons) DpTRP MCD DMS MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15 June 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/Z4310/D/23/3315080

25 Heyscroft Road, Liverpool L25 8RU

- 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 Daniel Ronan against the decision of Liverpool City Council.
 - The application Ref 22H/2162, dated 5 August 2022, was refused by notice dated 2 November 2022.
 - The development proposed is demolition of existing garage and construction of two storey gable extension, single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. An application for a Certificate of Lawfulness has previously been approved to alter the existing roof from a hipped one to a gable¹. A planning application has also previously been granted for a two storey side extension². I note that the notice granting the Certificate of Lawfulness includes an informative that those works if carried out would prevent the implementation of the approved planning application.
3. The description of the proposed development includes a single storey rear extension. This part of the proposal is not in dispute and I have no reason to disagree. The proposal also includes demolishing an existing garage which at the time of my site visit had already gone and construction works were underway on the site.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons

5. The appeal site comprises a semi-detached house at the end of a cul-de-sac. At the head of the cul-de-sac is a row of terraced houses with a pair of semi-detached houses at either end of the turning head and another pair of semi-detached houses at right angles to the terrace that is, Nos 25 and 27 at one end are mirrored by Nos 20 and 22 at the other end. There is a uniformity to this layout which contributes to the character of the area and whilst No 25 is

¹ Application No: 23LP/0108.

² Application No: 22H/3143.

located at the end of a cul-de-sac, the turning head is fairly wide and so the house can easily be seen from this end of the road.

6. The adjoining semi-detached house, No 27 has a two-storey flat roofed side extension and so there is already some degree of unbalancing or a lack of symmetry between these properties. I also note that No 27 also has obtained a Certificate of Lawfulness to alter the roof from a hip to a gable³. Whilst the area is generally characterised by hipped roofed there are examples where alterations have changed this. In particular, Nos 7 and 9 and Nos 17 and 19 Heyscroft Road. However, neither No 7 or No 17 have been extended in the same way as proposed here. For example, Nos 7 and 9 are different styles of houses and the position of Nos 17 and 19 in a row along Heyscroft Road is different to the layout of houses at the head of the cul-de-sac where No 25 is located. Other examples are cited which I have only limited details about but in any event are located further away and so do not directly relate to Heyscroft Road.
7. Notwithstanding the above, the original design of the houses in the road comprises hipped roofs and the approved two storey extension to No 25 would retain a hipped roof. The Certificate of Lawfulness demonstrates that the roof to No 25 could be altered from a hip to a gable without planning permission. However, these two developments could not both take place. In effect, one or the other could be built but not both. Therefore, either the approved planning approval or the Certificate of Lawfulness provide fall-back positions.
8. However, the proposal would result in an amalgam of these two designs by altering the shape of the roof and adding a two storey extension (and the single storey rear extension). Whilst the main difference therefore would be an added section of roof, this would enlarge the overall width of the roof and make the alteration from a hip to a gable very pronounced; much more so than that which could be constructed under permitted development. I find that the harm caused by the totality of this proposal would be significant to both the host dwelling and the surrounding area.
9. As proposed, I find that the proposed extension would significantly alter the character and appearance of the existing dwelling. It would erode the original proportions, design and overall appearance of the house to such an extent as to be harmful. Although No 25 is at the end of the cul-de-sac, the layout of the surrounding houses, their uniformity in design and the large turning head which makes the appeal site very visible, would result in a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the street scene.
10. Notwithstanding the fall-back positions explained above, I consider that the design of the proposed two storey extension would fail to complement the style of the dwelling and its size and scale would not be in keeping with the original dwelling or the surrounding area as required by Policy H8 of the Liverpool Local Plan⁴. The harm caused by the proposal would be significant and the fall-back positions arising from the Certificate of Lawfulness and the previous planning approval do not outweigh that harm.

³ Application No: 22LP/1717.

⁴ Liverpool City Council – Liverpool Local Plan 2013-2033, Adopted January 2022.

Other matters

11. The appellant has pointed out the economic benefits of the proposal during the construction phase; the benefits arising from improving the appearance of the host dwelling; and the lack of any adverse impacts on residential amenity or highway safety. Whilst these support the proposed scheme they are not of such scale or of sufficient merit to overcome the harm I have identified.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above, and having regard to the development plan and all other consideration, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

J D Clark

INSPECTOR