



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 January 2024

by S. Hartley BA (Hons) Dist.TP (Manc) DMS MRTPI MRICS

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 January 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/M4320/D/23/3331515

8 Coronation Road, Lydiate, Sefton L31 2NQ

- 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 Shennan against the decision of Sefton Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref: DC/2023/01271, dated 17 July 2023, was refused by notice dated 13 September 2023.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a two-storey extension to the side of the existing dwelling and a single storey extension to the rear of the existing dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for the erection of a two-storey extension to the side of the existing dwelling and a single storey extension to the rear of the existing dwelling at 8 Coronation Road, Lydiate, Sefton L31 2NQ in accordance with the terms of the application ref DC/2023/01271, dated 17 July 2023, and subject to the following conditions: -
 - i. The development hereby permitted shall begin no later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - ii. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: site plan/block plan (with date and time 11:54:55 17/07/2023); drawing no. 21 DS02-0, and location plan (with date and time 11:54:46 17/07/2023).
 - iii. 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.

Procedural Matter

2. A revision to the National Planning Policy Framework 2023 (the Framework) was published on 19 December 2023. The amendments made did not have a bearing on the issues in this appeal, and it was therefore not necessary to seek comments from the main parties upon it. Where I have referred to the Framework, it is that of the December 2023 version.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development upon the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is located on the corner of Coronation Road and Client Avenue in a residential area consisting of mainly two-storey dwellings with hipped roofs. It forms what appears to have been one part of a pair of semi-detached properties, but which, by the addition of extensions, is now a continuum of 4 linked dwellings. Those extensions include two storey additions to No's 6,4 and 2 Coronation Road where the first floors are set well back from the original front elevations.
5. The appeal property includes a single storey porch with a double pitch roof which extends beyond the front elevation of the appeal property.
6. The proposed development includes the demolition of a single storey, attached side garage and its replacement by a two-storey side extension where the existing hipped roof would be extended over it in like manner. The two-storey side extension would join a single storey rear extension.
7. The Council's Extension Supplementary Planning Document 2023 (SPD) would normally expect a two-storey side extension to be set back by at least one course of brickwork from the existing front elevation at ground floor level, and by at least a metre at first floor level. Such extensions should not normally take up more than half of the available space between the existing side of the house and the adjoining highway. In addition, extensions should not encroach beyond established building lines, and materials should be in keeping with the original dwelling house and surrounding area.
8. However, so far as the set-back at first floor level is concerned, the SPD states that this does not apply where *'the extension is set in from the side boundary by at least one metre and /or would not give the appearance of linking properties or result in a terraced effect'*.
9. The appeal property is on a corner and the proposed extension would be more than 1 metre away from the side boundary. As it is the end property, the extension would not create either the impression or the reality of a linked development.
10. So far as the building line to Client Avenue is concerned, this is not entirely uniform and, in addition, it can be considered to follow the curve of the road. In any event, the position of the proposed extension in this regard would not be substantially different to the existing side garage which it would replace. Any such difference to the building line would not be particularly noteworthy. There would be no change to the building line on Coronation Road.
11. It is the case that the side extension would not be set in from the front elevation by at least one course of brickwork and the ridge to the side extension would not be set down below that of the host property. There would thus be some conflict with the SPD. However, the SPD advises that *'it is important that you do not read each section of this document in isolation as the guidance will be applied as a whole'*.
12. I have given consideration to how the proposed extension would look when seen alongside the adjoining property where the two together, despite the existing extensions, still retain some semblance of a pair of semi-detached

dwellings. However, the differences between the two are considerable, as a result of the side extensions, the porch to the appeal property, and the different treatment to the front elevations, with one retaining its brick appearance and the other having an off-white colour.

13. I consider that the overall balance between the adjoining properties has been lost and would not be replaced if the proposed extension were to mirror that of the adjoining dwelling. For one thing, the existing porch to the host property would prevent any such balance from being restored.
14. On my site visit, I noted that the adjoining property at 95 Client Avenue has a similar, though not exact, two storey side extension to the appeal proposal, though I acknowledge that it was constructed prior to the adoption of the SPD.
15. For the above reasons, I conclude that, despite some conflict with parts of the SPD, the proposed development would accord with its overall intentions, and that in terms of size, scale, use of materials and overall design, it would assimilate satisfactorily with the host property and that of the immediate area. It would conform with policy HC4 of the Sefton Local Plan 2017 which requires house extensions to be of high-quality design and which match the style of the dwelling in question and that of the surrounding area. It would also accord with Chapter 12 of the Framework which requires the same.

Conditions

16. I have imposed the standard time condition and a condition to ensure the development is in accordance with the approved plans in the interests of certainty. In the interests of good design, it is necessary to impose a condition relating to external materials.

Conclusion

17. For the reasons outlined above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

S. Hartley

INSPECTOR