

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 July 2023

by John Whalley

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25th July 2023

Appeal ref: APP/Z4310/D/23/3319886

57 Childwall Valley Road, Liverpool L16 4PB

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal of planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Paul Taylor against the decision of Liverpool City Council.
 - The application, ref. 22H/3234, 26 November 2022, was refused by a notice dated 7 February 2023.
 - The development proposed is the retention of dormer extension to the rear.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. Planning permission 20H/2226 was issued in January 2021 for a 2-storey extension at the side and single storey extension to front and rear to the semi-detached house at No. 57 Childwall Valley Road. The Council said the rear dormer was wider than that approved, extending into the 2 storey side extension. Although it may be doubtful that the wider dormer is severable from the 20H/2226 permission, the Appellant Mr Taylor seeks retrospective planning permission for the retention of the rear dormer window extension. I have dealt with the appeal on that basis, (s.73A of the Act).

Main issues

3. The main issues in this appeal are whether or not the dormer extension at No. 57 as built is an unacceptably prominent and incongruous addition to the dwelling and whether it has materially harmed the appearance of the street scene.

Considerations

4. The Council said the 6m wide appeal dormer had created a roof extension with a volume of 32.4m³. By extending across the existing and part of the extended roof planes, it was unduly prominent and incongruous. It had harmed the street scene.
5. Seen from the fronting Childwell Valley Road, directly facing No. 57, the extensions to the house do not look unduly intrusive. The 2 stepped ridge levels of No. 57 match those of No. 59, the other part of the 2 semi-detached dwellings, the main visible difference being the 2 roof windows in the side

extension at No. 57. As the view to No. 57 moves to the south-west along Childwall Valley Road the degree of imbalance in the roofs, that was of concern to the Council, becomes evident and obvious. I agree with them that the resulting extension at No. 57 fails to match the sympathetic subservient side extension that was added to No. 59 a few years ago. As a result, the new side roof at the Appellant Mr Taylor's home looks incongruous and ill-fitting, materially harming the view to the house and its immediate surroundings.

6. I note the Appellant's comments about a suggested minimal difference between the fallback position, that is, the right conferred by the General Permitted Development Order to extend a dwelling without the need for specific planning permission, and what has been built at No. 57. But it is that difference and that between what was permitted by the 20H/2226 planning permission and the present roof alteration that has produce an unacceptable layout. There has been a greater emphasis on the desire to provide better internal accommodation than to achieve an acceptable external design.
7. I viewed a number of houses nearby that have dormer extensions. Several of those extensions were described by the Appellant as prominent. I agree with his assessment, incorporating perhaps the implication that 'prominent' included a critical connotation. Precedents can be relevant in considering the merits of new building work. But they should not guide a decision towards a wider acceptance of poor design, in this case further harming the street scene.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons outlined above, the appeal is dismissed.

John Whalley

INSPECTOR