



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 October 2023

by R Jones BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26th October 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/Z4310/D/23/3325729

10 Barnhurst Road, Liverpool L16 7QA

- 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 and Mrs P Read against the decision of Liverpool City Council.
 - The application 22H/3235, dated 27 November 2022, was refused by notice dated 25 April 2023.
 - The development proposed is to erect a first floor extension at side, single storey extension at front (incorporating a new porch).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The Council have raised no issue with the proposed single storey (porch) extension and I have no reason to form a different view. The main issue in this case is therefore the effect of the proposed first floor extension on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. No.10 Barnhurst Road (No.10) is a two-storey semi-detached dwelling located in a prominent position on the corner of Barnhurst Road and Kendal Road. To the side is an existing single storey extension and it is proposed to extend over this to accommodate a master bedroom with ensuite at first floor.
4. My attention has been drawn by both parties to an earlier appeal for an extension to the appeal property, dismissed in January of this year (APP/Z4310/D/22/3312016). I have not been provided with full details of that extension, but there is agreement between the parties that the first floor side element was the same as now before me; the only difference being a rear dormer. Because of the similarities, I have had due regard to this very recent decision and the conclusions of the Inspector.
5. I observed on my site visit that No.10 is located in a residential area comprising semi-detached dwellings of a fairly uniform form and design. The immediate area is characterised by a sense of spaciousness, in part derived from the spacing between the semi-detached pairs and front and rear gardens, but also the building lines of corner plots. The original two-storey elements of No.10 and No.8 Barnhurst Road (on the opposite side of Kendal Road) were designed such that they are offset from the boundary with Kendal Road

providing a sense of spaciousness and affording relatively open views from Barnhurst Close and Barnhurst Road toward Kendal Road. Whilst both of these dwellings have been extended to the side at ground floor, their low height means they do not detract from this spacious quality. I disagree with the previous Inspector that the stepped parapet detail to the front of these extensions is characterful or particularly attractive, but it nonetheless provides a degree of uniformity in appearance either side of the entrance to Kendal Road.

6. The guidance in the Council's *House Extensions Supplementary Planning Guidance Note 1* (SPG1) is that two storey extensions to dwellings on corner plots shall not normally extend beyond the established building line to the return street to ensure they do not detract from the streetscene. The proposed first floor extension would be offset from the side boundary with Kendal Road by only 1.45m, and would be set back from the front elevation by around 1m, projecting to the existing rear elevation. Although it would have a hipped roof form (which slopes away from Kendal Road) and would be set down from the ridge of the original roof, the proposed extension would nonetheless significantly increase the scale and massing of No.10 in a prominent location. It would be to the detriment of the spacious character of the area and would extend this massing beyond the established building line of dwellings on Kendal Road, so the return street. There would therefore be a clear conflict with the SPG1 guidance.
7. The appellant has drawn my attention to various other extensions within the surrounding residential area. I also observed on my site visit that many dwellings have been altered and/or extended, including over two-storeys. However, I do not have any evidence before me to demonstrate that these extensions are so similar as to provide a direct comparison, nor, from my own observations, do I find they lend particular support to the appeal proposals now before me.
8. For the reasons given, I agree with the conclusions of the previous Inspector that the proposed first floor side extension would cause harm to the character and appearance of the area. Consequently, in addition to the conflict with the SPG1 guidance identified above, it would conflict with paragraph 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework and saved Policy H8 of the Liverpool Local Plan 2013-2033 (2022) which together, amongst other things, seek to protect local character.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

R Jones

INSPECTOR