



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 January 2024

by F Rafiq BSc (Hons) MCD MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 6th February 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/Z4310/W/23/3323925

Former Lock Up Garages Site, Honey's Green Lane, Liverpool, Merseyside L12 9EN

- 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 Thomas Wong against the decision of Liverpool City Council.
 - The application Ref 23F/0610, dated 24 February 2023, was refused by notice dated 31 May 2023.
 - The development proposed is to reconfigure and extend lock up garages to accommodate private car collection.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. A revised National Planning Policy Framework (Framework) was published in December 2023. I have had regard to this in reaching my decision.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development on: (i) the character and appearance of the area; and (ii) the living conditions of nearby residential occupiers, with regards to outlook.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

4. The appeal site is located to the rear of houses off Honey's Green Lane and behind commercial properties that are on the corner of Honey's Green Lane and Eaton Road. It is occupied by various single storey garages and the access to them also provides access to the rear of a number of neighbouring properties. The area around the appeal site is formed mainly of two storey properties that are set on generally consistent building lines and which have regular features, such as front bay windows that gives the area a cohesive character.
5. The proposal includes a single storey unit which would be no higher than the height of the existing garages. Despite this, it would occupy a significant portion of the site. This would result in a poor relationship with surrounding development, which is characterised by regularly shaped plots, with many of the buildings set in from the boundaries. Although there would be limited views of the proposal from public vantage points, it would still be seen in views along

the access, where it would appear out of keeping with the prevailing form of development.

6. I therefore conclude that the appeal development would have an unacceptable adverse impact on the character and appearance of the area. As such, it would conflict with Policies UD1, UD2 and UD5 of the Liverpool Local Plan 2013-2033 (Local Plan) and Paragraph 135 of the Framework, which seek, amongst other matters, the highest design standards and development proposals that take account of local grain and the pattern of development.

Living Conditions

7. The appeal development is close to the garden areas of a number of surrounding properties. As the proposal would not result in an increase in the height at the boundaries, I do not consider that there would be any adverse impact on the outlook of neighbouring residents from their garden areas. The development would however be seen from the upper floors of surrounding residential properties, but in such views, the proposed sedum roof would replace the current views that comprise of garage roofs and areas of concrete hardstanding. As such, its form would soften the appearance of the site as it appears currently from elevated views, and it would not be an overdominant structure that is harmful to the outlook of neighbouring residential occupiers.
8. Given the above, I conclude that the proposed development would not have an unacceptable adverse impact on the outlook of neighbouring residential occupiers with regards to outlook. As such, it would not be contrary to Policies H7 or UD5 of the Local Plan, which seek, amongst other matters, that there would be no detrimental effect on the amenities of the residential area. It would also not be contrary to Paragraph 135 of the Framework, which seeks, amongst other matters, a high standard of amenity.

Other Matters

9. The proposal seeks to provide a covered space to store, inspect and valet a private car collection. The current garages were constructed at a time when cars were smaller and are in need of refurbishment. The proposed unit would also ensure that any works that would take place on the cars would be contained internally rather than in the open external area. The proposal would use natural ventilation and reference has been made to other measures, including the re-use of water. These considerations weigh in favour of the development, but they would not however outweigh the harm that I have identified on the first main issue.
10. The appeal site is not in a conservation area, a housing renewal area or at risk of flooding. These are however neutral considerations and are not matters which weigh in favour of the development.
11. I have taken into account the other matters raised in relation to the proposed use in terms of traffic generation, noise and disturbance, but they do not alter my conclusion on the first main issue in this case.

Conclusion

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

F Rafiq

INSPECTOR